INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP PRACTICE IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF KELLEM WOLLEGA ZONE, OROMIA NATIONAL REGIONAL STATE, ETHIOPIA

M.A THESIS

MITIKU HABTE GEMTESA

AUGUST, 2018

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY, HARAMAYA

Instructional Leadership Practice in Secondary Schools of Kellem Wollega Zone, Oromia National Regional State, Ethiopia

A Thesis Submitted to the College of Education and Behavioral Science, Department of Educational Planning and Management

Postgraduate Program Directorate

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

Mitiku Habte Gemtesa

August, 2018

Haramaya University, Haramaya

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY

POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE

We hereby certify that we have read and evaluated this thesis entitled ‘‘*Instructional Leadership Practice in Secondary Schools of Kellem Wollega Zone, Oromia National Regional State, Ethiopia’’* prepared under our guidance by Mr. Mitiku Habte. We recommend that it be submitted as fulfilling the thesis requirement

Bahar Adem(Ph,D) _____ _____

Major Advisor Signature Date

Yergalem Alemu(Ass.Profesor) _____ _____

Co- Advisor Signature Date

As members of the board of examiners of the MA Thesis open Defense Examination, We certify that we have read and evaluated the thesis prepared by Mitiku Habte and examined the candidate. We recommend that the Thesis be accepted as fulfilling the Thesis requirement for the Degree of *Master of Arts in School Leadership.*

_____ _____ _____

Chair Person Name Signature Date

_____ _____ _____

Internal Examiner Name Signature Date

_____ _____ _____

External Examiner Name Signature Date

Final approval and acceptance of the Thesis is contingent upon the submission of its final copy to the council of Graduate Studies (CGS) through the candidate’s department or School graduate Committee (DGS or SGC)

DEDICATION

I dedicate this piece of work to my beloved wife Yerusalem Merga and all my families.

STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR

By my signature below, I declare and confirm that this Thesis is my own work. I have followed all ethical and technical principles of scholarship in the preparation, data collection, data analysis and compilation of this Thesis. This Thesis is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the MA Degree at Haramaya University. The Thesis is deposited in the Haramaya University Library and is made available to borrowers under the rulers of the library. I solemnly declared that this Thesis has not been submitted to any other institution anywhere for the award of any academic Degree, Diploma or Certificate.

Brief quotation from this Thesis may be made without special permission provided that accurate and complete acknowledgement of the source is made. Request for extended quotation from or reproduction of this Thesis in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the school or department when in this judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interest of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author of the Thesis.

Name: Mitiku Habte Gemtesa Signature _____

Date _____

School/ Department: Educational Planning and Management

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

The author was born in Oromia Reginal State, Kellem Wollega Zone, Sayo Woreda, on September 11, 1985. He attended his primary education at Tabor Elementary school (1993-2000). Then, he joined Bethel Evangelical Secondary School where he attended grade 9^{th} to 10^{th} (2001-2002) and he attended 11^{th} and 12^{th} grades (2003-2004) in Kellem Secondary and Preparatory School and completed his general secondary education in June 2005. Then, he joined Dilla University in (2005-2008) and received BED Degree in Chemistry in July 2008. After his graduation, he taught at Kondala Secondary School in Kondala Woreda of Western Wollega Zone as a Chemistry Teacher. He had taught there for five years and has been transferred to Biftu Ashi Secondary School in 2014 which found in Kellem Wollega Zone, Anfillo Woreda where he is working now. Currently, he is working in Kellem Wollega Zone, Anfillo Woreda as vice principal of Biftu Ashi Secondary School; and he joined Haramaya University, the school of Graduate Studies to Study MA program in School Leadership in July 2016.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The successful completion of any study of this kind is only possible through the invaluable support of a number of people. Therefore, I would like to express my appreciation for the help I received from several individuals and institutions in the course of carrying out this study.

My heartfelt gratitude also goes to my major advisor Bahar Adem (Ph.D) and co- advisor Yergalem Alemu(Ass.Profesor) for their constructive comments and support from the beginning to the end of the research work. Their valuable advice and constructive comments helped me to a great extent, and their assistance in shaping the paper in its present form.

My thanks also go to Kellem Wollega Zone Secondary School principals, supervisors, teachers and Woreda Education Experts for their cooperation in filling out the questionnaire and attaining the interview.

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

EdPM	Educational Planning and Management
ESDP	Education Sector Development Program
ETP	Education and Training Policy
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GEQIP	General Education Quality Improvement Package
MAP	Management and Administration Program
MoE	Ministry of Education
NETP	National Education and Training Policy
PTA	Parent Teacher Association
SIP	School Improvement Program
TDP	Teachers Development Program
UNESCO	United Nations, Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organizations
WEEs	Woreda Education Experts
WEO	Woreda Education Office

Table of Contents

Continues…

Continues…

LIST OF TABLES

Tables

Instructional Leadership Practice in Secondary Schools of Kellem Wollega Zone,Oromia National Regional State, Ethiopia

Mitiku Habte

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the Instructional Leadership Practice in Secondary Schools of Kellem Wollega Zone, Oromia National Region State, Ethiopia. To this end, basic questions were raised regarding the instructional leadership practices, and the factors that hinder the practices of instructional leaders. To conduct this study descriptive survey research design was employed. Sampled schools were selected by simple random sampling method. The sample size was 123 teachers were selected by using stratified random sampling techniques, 37 school leaderds were selected by using availability sampling techniques with the total of 160 participants out of 215 study populations. The data gathering tools employed was questionnaire, interview, focus group discussion and document reviews. The data were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. The quantitative data was analyzed by descriptive statistics such as mean, frequency, percentage, standard deviation and inferential statistics t-test to compare the means of two groups. The qualitative data gathered was analyzed qualitatively through narration for the purpose of triangulation. The finding of the study indicated the performance of secondary school leadership practice in implementation of SIP, decision making and resource management was found at moderate level in selected secondary schools. In addition, these school leaders were not effectively playing their part in monitoring, motivating their schools communities and stakeholders. As a result, lack of implementation what was planned, lack of cooperation among school communities and low awareness on instructional leadershippractices happened. To improve the practices of instructional leadership in secondary schools, all the concerned bodies, namely: Zonal education office, woreda education office and leaders at school level should commit themselves to solve the schools instructional leadership practices problems by creating awareness on the practice of instructional leadership through positive work relation, experience sharing, distributing instructional materials and facilitating different training for the practices of instructional leadership.

1. INTRODUCTION

This part of the study discusses sub-topics which deal with background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions, objectives, significance, delimitation and limitation of the study and definition of key terms.

1.1 Background of the Study

In the era of globalization, education is viewed as a vital tool of socialization and development of human capital. That is why the success of schools are mainly depending on leadership capacity of the school leaders, as one factor and mainly teachers' achievement which affects students' academic performance to approve quality education. This implies that the practices of instructional leadership is a collaborative and teamwork between school principals, mentor teachers or in-built supervisors. Mainly, instructional leaders will interpret and enact their practices in a variety of ways depending on the instructional leaders: attitude, functions/contributions, challenges, and other factors (Hallinger, 2005).

Schools are expected to carry out their day to day activities in a proper manner in order to achieve common instructional goals. This requires the effectiveness and commitment of the stakeholders particularly teachers, school leaders and management. Education sector's ability to deliver high quality education is dependent to a very large extent on its leadership quality. For that reason, the sector would see to the permanent appointment of acting principals. This implies that the school leaders as instructional leadership have a significant role to play regarding education quality improvement (Aggarwal, 1985).

In line with the attention given to the quality education, the importance of instructional leadership is considered as a major vehicle for the change and educational development (Musaazi, 1988). With the increased value put on instructional leadership, what comes to vision is the school as an environment to change the productivity which depends mainly on the ability of instructional leaders to analyze existing conditions and future challenges, and implement strategies for attaining the goals (Ubben & Larry, 1997). On top of this, principals should be well qualified, competent, and experienced in performing instructional leadership functions; framing and communicating school goals, supervising and evaluating of instruction, coordinating of the curriculum, monitoring of student progress, protecting of instructional time, maintaining high visibility, providing incentive for

teachers, promoting professional development, and providing incentive for learning (Murphy & Schiefelbein, 1990).

However, in implementing the above instructional activities and in bringing changes in the school systems as effective as possible, school leaders may face many challenges; the divergent challenges and needs that evolved from discontinuous environmental changes including globalization introduce new trends of instruction in schools. This in turn will create challenging burden upon the effectiveness of school leaders, teachers, and students. In this regard, to overcome the bottleneck challenges faced by school leaders and improve instructional leadership, there might be strategies used by school leaders (Faunce, 1955).

Due to the fact, the government of Ethiopia has prepared a guide line which incorporate instructional leadership functions and criteria for recruitment and selection of competent principals at secondary schools with higher standard in academic readiness(post graduate), five year experiences in instructional activities and commitment aspects of teachers to be school principal (MoE, 2010). In Ethiopia, although an attempt has been made to make the instructional leadership decentralized and professional, still a lot remains to be done in training and professionalizing principal ship. Owing to this fact, principals failed to play their pivotal instructional leadership role (MoE, 2013).

With regard to Kellem Wollega Zone Education Office Report (2015), over the last 10 years substantial quantitative achievement have been made, secondary schools have increased from 2 in 2003 to 37 in 2013. New schools had been built and expanded. So that education opportunities and the participation of students were gradually increasing in the Zone. Nevertheless, quality of secondary education in the zone is yet requiring much to be done. Thus, to improve this, school principals need to be well competent and effective in performing instructional leadership activities. Consequently, the preceding attempts would indicate that the conditions of secondary schools invite for appropriate instructional leadership which in turn calls for scientific study of major problems of secondary schools principals in instructional leadership. Therefore, the study attempts to measure instructional leadership practices and challenges related to school improvement program, resources management, participatory decision making and practice of shared leadership. Besides, the study identifies challenges affecting school leaders' instructional leadership practices and strategies used by school leaders to improve instructional leadership practices.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Instructional leadership has a particular importance in educational administration because of its far reaching effects on the accomplishment of school programs, objectives, and educational goals. In light of this, secondary school principals are expected to perform well with instructional leadership activities (MoE, 1994). Effective educational leaders are designed to manage the computing sometimes conflicting demands of the school members to provide an educational climate that promotes growth and development of the students, teachers and leaders. Because when instructional leaders monitor and provide feedback on teaching and learning process, there is an increase in teacher reflection and relatively informed instructional behaviors, a rise in implementation of new ideas, greater variety in teaching strategies, more likely to take risks and had more focus on the instructional process, and teachers used professional direction to make changes in class room practices (Marks and Printy, 2003).

In order to promote quality education, Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia's MoE (1994) gave more attention to school leadership recently. To ensure this management and administration program of GEQIP was designed (MoE, 2007). It is believed that proper implementation of this program has great contribution to build the capacity of school leaders. This in turn contributes to the improvement of education quality. Actually, after education quality assurance package has been introduced, it is essential to undertake regular and systematic assessment on its effectiveness.

Firdissa (2006) on his part argued that although there are established opportunities, including GEQIP for quality assurance in Ethiopian education system, many challenges such as the rapid enrollment expansion, scarcity of resources and low proportion of qualified teachers are untouched challenges. Moreover, as stated by UNICEF (2010), the weak capacity of the schools to correctly interpret, plan, implement, and monitor policies and programs, and inadequate resources highly affect the reform. The school principal, who must also be the instructional leader, must focus on process related to teaching and instruction and also support the achievement of students in every other conceivable fashion(Marks and Printy, 2003), because school leader is one of the role player in schools to promote quality education(MoE, 2007).

The researcher has been working as school vice principal for more than 5 years in the study area. He observed from his experience the contribution of instructional leaders in some schools is poor. This

resulted from inappropriate implementation of school activities like SIP, lack of resource management, lack of participatory decision making and lack of cooperation among the school communities namely the principals, unit leaders, department heads, teachers, students and parents.

There were local studies conducted in relation to the practice of instructional leadership in Ethiopia content. For instance, the study done by Demoze (2007) in Addis Ababa indicated that practices of instructional leadership enhance quality of education in relation to identifying some of its effects. The study done by Aselef(2012) in Dire Dawa indicated that there were some problems with the status of instructional leadership practices. The study done by Abose(2014) in Haramaya University indicated that practices of instructional leadership in prepatory school of western Wollega Zone. Hence, as Kellem Wollega zone which is one of the zones in Ethiopia is not free from lack of effective and efficient instructional leadership practice in secondary schools. This was found to be weakness in instructional supervision and implementation capacity of school principals (Kellem Wollega Zone Education Office Report, 2015). Though, from the above notions one may depict that the existing situation could affect the quality and practices of instructional leadership in secondary schools, until now there were not enough studies that could show the status of instructional leadership practices in Kellem Wollega zone. Therefore, this study was attempted to make an assessment on practices of instructional leadership in secondary schools of Kellem Wollega Zone, Oromia Region with the following basic questions:

1.3. Research Questions

Based on the problem stated above the study was designed to answer the following basic research questions:

1. What were the instructional leadership practices of the secondary schools in Kellem Wollega zone in terms of implementation of SIP, resource management, participatory decision making?
2. What were the challenges that instructional leaders encounter during their day to day activities in secondary schools of the study area?
3. What were the strategies used by school leaders to improve instructional leadership practices?

1.4. Objective of the Study

The Objectives of this study was presented as general and specific objectives.

1.4.1 General objective

The general objective of the study was to investigate instructional leadership practices in selected secondary schools of Kellem Wollega Zone Oromia National Regional State, Ethiopia.

1.4.2 Specific objectives

The specific objectives of the study were intended to:

- To assess the existing instructional leadership practices in terms of implementation of SIP, resources management and participatory decision making in secondary schools of Kellem Wollega Zone.
- Pinpoint the challenges that encounter instructional leadership practices in General secondary schools of study area.
- Recommend strategies in order to improve instructional leadership practice in general secondary schools of study area.

1.5. Significances of the Study

The finding of this study may help for the better implementation of instructional leadership practice. Therefore, the researcher wanted to indicate how to implement instructional leadership practice and ways how to overcome hindrances of instructional leaders' methodology in the schools. Based on these facts, the finding of this study will help the existing school leadership practices and contribution to quality education in secondary schools and provide valuable information for different stakeholders such as educational officers, secondary school principals and others. It might also help the school leaders would be conscious of their shortcomings and the major problems they face so that they may find ways to alleviate the problems. The study might serve for the subsequent researcher as a reference to conduct further study in a similar field.

In the case of beneficiaries, students, teachers, school leaders, policy makers and community at large were expected to be beneficiaries because the finding will had a contribution to strengthen improving the status of instructional leadership practices.

1.6. Delimitation of the Study

Instructional leadership practices are performed by principals, vice-principals, unit leaders, department heads and the teachers (Harris, 2003). To make the study more manageable time, cost effectiveness and feasible, the researcher geographically delimited the study to four weredas and one Town administration in six government secondary schools (grade 9-10) Kellem Wollega Zone namely; Alem Tafari, Burayu, Kellem, Jahan Sayo, Biftu Ashi and Alfillo secondary schools.

The research was delimited to 160 respondents of this study were (123 teachers, 37 school leaders. There were a number of issues to be raised in studying effectiveness of instructional leadership practices in its boarder sense in school. Due to financial and time constraints this study was delimited to practices of SIP implementation, resource management and participatory decision making and this study gave emphasize only to those major factors that affect practices of instructional leadership in secondary schools of Kellem Wollega Zone.

Finally, the study delimited to data collection instruments to questionnaires, interview, document analysis and focus group discussion. The quantitative data was collected, coded, tabulated, analyzed, described and interpreted using descriptive and inferential statistical tools such as percentage, frequency, mean and weighted mean and t-test respectively. The qualitative data were narrated, described and interpreted logically.

1.7. Limitations of the Study

Every study has its own drawbacks. Likewise this study has some limitation, which may affect its qualities. A researcher planned his work to make the finding objective and effective of the factual data .This needed collection of data from concerned angles and making references, as much as possible. Some limitation factors in this research were; the research has been lacked of adequate literature references related to title of study. In addition, the limitation of this study could be the fact that the findings cannot be generalized for all schools in the zone, because the study focused only on (grade 9-10) secondary schools excluding the preparatory and primary schools due to shortage of time, budget and resources the study was restricted to six secondary schools.

However, the researcher was trying to alleviate the shortage of the references by using on the internet. The researcher was also supported by assistant data collectors to overcome the problem

pertained to the scattered location of sampled schools and to collect the data within the allowed time.

1.8. Definitions of Key Terms

Instructional leaders are those defining the school's mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive school-learning climate (Hillinger and Murphy, 1985).

Instructional leadership can be defined as those actions that a principal takes, or delegates to others, to promote growth in student learning (Wildy and Dimmock, 1993)

Leadership is a process of social influence in which a person can enlist the aid and support of others in the accomplishment of a common task (Kouzes and Posner, B.Z. 2004).

Practices refer to routines that have evolved in relevant communities as ways of solving frequently occurring practical problems (Hutchins, 1995).

Secondary school It is among the existing education level and include two Ethical part or cycle which are (9-10) first cycle and which (11-12) second cycle /preparatory (MOE,1994).

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This section provides a comprehensive review of the related literature on different aspect of instructional leadership practice in secondary schools. The literature review is organized into the following sub topics. These are: Definition and concept of instructional leadership, instructional leadership in teaching and learning, effective instructional leadership skills, instructional leadership roles and quality education, roles of instructional leaders, school improvement program and factors that hinder practices of instructional leadership.

2.1. Definition and Concept of Instructional Leadership

The concept instructional leadership is a relatively new concept that emerged in the early 1980's that called for a shift of emphasis from principals being managers or administrators to instructional or academic leaders. Leithwood and Duke (1998) described instructional leadership as focusing on the behaviors of teachers as they engage in activities directly affecting the growth of students. This shift was influenced largely by research which found that effective schools usually had principals who stressed the importance of instruction. In a similar fashion Flath (1989) described instructional leadership as those actions that a principal takes, or delegates to others, to promote growth in student learning. In actual practice, the principal encourages students' educational achievement by making instructional quality as the top priority of the school and brings that vision into real actions.

In a slightly different conceptualization, Hallinger and Murphy (1985) described instructional leadership in a model that consists of many specific functions within three broad categories: defining the school mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting school climate. Researchers have further defined instructional leadership to include different approaches. First, the concept of instructional leadership could be divided into an "exclusive" and an ‘inclusive’ approach. Researchers who count instructional leadership as "exclusive" regard the principal as the sole holder of responsibility when it comes to setting goals for the school, supervision, and in developing instruction that enhances academic achievement. This perspective tends to focus only on the role of principals as instructional leaders (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). However, other researchers have recently expanded the concept of instructional leadership to include not only principals, but also other school staff. They take an "inclusive" approach to instructional leadership. Especially, Guthrie and Reed (1991) have pointed out the importance of the collaboration between principals and

teachers to develop curriculum and instruction for improving pupils' performance. Thus, they conceptualized this inclusive approach as “shared instructional leadership” and understood the role of principals as that of “leaders of instructional leaders”.

Instructional leadership is the ability to navigate people to effectively educate others to advance in their knowledge, skills, and ability. As principal, instructional leadership is very important, this concept deals with the students indirectly, but it greatly affects them. Instructional leadership allows one to guide people through the process of curriculum, instruction, and staff development. A principal can enhance the ability of any one through the use of staff development. School leaders can have a tremendous effect on student learning through the teachers they hire, how they assign those teachers that improve student achievement are more likely to have principals who are strong organizational managers than are schools with principals who spend more of their time observing teachers to classrooms, how they retain teachers, and how they create opportunities for teachers to improve instruction. Organizational management for instructional improvement means staffing a school with high-quality teachers and providing them the appropriate supports and resources to be successful in the classroom (Guthrie and Reed 1991).

Instructional leadership is “learning-focused leadership” that focuses on influencing the instructional atmosphere of the school by exerting an effective roles of the principal by building the capacity of teachers in terms of their knowledge, skill and attitude to support learners and by giving attention for curriculum, instruction and assessment through the active participation of stakeholders for the major influence on the improvement of instruction.(Bossert and et-al, 1982).

2.2. Instructional Leadership in Teaching and Learning

Learning to become an effective instructional leader is a complex and multidimensional task. If principals believe that growth in student learning is the primary goal of schooling, then it is a task worth learning. In today’s rapidly changing world becoming a leader of leaders is achieved by learning and working with teachers, students, and parents to improve instructional quality. Goal setting and problem solving become site-based, collective and collaborative activities. The leadership of principal is pivotal in ensuring that the process is informed of all school issues, especially those which relate to student instruction (Tonneri, 2003).

Instructional behaviors, in implementations of new ideas, greater variety in teaching strategic, more responses to students' diversity, lessons were prepared and planned more carefully teachers were more likely to take risks and more focus on the instructional process, and teachers used professional discretion to make changes in classroom practice. Teachers also indicated positive effects on motivation, satisfaction, confidence and sense of security. Instructional leadership behaviors associated with promoting professional growth and staff development yield positive effects on classroom practice. In particular leaders that engage in behaviors that inform staff about current trends and issues, encourage attendance at workshops, seminar and conferences, build a culture of collaboration and learning, promote coaching, use inquiry to drive staff development, set, professional growth goal with teachers, and provide resources foster teacher innovation in using a variety of methods, materials, instructional strategies, reflective practice, and technology in the classroom. This in turn, increases the student achievement (Blasé. and Blasé, 2000).

2.3. Effective Instructional Leadership Skills

Flath and Likewise (1989) briefly state that activities like ordering of books; building master schedules; addressing disciplinary problems and other administrative tasks do not comprise the effective instructional leadership's activities. Class visits and helping educators who experience curricular problems are cited as examples of the instructional duties of an effective leader. This raises the question 'what is the effective Instructional leader's practice?' Kruger (1996) helps answer this question by providing some elements of instructional leadership. These could be linked to the behavioral characteristics of good instructional leaders. These are: effective use of resources, communication skills, serving as instructional resources, being visible and accessible, determining objectives, curriculum coordination and creating the climate conducive to teaching and learning.

2.3.1. Effective use of resources

It isn't sufficient for principals to just know their faculty's strengths and weaknesses. If specific resources can benefit the staff, the principal should be ready and prepared to provide them. They should also clearly recognize that teachers thrive on being appreciated and acknowledged for good performance (Kruger (1996).

2.3.2. Communication skills

Of course, instructional principals should be excellent communicators. Interpersonal or people skills are crucial to the success of a principal. They must be able to communicate their beliefs pertaining to education, including the conviction that every student is capable of learning. These skills inspire trust, spark motivation and empower teachers and students (Kruger (1996).

2.3.3. Serving as an instructional resource

Teachers rely on principals and other administrative officials to be sources of information related to effective instructional practices and current trends in education. Instructional leaders should be tuned in to all of the pertinent issues and current events related to curriculum, effective assessment and pedagogical strategies (Kruger (1996).

2.3.4. Being visible and accessible

Lastly, good principals should be a positive, vibrant and visible presence in the school. Modeling behaviors of learning, focusing on learning objectives, and leading by example are crucial to the success of an instructional principal. In addition to these four qualities, a successful instructional principal should also have excellent planning and observation skills as well as proficiency in research and evaluation of both staff and student performance (Kruger (1996).

2.3.5. Determining objectives

According to Kruger (1996) before aims and objectives can be formulated, clarity regarding the vision and mission of the school should be arrived by the top management and the staff of the school. This participation by all stakeholders are referred as the second dimension of school based management. The first dimension is devolution of authority through decentralization to school managers. This implies that the instructional leaderships are responsible and accountable for the mobilization of all stakeholders to participate in decision making and determination of school objectives. It is therefore important that the principal as an instructional leadership first facilitate a process whereby all stakeholders are involved in the formulation of the vision and mission statement. Kruger (1996) recommends that the process be aimed at continued realization of educative teaching.

2.3.6. Curriculum coordination

According Kruger (1999) instructional leaders are responsible for taking the lead in matters of school curriculum practice and development. The role of instructional leaders is described as the implementation of curriculum according to the national policy frame work. Key issues in the new curriculum are its emphases on outcomes and continuous assessment. The aim is to develop learners intellectually, socially, physically and morally. These imply that education involves the total sum of all the learner's experiences.

The responsibility of the Instructional leader entails the coordination of different subjects into the core curriculum and organizing all activities outside the classroom into the external curriculum. All other activities that promote the general ethos of the school form the hidden curriculum. Instructional leaders update their knowledge of curricular content in order to offer valuable guidance and support. He also states the need for the inst1ructional leaders to keep their educators well informed of new curricular development and to gate them involved in designing curricula innovations and change. Curricular support ensures a quick resolution of problems which is necessary for continuity of a strong culture of teaching and learning. The educators, where this support is lacking, become frustrated, insecure and helpless. The latter attributes affect teaching and learning adversely and the principals must always strive to become effective curricular supporters (Lyons, 2010).

2.3.7. Creating the climate conducive to teaching and learning

The importance of creating a climate where learning is made exciting, where teachers are supported and where there is a sense of shared purpose. The concept according to Kruger (1996) refers to the complex psychological environment within an organization and it relates to concepts such as atmosphere, spirit and basic ambience. This organizational climate evolves over time and can be inferred from the behavior of individuals within the organization. Behavioral patterns could thus be viewed as the expression of the climate that prevails within an organization. The instructional leaders in their leadership role are better positioned to model and influence the behavior of the followers in order to promote commitment, sense of ownership and effectiveness. It is thus important for the instructional leaders to be well-versed with what the school's climate entails so as to manipulate it to achieve quality education.

A familiar climate is characterized by a jovial and friendly interaction between staff and the leader where there is very little task orientation with motivation and job satisfaction only average. A paternal climate is characterized by closeness due to the passivity of the leader which leads to a lack of cooperation, lack of involvement of teachers as well as students, very little job satisfaction and a low morale among educators. Finally, there is a closed climate characterized by a high degree of involvement of teachers as well as students, very little job satisfaction and a high staff turnover. Other stakeholders are also affected as (Cunningham, 2008) points out that the school's culture is part of a community's culture. He argues for instance that a rural Afrikaner, being more paternalistic, would typically expect learners to be disciplined more strictly than an English language community would at their school. In the light of the exposition above, it follows that creating a healthy school climate would be a more challenging and important aspect in many Ethiopia secondary schools which are becoming more multicultural.

2.4. Instructional Leadership Role and Quality Education

According to Walker, A. and C. Dimmock (2002) no quality program will work without appropriate leadership. He is of the opinion that before the issue of quality is raised within a school, the quality of leadership may need to be explored. Botha (2004) corroborates this view in asserting that 'one of the –if not the single most important factors in improving education is the school leader'. A school instructional leader should continuously strive for improvement of education quality. To do this the principal as instructional leader required to have a number of skills. Such as: Defining and communicating a clear mission, goals and objectives, managing curriculum and instruction, supervising teaching, Monitoring learner progress, Promoting instructional climate.

According to Botha (2004) there is a link between the instructional leadership effectiveness of the instructional leader and improvement in the quality in education. It became clear that a significant relationship exists between the two concepts. He adds that the three major elements that determine educational quality, which are the educator; the learner and the curriculum were found to be focus of the instructional leader's activities. The principal needs to note that the introduction of the new curriculum implies some significant changes in the teaching approach of educators. He go on saying principal as instructional leader has to facilitate the teacher needs for more resources and expected to promote group activity and to assess effectively. The principal should also possess sound financial

management skills. This also necessitates that the principal move around to take note of challenges in the classrooms so as to offer empathy.

The principals' behavior also has its effect on his leadership skills. In relation to this, Kruger (1996) states the principal needs to realize that, as instructional leader, his/her behavior determines the organizational motivation, its culture and its level of commitment. Teachers are encouraged to strive for excellence when they see that the principal is empathetic, supportive, offers praise where it is due, has good negotiation skills, helps remove barriers and is always ready to empower them. The same attitude should be displayed to the learners.

The instructional leader also should expect to encourage and guide the learners to share the vision of quality performance with other stakeholders. In relation to this Botha (2004) explained that learners could be involved in identifying the characteristics of quality that need attention. This is consistent with customer focus approach since learners as recipients of service from the school also constitute the customer base of the school. In general the instructional leadership skills offers the principal an opportunity of holistic approach to improve the quality of education. It is important that an instructional leadership ensures that teachers experience, motivation and availability of teaching resources and teaching aids.

After the New Education and Training policy (1994) launched the system of education in Ethiopia was changed. Several children had got access to education, teachers were trained, educational materials were prepared and distribute. Even though quantitative achievements were made quality of education was not yet achieved. Thus in order to improve quality of general education General Education Quality Improvement Program (GEQIP) was designed and launched by Ministry of Education. GEQIP consists of six components which are aimed at improvement of education quality from different perspective as stated in ESDP IV (MoE, 2010). These are school improvement program (SIP), teacher's development program (TDP), information communication technology (ICT), curriculum improvement program, civic and ethical education program and management and administration program (MAP). Among these programs school improvement program (SIP) was selected for the purpose of this study. In order to assess the current practices of SIP reviewing related literature was very important. Thus the related literatures were reviewed as follows.

2.5. School Improvement Program

The main target of school improvement program is for improved student results. The school improvement program is national program, developed by the Ministry of Education in 1994, to improve student results in primary and secondary schools. Since the launch of the SIP all schools have developed and implemented three-year strategic plans. The program has four domains. All the domains are directly related to enhancing students' achievements and school improvements. These include: teaching and learning, community participation, safe and health school environment, and leadership and management (MoE, 1994).

2.5.1. Teaching and learning domain

Teachers use active teaching methods in the classroom to realize improved learning results. Under this standard active learning method are defined as classroom activities such as group work, individual assignments, reciting, games, and question and answer among others. At this time the MoE(1994) was encouraging teachers in all primary and secondary schools to use a range of active learning methods in the classroom. This emphasis was based upon research within Ethiopia, international research findings which stated that students are able to learn more when active learning methods are used in the classrooms. In the past much of the teaching in primary and secondary schools has used the traditional teaching method of oral recitation where students sit quietly and listen to each other recite his or her lesson until everyone had been called upon.

In addition to an overemphasis on verbal answers, the traditional teaching method also relies heavily on rote memorization. Plass, H. (1998) indicated that the traditional teaching method is extremely inefficient as all students must be taught with the same materials at the same point in time. And students that do not learn quickly enough with this method can quickly fall behind, rather than being allowed to learn at their natural speeds. To address the limitations with the traditional teaching method the MoE is strongly encouraging all teachers to use range of active learning methods in the classroom (MoE, 1994).

2.5.2. Favorable learning condition and environment domain

Schools provide adequate school facilities that enable all staff to work well aiming at academic excellence and student growth. School facilities include teachers, room with desks and storage, a playing area for students, adequate teaching materials, reference materials, well protected school

compound with fence, tea rooms, library, pedagogical centre, toilets for teachers, girl students and boy students, clean water, daily cleaning of toilets, good management and maintenance of water and sanitation facilities, and for secondary schools laboratory and IT center (MoE,GEQIP, 2010).

2.5.3. Community participation domain

Teachers meet with parents when necessary, and at minimum twice per semester, to provide quality reports and to discuss their child's learning achievement. Schools successfully mobilize the community to provide resources to support implementation of the school improvement plan. Schools are active in communicating and promoting the importance of education to the community (MoE, 2010).

2.5.4. School leadership and administration domain

According to school improvement program revised manual (2011) school leadership and administration play an important role in the coordinating and managing phases due to its vitality for the improvement of student result in schools. The leadership and management include the following: Director and Deputy Director, School leadership committees (drawn from teachers, students, parents and the local community) and Professionals and officials of education outside of the school. These organs are expected to play the forefront role in bringing continuous improvement in schools. In this regard, these organs are the primary responsible ones for the problems and weaknesses at schools and they also play appropriate role in bringing effective practice and experience to seek solution for the problems. In this respect, they should act jointly with the school improvement committee in the formulation of school vision and strategic plan.

2.6. Factors Influencing Instructional Leadership Practices

There are factors that affect instructional leaders' roles. Recent literatures on school reform suggest that instructional leaders play a significant role in the successful implementation of the strategies to improve teaching learning process. Instructional leaders effectiveness on leadership is largely depend on the knowledge and skill of leadership they possess. They acquire knowledge and skills through training and development (Bush and Bell, 2003).They explained training and development as follows: Training typically refers to teaching lower level or technical employees how to perform their present jobs. Development refers to teaching administrators and professionals the skills needed

for both present and future positions. In carrying out the task of instructional leadership, instructional leaders face a lot of problems.

The most important factors that affect instructional leadership roles which were identified by Gorton (1993) are: 1. Problem of limited acceptance - teachers do not always recognizes principals as instructional leader of the school. This is because; they consider him/her as not having necessary expertise regarding the actual teaching process, 2. The extent of resource-lack of resource (human, financial or physical) can be a serious obstacle to instructional leadership. An education leader may want to lead the situation and expectation of others may call for his leadership. But if the resources necessary to implement his/her leadership are inadequate the leader will be facing a significant problem, 3. Personal qualities of the Leader-the educational leader own personality vision, extent of commitment, human relation skills etc. can serve to hamper the exercise of effective instructional leadership**,** and 4. Wrong Use of Leadership style-the leader should use his/her authority properly while leading the school. Improper/wrong use of instructional leadership may affect his/her leadership roles. According to Badway (1982), since employees differ in a variety of characteristics such as motivation, interest, ability, attitude, and others, they each may require different leadership style. This also may complicate the instructional leadership problem. However, in most cases participative human relation style would be better particularly for those who are intelligent and have positive self-esteem. Therefore, educational leaders should be able to select the style that suits the situation.

Another factor that can affect instructional leadership roles may be formulation of school goals without teachers' participation. Sometimes leaders set school goals alone. Regarding this, Leithwood et al. (1999) stated that individual teachers can internalize organizational goals if goal-setting processes are highly participatory. There are still others factors which are very crucial in influencing instructional leadership. They are effective supervision, evaluation and lack of motivation or low morale of teachers. According to Leithwood et al. (1999), teachers' beliefs about their capacity are eroded because teachers do not frequently receive feedback from leaders about the qualities of their practice.

3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This part provided an overview of description of the study area, research design, sources of data, population, sample size and sampling technique, data collection instrument, data collection procedure, method of data analysis and ethical consideration.

3.1. Description of the Study Area

Kellem Wollega Zone is located on South by Gambella National Regional state, On the North by Beneshangul Gumuz, on the East by West Wollega Zone and on the West by Weast Sudan. The Zone has varied topographic features that encompass tropical and sub-tropical zone types of climatic conditions. It has also had diversified people having different languages, religions and ethnic backgrounds. It is the region of Oromia regional state by one of the areas cash crop items and main livelihood of population is agriculture.

3.2. Research Design

The descriptive survey research design was employed for the study. Because this method can provide precise information concerning the current status of school leadership practices in the study area. Besides, the survey method involves obtaining information directly from the participants by posing questions. Survey research determines and reports the way things are; it involves collecting numerical data to answer questions about the current status of the subject of study (Gay, 2009). Moreover, it also helps to draw valid general conclusions. Therefore, in order to identify and analyze the existing conditions of school leadership practice, compare its existing condition with the reviewed research findings of the past and to draw a general conclusion of the study, the researcher was interested to use this research method of the study. Besides, qualitative research methodology would be employed as a supplementary to the study with the information gain from semi- structured interview make with school principals and supervisors from the open ended questions.

Dornyei (2007) stated that mixed methodology has a unique potential to produce evidence for the validity of research outcomes and also we can gain a better understanding of a complex phenomenon by converging numeric trends from quantitative data and specific details from qualitative data. In this study, descriptive survey research design was used to describe the overall practices of school leadership in secondary schools of Kellem Wollega Zone.

3.3. Sources of Data

To collect reliable information, the researcher used both primary and secondary sources of data to get adequate information about study.

3.3.1. Primary data sources

In order to get adequate information about the practices of instructional leadership in secondary schools of Kellem Wollega Zone, the primary source for information was obtained from teachers, school leaders (principals, vice- principals, unit leader, and department Heads), supervisors and woreda education experts.

3.3.2. Secondary data sources

Secondary data was collected from various documents like GEQIP implementation document, portfolio, school improvement program and reports of woreda education offices.

3.4. Population, Sample size and Sampling Technique

The population of this study was government secondary schools that were found in Kellem Wollega Zone. There were 12 *werads* and 3 administrations towns currently found in the Zone. Among these 5(41.67%) weredas and 1(33.3%) administrations town were selected using simple random sampling technique. These weredas and administration town were Anfillo, Alem Teferi, Hawa Galan, and Sayo woredas and Dambi Dollo town. In these selected weredas and administration town there were 15 secondary schools from which 6(40%) government secondary schools were selected for this study. In general, populations of this current study from these six selected secondary schools were 215 respondents (37 School Leaders, 178 Teachers).

The total number of sample size of this current study from these six selected secondary schools had been 160 (71.1%) respondents (37 school leaders, and 123 teachers). The researcher used simple random sampling technique in six secondary schools considering their large size which makes the study activities more complex and to make it manageable. In this sample size school leaders (principals, woreda education experts and supervisors) were taken 100% for the study by using available sampling techniques. Gay and Airasian (2003) defined available sampling as one which involves selecting a sample based on small numbers.

After selecting the sample schools from the total population size of teachers in the 6 sample schools 178, 123 teachers were taken as a sample size. The number of teachers in each school varied due to differences in the number of students. Therefore, to determine the sample size of teachers to be drawn from each selected school, the researcher was used Yemane's (1967:258) formula as following:-

$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)2}$ $n = \frac{178}{1+178(0.0025)} n = \frac{178}{1.445}$ n=123 $\frac{123}{178} x100 = 69$ % (% of each school teachers sample size)

N= Population size, n= sample size e= the level of margin error (.05)

Table 1.Population, sample size and sampling techniques

		Principals				Supervisor				Teachers				Woreda edu. Ex.			
No	Sample schools	P	S	%	ST	P	S	%	ST	P	S	%	ST	P	S	%	ST
1	Alem Teferi	2	2	100	AST	1	1	100	AST	35	24	69	SST	4	4	100	AST
2	Burayu	2	2	100	AST	1	1			26	18	69	SST	4	4	100	AST
3	Jahan Sayo	2	2	100	AST	1	1	100	AST	24	17	69	SST	4	4	100	AST
4	Anfillo	2	2	100	AST	1	1	100	AST	32	22	69	SST	4	4	100	AST
5	Ashi	2	2	100	AST					26	18	69	SST				
6	Kellem	2	2	100	AST	1	1	100	AST	34	24	69	SST	4	4	100	AST
Total		12	12	100		5	5	100		178	123	69		20	20	100	

P= population, S= sample, ST= Sampling Technique, AST= Available Sampling Techniques, SST= Stratified Sampling Techniques

3.5. Data Collection Instruments

The study data collection tools to be employed was questionnaires, interviews, document reviews and focus group discussion because they are suitable tools to gather real rich and wider information from the subjects of the study.

3.5.1. Questionnaire

Questionnaires are written forms that ask exact questions of all individuals in the sample group, and which respondents can answer at their own convenience. The questionnaire is the most widely used

type of instrument in education. The data provided by questionnaires can be more easily analyzed and interpreted than the data obtained from verbal responses (Gall, 2007).

A questionnaire was prepared by the researcher to collect information from teachers and school leaders and filled the questionnaires because the researcher believed that they are rich the information required to accomplish the research. Both open-ended and closed-ended questions were included in the questionnaire to create an opportunity for respondents to express their feeling freely. Hence, questionnaire was prepared in English Language and administered to all teachers and school leaders' participants with the supposition that they can understand the language. It was consisting of two parts. The first part deals with the general background of the participants. The second part was containing the total number of both closed ended and open-ended question items that pertain to the basic questions of the study.

Checking Reliability Test of the questionnaire using a pilot test was conducted to examine the internal consistency of the items in each instrument type, which is to be used to collect data to undertake this study. To make necessary corrections and to maintain the reliability of instruments, pilot test was carried out on one non sampled school 10 samples: (7 teachers, 5 school leaders) of the Aleku secondary school in Sayo *wereda* before the final data collection was conducted. The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient at significance level of 0.05 was used to check the consistency of data collection instrument. The reliability coefficient for all sample items was calculated using the Cronbach alpha and .922 obtained. Which indicates the instrument is reliable to use for actual data gathering activity and is used for that purpose.

In an attempt to get valid information, draft instruments were checked by advisor, experienced teachers and principals those have enough experience. In accordance with suggestion from these experts, modification was made on the errors that being identified. Based on their comments, the instruments were improved before they were administered to the major participants of the study to reduce errors. As a result, three irrelevant items were removed; two lengthy items were shortened, and many unclear items were made clear.

3.5.2. Interview guide

Interviews is useful for collecting in-depth information that allows opportunity for explanation of questions and can be applied to any type of population (Kumar, 2005).Thus, the purpose of the

interview is to collect more supplementary opinion, so as to stabilize the questionnaire response. With this in mind, interview would be conducted with 6 principals and 5 supervisors. Principals and supervisors know the strength or challenges, weakness and opportunities of each school. Therefore, they can have detailed information about the current practices of instructional leadership. This helped the researcher to get more and significant information. Semi structure interview were prepared for the above respondents. The reason behind the semi-structured interview items were the advantages of flexibility in which new questions can be forwarded during the interview based on the responses of the interviewee.

3.5.3. Focus group discussion

Focus group discussion is an efficient and interesting ways of gathering insight in two ways in which respondents share their knowledge and argue their different points of views. FGD sessions were also conducted to collect adequate information (Louis and Keith 2005).Five teachers would be participated in FGD session in each 6 sample schools. The members of the groups were selected randomly from the school teachers' understudy. Thus, three FGD guidelines were prepared and would be administered teachers who were not participated in the questionnaires. Guidelines in the FGD reflect functions of leadership practice, basic leadership roles, and possible solutions to resolve the problems of instructional leadership. Before the discussion, all focus group participants were agreed to hear each other's and to make additional responses as they hear what other people would have express their ideas. Accordingly, participants would have provided their opinion for different questions and would rise in group discussion and the end conclusions of the group were registered by researcher.

3.5.4. Document reviews

In documentary review, reliable and adequate information was obtained from Education Statistics Annual Abstract (Kellem Wollega Zone Education Office 2017 and 2016) which is document related with poor culture and skill and knowledge gap on the side of the leadership and of the professionals, particularly those at lower administrative level to use information for planning, monitoring and evaluation activities and making informed decisions were the school leadership problem that hinders quality education. In addition to this, the researcher reviewed national examination (EGSECE of grade 10^{th}) result/score sheets (2016 and 2017) to acquire the information

of how much percentage of students got pass mark in minimum requirement point and also joining rate to preparatory from 2016 and 2017 in sample secondary schools.

3.6. Data Collection Procedure

After sampling schools were selected for the study, the researcher adopted three steps in collecting data for the study, First, relevant literature were reviewed to set adequate information about the topic. Second, objectives and research questions were formulated to show the direction of the study. Third, data gathering tools were developed and piloted after the questionnaire were prepared in English language. Finally, Semi-Structured interview were conducted to Principals and supervisors.

3.7. Methods of Data Analysis

The researcher collected both quantitative and qualitative data from sample respondents. The data that collected through close ended questionnaires were coded, analyzed, described and interpreted by using SPSS (V.20). The quantitative data was analyzed by descriptive statistics such as mean, frequency, percentages, and standard deviation; and inferential statistics t-test to compare the means of the two groups. The sample size of these two samples is different, so t- test was employed after calculating pooled standard deviation. The percentage was used to interpret the characteristics of the respondents. Mean and standard deviations were used for organizing and summarizing sets of numerical data that collected by Likert type scales in the questionnaires. These mean and standard deviation are used because they are generally considered as the best measures of a sample record on a particular measure (Best, 2003). For interview part and document analysis, the researcher narrated and interpreted logically. This result helped to analyze the instructional leadership practice and to determine the challenges that affect the instructional leadership. Finally, the result of the interpretation was discussed and summarized to give recommendation.

3.8. Ethical Consideration

The study was started after fully discussed with the woreda's education office heads and school principals during the sensitization trip on the issue of study and reached on consensus that the data or information from the study is available for the development of the woreda. The respondents were asked for verbal consent to participate in the study.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Overall, the chapter comprised of two major parts. The first part presents the characteristics of respondents in terms of sex, age, academic qualifications and service year. The second part dealt with the results of findings from the data which were gathered through the questionnaire, interview, data analysis and focus group discussion.

4.1. Background of Respondents

Under this sub topic the sex, age, qualification, total years of service and experience of current position of the respondents were presented. The following table shows the distribution of respondent's characteristics.

Table 2.Frequency and percentage distribution characteristics of the respondents

	Category		School leaders		Teachers		Total	
			No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Sex	Male	22	73.33	104	87.4	126	84.6
		Female	8	26.66	15	12.6	23	15.4
		Total	30	100	119	100	149	100
2	Age	20-25	3	10	44	37	47	31.5
		25-30	14	46.66	38	31.9	52	34.9
		30-35	8	26.66	15	12.6	23	15.4
		35-40	3	10	8	6.7	11	7.4
		Above 40	2	6.66	14	11.8	16	10.7
		Total	30	100	119	100	149	100
3	Educational	Diploma	-	-	1	0.84	1	0.67
	status	Degree	22	73.33	116	97.47	127	96.69
		Masters	8	26.66	2	1.69	10	6.7
		Total	30	100	119	100	149	100
4	Work	≤ 5	5	16.67	63	52.94	68	45.6
	experience	5-10	14	46.66	20	16.81	34	22.8
		10-15	5	16.67	8	6.72	13	8.7
		15-20	3	10	15	12.61	18	12
		Above 20	3	10	13	10.92	16	10.7
		Total	30	100	119	100	149	100

The characteristics of the respondents in terms of sex revealed that 104 (87.4%) and 15 (12.6%) teachers were males and females respectively. From this, one could understand that, the number of females in the secondary schools is much lower compared to males in the sampled schools. Similarly, in terms of sex revealed that 22(73.33%) and 8(26.66%) school leader was males and females respectively. From this also, one could understand that, the number of school leader females in the secondary schools is much lower compared to males in the sampled schools. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that, females were under represented in the secondary school leadership position in Kellem Wollega zone. Hence, there is a need to encourage females to the position of leadership.

As Table 2, item 2 above showed, 44 (37%), 38(31.9%), 15 (12.6%) ,8 (6.7%) and 14(11.8) of teachers' age fall in the range of 20-25years, 25-30 years, 30-35 years, 35-40 years and 40 and above respectively. This showed that the majority of teachers in the secondary schools of the sample schools were in the range of 20-25years age. Therefore, being in these age categories might help the teachers to work actively and facilitate the teaching learning process. Similarly, 3 (10%), 14(46.66%), 8(26.66) ,3(10), and 2 (6.66%) of school leader age fall in the range of 20-25 , 25-30 years ,30-35 years 35-40 and 40 and above years respectively. Hence, this might indicate that at this age level, they might have sufficient experience to play the leadership role.

As far as the age of interview participants were concerned most of them were found to be in the range of 26-35, which was believed to be at their maturation age. Thus they could be probably in a better position to lead the school properly. Regarding the education status of teachers and school leaders, only 1(0.84%) of teacher and no school leaders (0.76%) had a diploma. Whereas, the majority of teacher respondents 116(97.5%) teachers and all school leaders respondents 22(73.33%) had a first degree except 8(26.66%) teachers of master holders. Thus, from the data; we can infer that there is no much discrepancy between the school leaders and teacher respondents in their educational status.

Work experience of the teachers respondents in the table 2 shows 63(52.9%) of the respondents had 1- 5 years' work experience. Whereas 20(16.8%) respondents had 6 -10 years' experience, 8(6.7%) respondents had 10 -15 years' experience and 15(12.6%) of the teacher respondents had 16-20 years' experience, and 13(10.9%) respondents were above 21 years' experience. It could be possible to conclude that, more than half of the teacher respondents experience was below ten years. This

implies that most of the schools were staffed by less experienced teachers which may have its own impact on proper implementation of the GEQIP to promote quality education.

However, from the above table regarding the total experience in teaching, 5(16.67%) school leaders were found in the range of 1-5 years, 14(46.66%) school leaders were found to be in the range between 5-10 years' experience, 3(10%) school leaders were found to be in the range between 15-20 years' experience and finally, 3(10%) school leaders were found to be above 20 years' experience. Thus, it's possible to say, they have good experience in teaching but they were less experienced in leading schools regarding educational background only 8 school leaders were graduated in educational planning and management; the rest school leaders were graduated in different subjects of teaching profession. Most of them did not have training of leadership. Leading organizations without qualification or adequate training by itself has impact on practices of leadership.

4.2. Major Practices of Instructional Leadership

The assessment of current practices of instructional leadership requires almost all major practices and roles of instructional leadership. However, due to vast nature of the course leadership only three major practices (school improvement program, resource management and decisions making process) were assessed. In addition to these practices, the major factors that affect instructional leadership's practices in secondary schools while they carry out their leadership practices were also assessed. Instructional leadership was expected to carry out their roles properly to produce productive citizens. Thus, this study focused on their current practices in general secondary schools.

4.2.1. Practices of school improvement program

SIP is one of the six programs of GEQIP which was designed by Ministry of Education. For better implementation of this program schools should have SIP plan. The data that were gathered from different respondents to assess the current practices of instructional leadership in secondary schools of the Kellem Wollega Zone concerning SIP were analyzed as follows.

Table 3.Practice of SIP in the sample secondary school

No	Item/Practices	School leaders		Teachers		Ave. Mean	T-value	P- value
		Mean	St.De	Mean	St.De			
1	The school conducts self-assessment consistently	3.73	0.67	3.46	1.08	3.68	0.84	0.02
2	Prepare participatory SIP plan to improve education quality	3.82	0.847	3.35	1.14	3.73	1.41	0.00
3	Encourage teachers to have their own plan	4.18	0.98	3.60	1.181	3.71	0.169	0.00
4	Ensures the provision of basic operational resources	3.64	0.924	3.11	0.98	3.22	1.70	0.00
5	Consistent monitoring and evaluation system is designed	3.82	1.079	3.36	1.144	3.45	1.369	0.00
6	Take corrective actions during implementation	4.00	1.00	3.13	1.134	3.30	2.363	0.00
7	Make the school environment safe and health	3.91	0.94	3.32	1.21	3.44	1.71	0.00
8	Encourage community participation on school issues	3.27	1.01	3.14	1.12	3.16	0.39	0.07
9	Translate the vision of SIP into practice	3.73	1.27	3.07	1.00	3.24	2.08	0.00
Average Mean		3.78	0.97	3.28	1.11	3.38	1.34	

N=149, significant at alpha level 0.05, Df, 147 for school leaders and Teachers Table value on the df(147)=1.960 at 0.05 and SD= Standard deviation

Item 1 in table 3, indicate the computed combined mean (3.68) of the respondents were indicated that both teachers and school leader were agreed on the school self-assessment consistently. Moreover, the combined standard deviation (1.02) of the respondents was indicated that there was little variability between them on the issue of self-school assessment consistently. Moreover, the computed t-test at $\alpha = 0.05$, $t(147) = 0.84$ which was much less than the critical region at $\alpha = 0.05$, $t(147) = 1.960$. Therefore, it was concluded that there was no statistically a significant mean

difference between teachers and school leaders on consistent self-assessment, t (147) =0.84, p > 0.05, two tailed.

In Table 3 of item 2, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on to what extent school leaders prepare participatory SIP plan. The mean scores that 3.35 for teachers and 3.82 for school leaders. These shows that teachers agreed that school leaders were preparing participatory SIP plan, while school leaders also agreed that school leaders preparing participatory SIP plan. In addition to this, the combined mean was 3.73 also implies that both group performance that school leaders were preparing participatory SIP plan. Moreover, the computed t-test at α =0.05, t (147) =1.14 which was less than the critical region at α =0.05, t (147) =1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was no statistically a significant mean difference between teachers and school leaders on prepare participatory SIP plan, t (147) =1.14, p > 0.05, two tailed.

As indicated in Table 3 item 3, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on the extent to what school leaders encourage teachers to have their own SIP plan. Both teachers and school leaders rated moderately and high performance with mean value were 3.60 and 4.18 respectively. In addition to this, the combined mean was 3.71 also implies that both group rated high performance that school leaders were encouraging teachers to have their own SIP plan.

Furthermore, the computed t-value at α = 0.05 was found to be 0.169 which was less than the critical value at α = 0.05 which was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was no statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which school leaders encourage teachers to have their own SIP plan, t(147)= 0.169, P >0.05, two tailed.

As it can be seen in table 3 of item 4, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on to what extent school leaders ensures the provision of basic operational resources. Both teacher and school leader group rated moderate performance with mean value 3.64 and 3.11 respectively. Moreover, the combined mean was 3.22 also implies that both group rated medium performance that school leaders ensure the provision of basic operational resources.

Furthermore, the computed t-value at α = 0.05 was found to be 1.70 which was less than the critical value at α = 0.05 which was 1.960. Therefore, it could be concluded that there was no statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which school leaders ensures the provision of basic operational resources, t(147)= 1.70, P >0.05, two tailed. Therefore, from this

finding we can conclude that school leaders perform medium performance work with the ensuring the provision of basic operational resources, t(147)= 0.169, P >0.05, two tailed.

In Table 3 of item 5, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on the consistent monitoring and designing evaluation system. Both teacher and school leader group rated medium performance and high performance with mean value of 3.36 and 3.82 respectively. Moreover, the combined mean 3.45 was also implies that both group rated moderate performance that school leaders consistent monitoring and designing evaluation system. In addition to the descriptive analysis, the computed t-value at α =0.05 was found to be 1.37 which was less than the critical region at α= 0.05 was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was no statistically significant mean difference among the teachers and school leaders on the rate to which school leaders consistent monitoring and designing evaluation system, t(147)= 1.37, P < 0.05, two tailed.

In Table 3 of item 6, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on the take corrective actions during SIP implementation. Both teacher and school leader group rated medium performance and very high performance with mean value of 3.13 and 4.00 respectively. Moreover, the combined mean 3.30 was also implies that both group rated medium performance that school leaders take corrective actions during implementation of SIP. In addition to the descriptive analysis, the computed t-value at α =0.05 was found to be 2.36 which is greater than the critical region at α = 0.05 was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was statistically significant mean difference among the teachers and school leaders on the rate to which school leaders take corrective actions during SIP implementation, t (147)= 2.36, P < 0.05, two tailed. Therefore, from this finding we can conclude that the school leaders did not take corrective actions during SIP implementation.

Regarding of awareness of school improvement program during the interview, the samples schools principals and supervisors were said that:

> *"Schools have SIP plan but not put into practice as properly as expected due to lack of commitment of teachers, principals and other stakeholders and as well as lack of materials resources.''*
>
> *"The awwerance of school improvement program was not the same in all stakeholders that made the practices if it medium".*

In general, the finding of interview responses and FGD indicate that school leaders were not taking enough correction actions during SIP implementation.

On Table 3 of item 7, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on the making the school environment safe and health. Both teacher and school leader group rated medium and high performance with mean value 3.32 and 3.91 respectively. In addition to this, the combined mean was 3.44 also implies that both group rated medium performance that making the school environment safe and health. In addition to the descriptive analysis, the computed t-value at α =0.05 was found to be 1.71 which is less than the critical region at α = 0.05 was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was no statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which school leaders making the school environment safe and health, t (149) = 1.71, P < 0.05, two tailed.

As indicated in Table 3 item 8, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on the encouraging community participation on school issues. Both teachers and school leaders rated medium performance with mean value were 3.14 and 3.27 respectively. In addition to this, the combined mean was 3.16 also implies that both group rated medium performance that school leaders were encouraging community participation on school issues.

Furthermore, the computed t-value at α = 0.05 was found to be 0.39 which was less than the critical value at α = 0.05 which was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was no statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which school leaders encouraging community participation on school issues, t(147)= 0.39, P >0.05, two tailed. Regarding community participation on school issues during the interview and focus group discussion, the samples schools principals and supervisors were said that:

> *‘’Community participation on schools issue like school improvement program was unsatisfactory due to lack of commitment of stakeholders. ‘’*
>
> *“Lack of incentives for stakeholders like PTA (Parent Teachers Association) could be making the participation of school community very low.”*
>
> *“Community participation on school issue was not as planned due to the commitment of stakeholders”.*

In general, the finding of interview responses and FGD indicate that school leaders were not encouraging community participation on school issues as much as possible.

As it can be seen in table 3 of item 9, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on to what extent school leaders translate the vision of SIP into practice. Both teacher and school leader group rated medium and high performance with mean value 3.07 and 3.73 respectively. Moreover, the combined mean was 3.24 also implies that both group rated medium performance that school leaders translate the vision of SIP into practice.

Furthermore, the computed t-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 2.08 which was greater than the critical value at $\alpha = 0.05$ which was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which school leaders translate the vision of SIP into practice, t (147) = 2.08, P < 0.05, two tailed. Therefore, from this finding we can conclude that the school leaders did not translate the vision of SIP into practice.

Regarding of translate the vision of SIP into practice during the interview, the two samples schools supervisors were said that:

> *''Lack of leadership skills or competence, confidences, commitment and lack of budgets by itself made translating the vision of school improvement program into practices made poor.''*
>
> *'' Participation of parents in school issue was very low, so it was difficult to translate the vision of SIP into practice without active involvement of parent in school issue.''*

In general, the finding of interview responses and FGD indicate that school leaders were not translating the vision of SIP into practice as much as possible.

Generally, the average mean value of both group 3.38 indicate that there was moderate practice of SIP in sample secondary schools. The calculated t-value of most of the items ensures that there was no statistically significance difference among the opinion of the two groups. Thus, it was possible to conclude that, the performance of secondary school leaders on the overall activities of SIP in the sample secondary schools was found at moderate level on the basis of quantitative analysis. The data that were obtained from the document show that all sample schools have a three years strategic plan and one year's operational plan of SIP program. The interview with FGD and secondary school leaders also revealed that the attempt of principals to develop participatory SIP plan was good. Besides, they conduct schools' self-assessment at least once in three years and evaluate their

performance at the end of each academic year. However, principals did not implement SIP plans as properly as expected.

4.2.2. Practices of resource management

Table 4.Practices of resource management

		School leaders		Teachers				
No	Item / practices	Mean	St.De	Mean	St.De	Ave. mean	T-Value	P-value
1	Effectively manage time resources	4.36	1.20	3.59	1.05	3.74	2.39	.00
2	Wise use of material resources	4.18	0.87	3.32	1.13	3.49	2.59	.00
3	Capable to optimum utilization of available financial resources	4.00	0.78	2.95	1.05	3.16	3.28	.00
4	Enhance proper use of human resource	4.09	0.94	3.23	1.09	3.40	2.63	.00
5	Keep accurate and complete human resource record	3.91	0.83	3.26	1.09	3.39	2.00	.00
6	Facilitate auditing, concerning financial resources	3.45	1.13	2.76	1.20	2.90	2.01	.00
7	Facilitate inventory and monitoring of materials	3.91	0.83	3.21	1.18	3.35	2.08	.00
8	Purchasing necessary materials on time	3.00	1.00	3.08	0.97	3.06	0.24	.00
9	Proper storage of material resource	4.00	1.09	3.14	1.20	3.31	2.50	.02
10	Distribution of materials on time	3.82	1.08	3.08	1.19	3.23	2.16	.00
11	Disposition of expired, unwanted or excess materials on time	3.09	1.13	2.86	1.21	2.90	0.67	.00
Average mean		3.80	0.95	3.13	1.12	3.26	2.00	

N=149, significant at alpha level 0.05, Df= 147 for school leaders and Teachers Table value on the df(147)=1.960 at 0.05 and SD= Standard deviation .

As indicated in Table 4 item 1, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on the extent to what school leaders effectively manage time resources. Both teachers and school leaders rated medium and high performance with mean value 3.59 and 4.36 respectively. In addition to this,

the combined mean was 3.74 also implies that both group rated medium performance that school leaders were effectively managing time resources.

Furthermore, the computed t-value at α = 0.05 was found to be 2.39 which was greater than the critical value at α = 0.05 which was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which school leaders effectively manage time resources, t (147) = 2.39, P >0.05, two tailed. This in general, implies that school leaders and teachers in sample secondary schools have no similar idea with what was going on regarding effective management of time resource in their schools. Thus one can understand from these statistical variations that either school leaders rated their performance higher or teachers rated the performance of their leaders' medium. The result of focus group discussion indicates that there was moderate practice in their schools which supports the response of the teachers. The Interviewed principals and supervisors responded that:

> "*Practices of time resources management were better than other resources management.*
> *''Woreda Education office did not allocate enough Block Grant budget to schools.*
> *''Some of Secondary school leaders of the sample schools did not facilitate auditing regarding financial resources to reduce corruption.''*

In general, the finding of interview responses and FGD indicate that school leaders were not effectively managing time and material resources as much as possible.

As indicated in Table 4 item 2, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on the extent to what school leaders wise use of material resources. Both teachers and school leaders rated medium and high performance with mean value 3.32 and 4.18 respectively. In addition to this, the combined mean was 3.49 also implies that both group rated medium performance that school leaders were wise use of material resources.

Furthermore, the computed t-value at α = 0.05 was found to be 2.59 which was greater than the critical value at α = 0.05 which was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which school leaders effectively manage time resources and wise use material resources, t (147) = 2.59 respectively, P >0.05, two tailed.

This in general, implies that school leaders and teachers in sample secondary schools have no similar idea with what was going on regarding wise use of material resources in their schools. Thus one can understand from these statistical variations that either school leaders rated their performance higher or teachers rated the performance of their leaders' medium. The result of focus group discussion indicates that there was moderate practice in their schools which supports the response of the teachers.

As indicated in Table 4 item 3, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on the capable to optimum utilization of available financial resources. Both teachers and school leaders rated poor and high practices with mean value were 2.95 and 4.00 respectively. In addition to this, the combined mean was 3.16 also implies that both group rated medium practices that school leaders were optimum utilization of available financial resources.

Furthermore, the computed t-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 3.28 which was greater than the critical value at $\alpha = 0.05$ which was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which school leaders optimum utilization of available financial resources, $t(147) = 3.28$, $P > 0.05$, two tailed.

The result of FGD indicates that even though the degree of their perception varies, there was poor practice on proper utilization of financial resources which improve the idea of teachers' response.

As indicated in Table 4 item 4, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on the enhancing proper use of human resource. Both teachers and school leaders rated medium and high practices with mean value were 3.23 and 4.09 respectively. In addition to this, the combined mean was 3.40 also implies that both group rated medium practices that school leaders were enhancing proper use of human resource.

Furthermore, the computed t-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 2.63 which was greater than the critical value at $\alpha = 0.05$ which was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which school leaders enhance proper use of human resource, $t(147) = 2.63$, $P > 0.05$, two tailed. The result of FGD indicates that there was medium practice on enhance proper use of human resources in the sample schools. The Interviewed principals and supervisors responded that: ''Practices of human resources management were better than other resources management."

As it can be seen in table 4 of item 5, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on to what extent school leaders keep accurate and complete human resource record. Both teacher and school leader group rated medium practice with mean value 3.26 and 3.91 respectively. Moreover, the combined mean was 3.39 also implies that both group rated medium practice that school leaders keep accurate and complete human resource record.

Furthermore, the computed t-value at α = 0.05 was found to be 2.00 which was greater than the critical value at α = 0.05 which was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which school leaders keep accurate and complete human resource record, t (147)= 2.08, P < 0.05, two tailed. Therefore, from this finding we can conclude that the school leaders did not keep accurate and complete human resource record as much as possible. Regarding this item, the result of FGD and interview indicate that there was medium practice.

Item 6 in the table 4, was also recognized by school leaders and teachers differently with mean value 3.45 which represent moderate practice and 2.76 which indicate poor practice respectively. The t-value for this item is 2.01. This also shows significant difference. The result of FGD reveals that they had no any information regarding audit in schools for five consecutive years. From this response one can conclude that secondary school leaders of the sample schools did not facilitate auditing regarding financial resources to reduce corruption. The Interviewed principals and supervisors responded that*:* "Some of secondary school leaders of the sample schools did not facilitate auditing regarding financial resources to reduce corruption.''

As it can be seen in table 4 of item 7, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on to what extent school leaders facilitate inventory and monitoring of materials. Both teacher and school leader group rated medium and high practice with mean value 3.21 and 3.91 respectively. Moreover, the combined mean was 3.35 also implies that both group rated medium practice that school leaders facilitate inventory and monitoring of materials.

Furthermore, the computed t-value at α = 0.05 was found to be 2.08 which was greater than the critical value at α = 0.05 which was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which school leaders facilitate inventory and monitoring of materials, t (147)= 2.08, P < 0.05, two tailed. Therefore, from this finding we can

conclude that the school leaders did not facilitate inventory and monitoring of materials as much as possible. The result of FGD indicates that there was medium practice on facilitate inventory and monitoring of materials in the sample schools.

On Table 4 of item 8, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on the extent to which school leaders was purchasing necessary materials on time. Both teacher and school leader group rated medium practice with mean value were 3.00 and 3.08 respectively. In addition to this, the combined mean was 3.06 also implies that both group rated medium practice that school leaders were purchasing necessary materials on time.

Furthermore, the computed t-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.24 which was less than the critical value at $\alpha = 0.05$ which was 1.96. Therefore, it could be concluded that there was no statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which was purchasing necessary materials on time, t (181)= 0.24, P >0.05, two tailed. Results of focus group discussion also support their idea.

As indicated in Table 4 item 9, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on the proper storage of material resource. Both teachers and school leaders rated medium and high practices with mean value were 3.14 and 4.00 respectively. In addition to this, the combined mean was 3.31 also implies that both group rated medium practices that school leaders were proper storage of material resource.

Furthermore, the computed t-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 2.50 which was greater than the critical value at $\alpha = 0.05$ which was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which school leaders were proper storage of material resource, t (147) = 2.50, P >0.05, two tailed. The result of FGD indicates that even though the degree of their perception varies, there was medium practice on were proper storage of material resource which improves the idea of teachers' response.

As it can be seen in table 4 of item 10, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on to what extent school leaders distribute materials on time. Both teacher and school leader group rated medium practice with mean value 3.82 and 3.08 respectively. Moreover, the combined mean was 3.25 also implies that both group rated medium practice that school leaders distribute materials on time.

Furthermore, the computed t-value at α = 0.05 was found to be 2.16 which was greater than the critical value at α = 0.05 which was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which school leaders distribute materials on time, t (147) = 2.16, P < 0.05, two tailed. Therefore, from this finding we can conclude that the school leaders did not distribute materials on time as much as possible. Regarding this item, the result of FGD and interview indicate that there was medium practice.

Item 11 in table 4, examines disposal of expired, unwanted or excess materials on time. Regarding this school leaders' response mean 3.09 indicates there was moderate practice, and that of the teachers 2.86 indicates poor practices. The calculated t-value 0.67 which is less than critical value 1.690 also indicate that there was no statistically significant difference among the two groups. The participants of FGD reported that there was moderate practice.

Generally, the practices of resource management in sample secondary schools was found at moderate level of performance in the average mean value of two groups of respondents 3.26. The data obtained from FGD and interviews indicated that practices of time and human resource management were better than other resources. School leader of sample secondary schools attempt to improve culture of time management preparing check-lists to monitor their time utilization and mobilize human resources for accomplishment of instructional tasks. Thus, it is possible to conclude improved practices of time and human resource utilization has great contribution to improve quality of education. However, almost all of the sample schools were not have enough human resources both from line and staff personnel.

School leaders collected necessary information from teachers for the provision of operational materials on time. But still the participants of FGD reported that provision of material resources which required for accomplishment of instructional tasks was insufficient. The result of interview conducted with principals' show that schools did not have enough budget to fulfill their material need. WEO did not allocate enough Block Grant budget to schools according to the principals and supervisors. The extent of resource was one of the major factors that affect instructional leaders' leadership roles. Regarding the extent of resource Gorton (1993) stated that "lack of resource (human, financial or physical) can be a serious obstacle to instructional leadership". With respect to disposition of materials principals reported that they could depose non-toxic materials but there were expired chemicals in schools which were beyond their capacity.

4.2.3. Practices of decision making process

Table 5.Practices of Decision making in sample secondary schools

No	Item / practice	School leaders		Teachers		Ave. Mean	T- value	P-Value
		Mean	St.De	Mean	St.De			
1	Collect necessary facts before proposing solutions to a problem	3.73	1.10	3.18	1.05	3.29	1.69	0.00
2	Evaluate various alternatives	3.36	1.12	3.15	1.09	3.19	0.64	0.00
3	Seeking participation of teachers and input to make decision	3.91	1.04	3.10	0.99	3.26	2.58	0.585
4	Deciding without stake holders participation	3.00	1.54	2.92	1.14	2.94	0.23	0.009
5	Seeking collaboration and make decisions with stakeholders	4.27	0.90	3.20	1.18	3.41	3.16	0.967
6	Letting others decide	3.64	0.67	2.90	1.07	3.04	2.30	0.00
7	Follow up for continuous improvement	3.82	0.82	3.03	1.06	3.18	2.44	0.00
	Average Mean	3.67	1.05	3.07	1.08	3.19	1.59	

N=149, significant at alpha level 0.05, df= 147 for school leaders and Teachers Table value on the df(147)=1.960 at 0.05 and SD= Standard deviation .

As observed in Table 5 of item 1, respondents were asked to rate their degrees of agreement on the extent to which school leaders collect necessary facts before proposing solutions to a problem. Both teacher and school leader group rated medium practice with mean value 3.18 and 3.73 respectively. Moreover, the combined mean 3.29 also implies that both groups have indicated medium practice on school leaders collecting necessary facts before proposing solutions to a problem.

Furthermore, the computed t-value at α =0.05 was found to be 1.69 which is less than the critical region at α = 0.05 was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was no statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which school leaders collect necessary facts before

proposing solutions to a problem, t(147)= 1.69, P < 0.05, two tailed. Interview result also assured that leaders practice in collecting necessary fact is found at moderate level of performance.

As observed in Table 5 of item 2, respondents were asked to rate their degrees of agreement on the extent to which school leaders evaluate various alternatives. Both teacher and school leader group rated medium performance with mean value 3.15 and 3.36 respectively. The combined mean 3.19 also implies that both groups have indicated medium practice on school leaders evaluating various alternatives

Furthermore, the computed t-value at α =0.05 was found to be 0.64 which is less than the critical region at α = 0.05 was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was no statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which school leaders collect necessary facts before proposing solutions to a problem, t(147)= 0.64, P < 0.05, two tailed.

As observed in Table 5 of item 3, respondents were asked to rate their degrees of agreement on the extent to which school leaders seek participation of teachers and input to make decision. Both teacher and school leader group rated medium and high performance with mean value 3.10 and 3.91 respectively. The combined mean 3.26 also implies that both groups have indicated medium performance on school leaders seeking participation of teachers and input to make decision.

Furthermore, the computed t-value at α =0.05 was found to be 2.58 which exceeded the critical region at α = 0.05 was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was no statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which school leaders seek participation of teachers and input to make decision, t(147)= 2.58, P < 0.05, two tailed. The result of interview with FGD reveals that principals seek participation of teachers and input in the decision making process. According to this group sometimes principals decide on different issues and consult or inform teachers for accomplishment.

As observed in Table 5 of item 4, respondents were asked to rate their degrees of agreement on the extent to which school leaders decide without stake holder's participation. Both teacher and school leader group rated medium performance with mean value 3.00 and 2.99 respectively. The combined mean 2.97 also implies that both groups have indicated medium performance on school leaders deciding without stake holder's participation

Furthermore, the computed t-value at α =0.05 was found to be 0.23 which was less than the critical region at α= 0.05 was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was no statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which school leaders decide without stake holders participation, t (147) = 0.64, P < 0.05, two tailed. Thus, it is possible to conclude that participatory decision making process is encouraged in the sample schools.

As observed in Table 5 of item 5, respondents were asked to rate their degrees of agreement on the extent to which school leaders seeking collaboration and make decisions with stakeholders. Both teacher and school leader group rated medium and high performance with mean value 3.20 and 4.27 respectively. The combined mean 3.41 also implies that both groups have indicated medium performance on school leaders seeking collaboration and make decisions with stakeholders.

Furthermore, the computed t-value at α =0.05 was found to be 3.16 which exceeded the critical region at α = 0.05 was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which school leaders seeking collaboration and make decisions with stakeholders, t(147)= 2.58, P < 0.05, two tailed. The response of FGD strengthens the teachers' idea which represents moderate practice. Therefore, the two groups' opinion shows significance differences between the two.

As observed in Table 5 of item 6, respondents were asked to rate their degrees of agreement on the extent to which school leaders letting decide. Both teacher and school leader group rated medium and high performance with mean value 2.90 and 3.64 respectively. The combined mean 3.04 also implies that both groups have indicated medium performance on school leaders letting others decide

Furthermore, the calculated t-value (t=2.30, p>0.05) also indicate that there was significant statistical difference between the view of the two groups of respondents with respect to letting others decide. Participants of FGD reported that: "Sometimes principals give a chance to teachers when issues related with instructional practice need immediate decisions."

As observed in Table 5 of item 7, respondents were asked to rate their degrees of agreement on the extent to which school leaders follow up for continuous improvement. Both teacher and school leader group rated medium and high performance with mean value 3.03 and 3.82 respectively. The combined mean 3.18 also implies that both groups have indicated medium performance on school leaders following for continuous improvement.

Furthermore, the calculated t-value (t=2.445, p>0.05) assured that there was statistically significant opinion difference among the two groups. The participants of FGD and Woreda education office experts said that: “School leaders did not pay more attention to follow up for continuous improvement, this also is a serious problem which hinders change in schools.’’

The average mean values of the school leaders and teachers response 3.19 show that the practice of decision making in the sample schools was found at medium level regardless of variation in degree of their perception. Variation in perception may result from the attitudes of the groups. In this case school leaders may over rate their performance or teachers may undermine the performance of their leaders. Interview was also conducted with FGD on this domain. The results of the interview also reveal that:

> *‘’there was moderate level of stakeholders’ involvement in decision making but there were weaknesses in implementation and follow up for continuous improvement.”*
> *“Weakness in implementation and follow up for continuous improvement may result from leaders’ negligence or lack of necessary resources that are required to implement the decisions*.”

In general, the finding of interview responses and FGD indicate that school leaders were not implementation and continuous follow up for improvement of quality of education in collaboration with stakeholders as much as possible.

4.4. Factors Affecting Instructional Leadership Practices

Table 6. Factors that affect instructional leadership practices in selected schools

No	Item/problems	School leaders		Teachers		Ave.mean	T–value	P-Value
		Mean	S .D	Mean	S .D			
1	Professional factors	3.27	1.61	3.22	1.29	3.24	0.11	0.00
2	Educational background(other than EdPM)	3.09	1.30	3.05	1.22	3.07	1.05	0.00
3	Work experience	2.73	1.27	3.08	1.10	2.90	1.98	0.00
4	Socio-political factor	2.75	1.36	3.34	1.22	3.04	0.05	0.08
5	Lack of human resource	3.09	1.30	2.83	1.16	2.96	0.76	0.00
6	Lack of financial resource	3.64	1.36	3.47	1.18	3.55	0.49	0.05
7	Lack of educational materials	3.00	1.18	3.24	1.20	3.12	0.70	0.00
8	Leaders personal qualities	2.39	0.94	3.15	1.19	2.77	3.11	0.00
9	Lack of motivation/Low morale of teachers	3.18	1.08	3.43	1.16	3.30	0.74	0.04
10	Low community participation	3.45	1.03	3.46	1.22	3.45	0.03	0.00
11	Teacher's covert resistance against policy and strategies of education	2.36	1.50	2.60	1.32	2.48	0.07	0.08
12	Students' attitude or interest for education	3.91	1.13	3.84	1.21	3.87	0.20	0.02
13	Inconsistent monitoring and evaluation	2.84	1.36	3.07	1.01	2.95	0.72	0.00
	Average Mean	3.01	1.26	3.20	1.18	3.10	0.79	

N=149, significant at alpha level 0.05, Df, 147 for school leaders and Teachers Table value on the df(147)=1.960 at 0.05 and SD= Standard deviation

As it can be seen in table 6 of item 1, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on to what extent professional factors affect instructional leadership practices. Both teacher and school leader group agree with mean value 3.22 and 3.28 respectively. Moreover, the combined mean was 3.24 also implies that both group agree that school leaders affected by professional factors..

Furthermore, the computed t-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.11 which was less than the critical value at $\alpha = 0.05$ which was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was no statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which school leaders affected by

professional factors, t (147) = 0.11, P < 0.05, two tailed. Therefore, as we can see from the mean values of groups' professional factor was the major factors that moderately affect instructional leader's leadership practices in sample schools.

As it can be seen in table 6 of item 2, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on to what extent educational background (other than EdPM) affect instructional leadership practices. Both teacher and school leader group agree with mean value 3.05 and 3.09 respectively. Moreover, the combined mean was 3.07 also implies that both group agree that school leaders affected by educational background (other than EdPM).

Furthermore, the computed t-value at α = 0.05 was found to be 1.05 which was less than the critical value at α = 0.05 which was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was no statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which school leaders affected by professional factors, t (147) = 0.11, P < 0.05, two tailed. Therefore, as we can see from the mean values of groups' education background, were the major factors that moderately affect instructional leader's leadership roles in sample schools.

As it can be seen in table 6 of item 3, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on to what extent work experience affect instructional leadership practices. School leaders rated negatively with a mean value of 2.73, whereas teachers recognized this factor positively with a mean value 3.08. But teachers recognized that work experience moderately affect the roles of their leaders. Furthermore, the computed t-value at α = 0.05 was found to be 1.98 which was greater than the critical value at α = 0.05 which was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which instructional leaders affected by work experience, t (147) = 1.98, P < 0.05, two tailed. The data obtained from interview with supervisors confirmed that the influence of work experience on leaders' role was relatively low.

As it can be seen in table 6 of item 4, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on to what extent socio-political factor affect instructional leadership practices. School leaders rated negatively with a mean value of 2.75, whereas teachers recognized this factor positively with a mean value 3.34. But teachers recognized that work experience moderately affect the roles of their leaders.

Furthermore, the computed t-value at α = 0.05 was found to be 0.05 which was less than the critical value at α = 0.05 which was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was no statistically

significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which instructional leaders affected by socio-political factors, t (147) = 0.05, P < 0.05, two tailed. The result of focus group discussion with teachers show that school leaders were burdened with extra political issues which were given from education and political organization offices of the woreda. The results of the interview also reveal that:

> *"Additional tasks were given to school leaders by order of political organization offices. This implies that political factors also affect instructional leaders' leadership roles."*
>
> *"School leaders undermined the influence of political factors on their role because they may perceive themselves as political leaders than professional leaders or because of their appointment on the basis of political commitment."*

School leaders rate item 5, lack of human resource as a factor that moderately affects their role with a mean value 3.09, whereas teachers rate the influence of this factor negatively with a mean value 2.83. But the computed t-value ($t=0.762$, $p<0.05$) show that there was no significant difference statistically. Teachers' perception regarding the influence of this factor on leaders' role was low. This may result from variation in individual and collective accountability. Since school leaders were accountable for the overall activities of their school they know the consequences of insufficient human resource. School leaders' report of the interview indicates that almost all of the sample schools have lack of human resources required.

School leaders and teachers had similar idea on item 6 in table 6. The mean values of this item are 3.64 & 3.47. The calculated t- value for this item is 0.494. This t-value is smaller than the critical t-value ($t=1.960$) at 0.05 level of significance for 147 degree of freedom. This t-value also assured that there was no statistically significant opinion difference among the two groups. Therefore, as we can see from the mean values of lack of financial resource were the major factors that moderately affect educational leader's leadership roles in sample schools.

As it can be seen in table 6 of item 7, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on to what extent lack of educational materials affect instructional leadership practices. Both teacher and school leader group agree with mean value 3.24 and 3.00 respectively. Moreover, the combined mean was 3.12 also implies that both group agree that school leaders' practices affected by educational materials..

Furthermore, the computed t-value at α = 0.05 was found to be 0.70 which was less than the critical value at α = 0.05 which was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was no statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which school leaders' practices affected by professional factors, t (147) = 0.70, P < 0.05, two tailed. Therefore, as we can see from the mean values of groups' lack of educational materials were the major factors that moderately affect instructional leader's leadership roles in sample schools.

As it can be seen in table 6 of item 8, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on to what extent school leaders personal quality affect instructional leadership practices. School leaders rated negatively with a mean value of 2.39, whereas teachers recognized this factor positively with a mean value 3.15.

Furthermore, the computed t-value at α = 0.05 was found to be 3.11 which was greater than the critical value at α = 0.05 which was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which instructional leaders practices affected by leaders personal quality, t (147) = 3.11, P < 0.05, two tailed. The participants of focus group discussion reported that leaders lack personal qualities, they lack confidence because of external influence, and even sometimes they did no implement what they decide up on to be implemented. This implies that leaders have gaps in professional competence their monitoring and evaluation system also lacks regularity.

School leaders and teachers had similar idea on items 9 and 10 in table 7. The mean values of these items are 3.18 & 3.43, and 3.45 & 3.46 respectively for items as well as for groups of respondents. The calculated t- values for these items are 0.373 and 0.028 and 0.202. The t-values of each two items are smaller than the critical t-value (t=1.960) at 0.05 level of significance for 147 degree of freedom. These t-values also assured that there was no statistically significant opinion difference among the two groups. Therefore, as we can see from the mean values of groups' low teachers' moral and low community participation were the major factors that moderately affect instructional leadership practices in sample schools.

As it can be seen in table 6 of item 11, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on to what extent leaders personal quality affect instructional leadership practices. School leaders rated negatively with a mean value of 2.39, whereas teachers recognized this factor positively with a mean

value 3.15. School leaders and teachers rated item 11 (teachers covert resistance against policy) in table 6 as poor factors with mean values of 2.36 & 2.60 respectively.

Furthermore, the computed t-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.70 which was less than the critical value at $\alpha = 0.05$ which was 1.960. Therefore, it was concluded that there was no statistically significant mean difference among the group on the rate to which instructional leaders practices affected by teacher's covert resistance against policy and strategy of education, t (147) = 0.70, P < 0.05, two tailed. Thus it is possible to conclude the impact of this factor on roles of education leaders is low.

School leaders and teachers had similar idea on item 12 in table 7. The mean values of this item for both groups are 3.91 & 3.84 respectively. Moreover, the calculated t- value for this item is 0.202, which is smaller than the critical t-value (t=1.960) at 0.05 level of significance for 147 degree of freedom. These t-values also assured that there was no statistically significant opinion difference among the two groups. Therefore, as we can see from the mean values of groups' students' lack interest for education were the major factors that moderately affect educational leader's leadership roles in sample schools.

In the same table for item 13, school leaders rate leaders' inconsistent monitoring and evaluation negatively. They recognized the influence of these factors on their role as relatively poor with mean values 2.84. But teachers recognized that these factors were moderately affects the leaders role with mean values of 3.07. However the calculated t-value for the item is 0.716.This t-value also assured that there was no statistically significant opinion difference among the two groups. The participants of focus group discussion reported that leaders lack personal qualities, they lack confidence because of external influence, and even sometimes they did no implement what they decide up on to be implemented. This implies that leaders have gaps in professional competence their monitoring and evaluation system also lacks regularity.

Generally, most of the factors listed in table 6 affect the role of instructional leaders in sample schools. However, the level of their influence varies from factor to factor as the mean values of each item indicate. On the basis of school leaders and teachers agreement the problem of students' attitude toward education ranked first with the mean value of 3.91 and 3.84 respectively. Lack of financial resource and low community participation on school issues the second and third major factors that

affect instructional leaders' leadership roles. Besides lack of material resources, professional factors, teachers' low morale, and educational background are other factors that affect leaders' role. On the basis of the interview and focus group discussion socio-political factors, lack of human resources, leaders' personal qualities and inconsistent monitoring and evaluation system are other factors that affect instructional leaders' leadership practices. Work experience, teacher's covert resistance against policy and strategies of education were relatively poor factors.

With respect to the extent of resource, Gorton (1993) stated that lack of resource (human, financial or physical) can be a serious obstacle to instructional leadership. Professional factors, educational background and leaders' personal qualities are also other problems which have their own impact on education quality. To minimize the effect of professional factors on instructional leadership building the capacity of instructional leaders needs more attention. Socio-political factor was factor that affects school leaders' leadership roles. Since schools embrace different interest groups, political factors may have its own influence on quality of education. Imposing political agendum on schools may cause resistance to change. Educational administrators typically cannot exercise their power directly to get things done: rather the administrator must obtain voluntary cooperation, support and good will from others to get things done Sergiovanni (2005).

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter consists of summary of the major findings, conclusion drawn from the findings and recommendation.

5.1. Summary of Findings

The main objective of the study was to assess the current practices of instructional leadership in secondary schools of Kellem Wollega Zone Oromia National Regional State. Hence, the following basic research questions were raised to answer in the course of the study.

1. What were the instructional leadership practices of the secondary schools in Kellem Wollega zone in terms of implementation of SIP, resource management and participatory decision making?
2. What were the challenges that instructional leaders encounter during their day to day activities in secondary schools of the study area?
3. What were the strategies used by school leaders to improve instructional leadership practices?

To search answers for these questions, a descriptive survey method was employed. The data collected from the closed ended questionnaires was analyzed and interpreted using different statically tools such as frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation. The data collected through interview, open ended questionnaires and FGD were analyzed qualitative by supplementing the data gathered through close ended questionnaires, and categorized and discussed in line with close ended questionnaires. On the basis of the analysis and interpretation of the data gathered through all the instruments, the following major findings were indicated.

The performance of school improvement program in sample schools was found at moderate level. All sample schools have a 3 years strategic plan and one year operational plan of school improvement program. Results of qualitative analysis also show that the attempt of school leaders to develop participatory SIP plan was good. Besides, they conduct school's self-assessment at least once in three years and evaluate their performance at the end of each academic year. But there were weakness in implementation of SIP. Due to inconsistent monitoring and evaluation system all prioritized issues which were listed in the operational plan were no implemented as intended; hence,

its impact is not undermined. It is found that from four domains of SIP community participation was low.

The overall practices of resource management in sample secondary schools were moderately high; whereas that of the teachers' response shows moderate practice. Practices of time and human resource management were better than other resources. Leaders of the sample secondary schools attempt to improve culture (habits) of time management by preparing checklists to monitor their time utilization. But almost all of the sample schools were not have enough human resources both from line and staff personnel which adversely affects practices instructional leadership. The finding was stated that there was no transparency in financial resources utilization in sample secondary schools which has its own impact on education quality. School leaders not facilitate auditing concerning the utilization of financial resources to reduce corruption.

The average men values of the school leaders and teachers response show that the practices of decision making in the sample schools was found at medium level regardless of variation in degree of their perception. Results of interview also show that there was moderate level of performance (stakeholders' involvement) in decision making which maintains the existing situation. However, it was found that there were gaps in implementation and follow up for continuous improvement.

Most of the factors that affect the role of instructional leaders in sample schools were listed. However, the level of their influence varies from factor to factor as the mean values of each item indicate. On the basis of school leaders and teachers agreement, the problem of students' attitude toward education (students' lack interest for education) ranked first with the mean value of 3.91 and 3.84 respectively. Lack of financial resource and low community participation on school issues were the second and third factors that affect instructional leaders' leadership roles. Besides lack of material resources, professional factors, teachers' low morale, and educational background are other factors that affect leaders' role.

5.2. Conclusions

The following conclusions were made on basis of the analysis and the summary made so far. The practices of instructional leadership had been assessed. The challenges that the instructional leaders were facing in their schools were identified. The conclusions were:

❖ All of the sample schools have their own SIP plan including the three years strategic plan and 1 year's operational plan. But weaknesses were observed in implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and enhancing community participation. Leaders monitoring and evaluation system lacks consistency. Low community participation makes one of the four domains of SIP weak. Due to inconsistent monitoring and evaluation system all prioritized issues which were listed in the operational plan were no implemented as intended. Having a good plan is not an end by itself; it requires proper implementation for instructional success.

❖ Practices of resource management and decision making process was found at moderate level, but deficiencies were observed. Provision of basic operational materials was insufficient. Lack of human resources (teachers and supporting staff) was the problem of almost schools under study financial resources allocated for students as block grant was inadequate. The scarce resources of the schools were not properly utilized as intended. School leaders were not transparent regarding utilization of financial resources.

❖ There were problems that face instructional leaders and affect their leadership practices. Some of the problems which were identified by this study were attitude of students toward education (students lack interest for educational). Lack of financial resource, low community participation on school issues, lack of human resource, sociopolitical factors, lack of material resources, low morale of teachers inconsistent monitoring and evaluation system, professional factors, leaders' personal quality, educational background other than educational planning and management, work experience, teachers' covert resistance against policy and strategy of education, teachers' experience, and teachers uncooperativeness to team work were major factors that affect instructional leaders' leadership practices.

5.3. Recommendations

Based on the major findings of the study and the conclusions drawn, the following recommendations were forwarded.

1. Although sample schools have a three years strategic plan and one year action plan of SIP, the instructional leadership practices to the SIP program implementation were not sufficient. Therefore, school leaders should have to exhaustively implement their plan by distributing leadership roles to

the school community, as well as designing appropriate system of monitoring and evaluation to check level of their SIP implementation regularly. Besides, they should enhance community participation in all school issues together with other stakeholders like PTA, the school board, Woreda Education office. Therefore, school leaders should have to use their capacity to the fullest to implement their plan, design regular monitoring and evaluation system and enhance community participation in collaboration with all stockholders of education.

2. To fulfill school facilities and basic operational materials need, school leaders should have a plan. Then they have to communicate their plan with concerned bodies on time to solve these problems. Woreda administrative office should allocate at least the amount of money that was stated in schools management, organization and finance manual per student for schools. Secondary school leaders should have to have plan of human resource need and report it to WEO on time. WEO should have to work with woreda administration office, so that enough budgets would be allocated to fulfill human resource needs of the schools.

3. Instructional leadership should be transparent on the utilization of money, and facilitate audit to reduce misuse of the scarce resource. They should have to publish the amount of budget allocated to schools by the woreda administrative office and WEO as the internal income of their schools. Moreover, MoE/OEB should have to revise the manual which deals with block grant budget and improve the amount of block grant budget allocated for students in comparison with the present day inflation.

4. The overall practices of decision making process including stakeholders' participation were found at medium level of performance. So that they should have to maximize their performance implementing every task which is decided to be accomplished, encourage participatory decision making for better implementation and prepares, support staff, PTA, the school board and WEO.

5. The major problems that encounter instructional leaders and affect their leadership practices in government secondary schools of Kellem Wollega zone were students' attitude toward education, lack of resource, low community participation on school issues, socio-political factors and low morale of teachers. Besides, inconsistent monitoring and evaluation system, professional factors, leaders' personal qualities and leaders' educational background were also other factors that affect instructional leaders' leadership practices. In order to alleviate these problems school leaders are

expected to conduct school self-assessment and identify problem that affect their leadership practices. After critical problems are identified they have to prioritize on the basis of their seriousness, and develop participatory plan in collaboration with all stakeholders to alleviate them.

6. Finally, this study was coming up with the above findings. But due to complex nature of instructional leadership practices one cannot think that it is complete and exhaustively explored. Thus, the researcher suggests that, in the future, a detailed study should be made to investigate more about the practices of instructional leadership in secondary schools.

6. REFERENCES

Abose Kuyise, 2014. The practices of instructional leaders in prepatory schools of Western Wolleaga Zone, unpublished thesis paper: Haramaya University.

Aggarwal,.J. 1985. *Theory and Principles of Education: Philosophical and Sociological Bases of Education*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.

Aselef Alemayehu. 2012. The current status of Instructional leadership in enhancing the quality of Education: The case of Dire Dawa Government Secondary schools, Unpublished thesis paper: Haramaya University.

Badway, K. 1982. *Development Management Skill:* New York; Van Nostr and Rinhold Company.

Best,J. W., and J.V. Kahn,2003.Research in Education(9th) New Delhi: Prentice Hall Pl.

Blasé, J., and J. Blasé, 2000.Principals Perspectives on shared Governance Leadership. Journal of School Leadership.10 (1):9-39

Blasé, J. & Roberts, J. 1994.The micro-politics of teacher work involvement: Effective Principals‟ impacts on teachers. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*.

Bossert, S.T., 1982.The instructional management role of principal. Educational Administration Quarterly.Vol.18, No.3, pp.34-65.

Botha, R.J., 2004. Excellence in Leadership: Demands on the Processional School Principals. *South African Journal of Education*, 24:239-243.

Bush, T.,and L.Bell.,2003. *The principals and Practices of Educational Management*; London: Paul Chapman Publising

Cunningham, R., 2008.A. Examination of the Relationship between Servant Leadership Behavior of the Elementary School Principal, School Climate and Student Achievement as Measured by 4th Grade Mathematics and Reading.

Demoze Degefa(2007).The Current Practices of Instructional Leadership in Enhancing the Quality of Education in the Government Primary Schools of AA City Administration. (AAU, Unpublished MA Thesis).

Dimmock, C.2002. Principals and school restructuring: conceptualizing challenges as dilemmas, *Journal of Educational Administration,* 37 (5), 441-462.

Dornyei, Z. 2007. Research Method in Linguistics: Quantitative and Mixed Methodologies. Oxford University Press.

Faunce, C. (1955). Secondary School Administration. USA: Harper and Brothers.

Flath, B., 1989. The principal as instructional leaders, *ATA Magazines*, 69(3) 19-22, 47-49.

FDRE: Addis Ababa. 2007. Quality Education Packages. EMPDA, Addis Ababa. Ethiopia. (2008). Review of the Ethiopian Education and Training Policy and its Implementation. Executive summary: Unpublished material.

Firdissa Jebessa .2006. Quality Assurance in Higher Education Institutions: Challenges and opportunities", *IER Flambeau*, 14: 1-2.

Gall. 2007. *Educational Research. An introduction (8th Ed.)* Toronto, on: Ally & Bacon.

Gay, L.R. and Airasian, P. 2003. Education Research: Competencies for Analysis and application. 6th Edition. New Jersey: merril.

Gay, L.R., G.E.Mills and P.Airasian. 2009**.** Educational Research (9thEd). New Jersy: Pearson

Gorton, R. 1993. School leadership and administration: important concepts, case studies, and simulations. 3rd Edition.W.M.C. Brown publishers.

Guthrie,J.W. and Reead.1991.*Educational Aim and Policy: Effective Leadership for American Education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hallinger, P.,and Murph.1985.*''Educational Aim and Policy: Effective Leadership for American Education.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hallinger, P.2005. Leading Education change: Reflection the practice of Institutional Transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3):329-351.

Harris, A. 2003. Teacher leadership and school improvement. London: Rout ledge/Falmer

Kouzes, J.M. and posner, B.Z. 2004. *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kruger, S.1996. Leadership craft and the crafting of school leaders. Phi Delta Kappan.

Kruger, E.1999.Instructional leadership: A constructivist perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. Vol.28.No.3.pp.430-443.

Kumar, R. 2005. *Research Methodology*. London: International and Professional Publisher.

Leithwood and Duke.1998. Transformational school leadership effects: A replication. School Effectiveness & School Improvement, 10(4), 451-479.

Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D, 1999. The relative effect of principal and teacher sources of leadership on student engagement with school. Educational Administration Quarterly, 35(5)

Likewise and Flath, M., 1989. *Educational Leadership*, 103-156p.

Louis, C., Lawrence, M. and Keith, M. 2005. *Research Method in Education (5th Ed.).* London: Routledge Falmers.

Lyons, B., 201.Principal instructional leadership Behavior as perceived by teachers and principals, at New York State Recognized and non-Recognized Middle Schools.

Marks, H. and S. Printy., 2003. Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership.

MoE. 1994. Secondary Education Standard. Addis Ababa: EMPDA.

-------. 2007. Quality Education Packages. EMPDA, Addis Ababa. Ethiopia.

-------.2010. Improving the Quality of Education and Student Result for all Children at Primary and Secondary Schools: School Improvement Guideline, Final draft. Addis Ababa.

-------.(2013). Education Sector Development Program II. Addis Ababa, Ministry of Education.

Murphy,J. 1990.Principal instructional leadership, In P. W. Thurston & L. S. Lotto (Eds.), Advances in educational administration: Vol. 1, Part B. Changing perspectives on the school (pp. 163-200). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Musaazi, J.S.S. (1988). The Theory and Practices of Educational Administration. London: Mc Millan Publisher.

Schiefelbein, E. (1990). Basic Elements to Reflect on the Quality of Education in the Latin America Context. Paris: UNESCO, HEP.

Sergiovanni,T. .2005. The"The virtues of leadership". The Educational Forum 69(2), 112-123.

Ubben, G.,& Larry, W. (1997). The Principal Creative Leadership for Effective Schools,(3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

UNICEF .2010. *A human rights-based approach to education for all*. New York: UNICEF.

Wildy & Dimmock . 1993. School Based Management and School Effectiveness. Great Britain: Machays of Chathan PLC, Chatham, Kent.

7. APPENDICES

HARAMAY UNIVERSITY

POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE

COLLEGE OF EDUCATIONAL ANDBEHAVIORAL SCINCES

7.1 . APPENDIX -I- Questionnaire to be filled by Secondary School Teachers

This questionnaire is designed to assess the contribution of instructional leadership practices to quality education of secondary school of kellem wollega zone.

The information gathered through this questionnaire will be used for academic research purpose only and kept confidential. To this end, your cooperation in filling and returning this questionnaire has paramount importance for the study. Thus, you are kindly requested to fill out the questionnaire carefully and frankly as much as possible.

Direction:

A/ No need of writing your name on the questionnaire.

B/ Please supply brief responses to open ended questions wherever needed.

C/ Please try to answer every question according to the instruction given.

Thank you in advance for your genuine opinion

Part I: General information

1/ Name of the woreda: _____

2/ Name of school: _____

3/ school level: Grade 9-10 ☐ Grade 9-12 ☐

4/ Sex: Male ☐ Female ☐

5/ Age: 20 years and below ☐ 21-30years ☐ 31-40years ☐

41-50 years ☐ 51 and above ☐

6/ Educational qualification:

a) College Diploma b) (BA/BS c/ B.Ed.) degree c) MA/MSc degree

7Area of Specialization: a) Field of study: Major _____Minor _____

b) Any training received relevant to your position: _____

8) Work Experience: a) ≤ 5 years ☐ b) 6-10 years ☐ c) 11-15years ☐

d) 16-20 years ☐ e) 21 & above ☐

Part II: **Instructional leadership practices**

The following are some statement about the instructional leadership practices to education quality of secondary school. Please indicate by putting the mark '√' under your degree of response. How do you rate the following items that are related with School improvement program, Resource Management, Decision-making process and creating conducive and healthy environment based on the current practices of instructional leadership in your school? Where;

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

No	Items	Degree of resp.				
1	**School Improvement Program**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
1.1	The school make regular self-assessment about its improvement and set priorities based on identified problems to develop SIP plan					
1.2	Instructional leaders prepare participatory SIP plan to improve education quality					
1.3	Instructional leaders encourage teachers to have their own plan to improve teaching –learning process					
1.4	Ensures the provision of basic operational resources for implementation of the plan					
1.5	The school makes regular monitoring and evaluation during implementation					
1.6	The school takes corrective actions during implementation based on feedback of monitoring					
1.7	Make the school environment safe and healthy (ensure peace and order in school)					
1.8	Instructional leaders encourage community participation for attainment of SIP goals					
1.9	The extent that SIP vision relate to enhance students achievement					
2	**Resource Management**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
2.1	Creation of awareness about effective utilization of time					
2.2	Follow cost-effective ways of resource utilization					
2.3	Optimum utilization of available financial resources					
2.4	Keep accurate and complete human resource record					
2.5	Facilitate auditing, concerning financial resources to reduce Corruption					
2.6	Facilitate inventory and monitoring materials to reduce misuse of material resource					
2.7	Provision of educational materials for tasks to be accomplished					
2.8	Distribution of materials on time for departments and other subunits					
3	**Decision making process**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
3.1	Principals as Instructional leaders collect necessary information before proposing solutions to a problem					
3.2	Instructional leaders evaluate various alternatives					
3.3	Seeking participation of teachers and input to make decision					
3.4	Instructional leaders make decision without teachers' knowledge					
3.5	Leaders seek collaboration and make decisions with teachers					
3.6	Letting teachers decide					
3.7	The school considers the impact of decisions to be made					

Part III

How do you rate the following items that related to factors affecting school leaders' leadership roles according to their degree of seriousness on the status of your school? Where;

1=strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Uncertain 4=Agree, and 5=strongly agree.

No	Items	Degree of response				
5	**Factors affecting instructional leaderships' roles**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
5.1	Professional factors					
5.2	Educational background					
5.3	Work experience					
5.4	Socio-political factors					
5.5	Lack of human resource					
5.6	Lack of financial resource					
5.7	Lack of educational materials					
5.8	Leaders personal qualities (personal competencies)					
5.9	Lack of motivation /low morale of teachers					
5.10	Low community participation					
5.11	Teacher's covert resistance against policy and strategic education					
5.12	Students' lack interest for education					
5.13	Inconsistent monitoring and evaluation					

Part IV

You are kindly requested to give short answer for the following questions on the space provided based on the current practices of your school leaders.

1. How do principals carryout their leadership roles in your school?
2. How do instructional leaders motivate teachers to improve teaching learning process in your school?
3. What is expected from the principals of your school to improve quality of education?
4. What are the major problems that educational faced in secondary schools in the present time?
5. What possible solutions do you recommend to solve the existing problems of educational leadership?

HARAMAY UNIVERSITY

POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE

COLLEGE OF EDUCATIONAL ANDBEHAVIORAL SCINCES

7.2 APPENDIX – II- Questionnaire to be filled by School leaders

This questionnaire is designed to assess the contribution of instructional leadership practices to quality education of secondary school of KellemWollega Zone.

The information gathered through this questionnaire will be used for academic research purpose only and kept confidential. To this end, your cooperation in filling and returning this questionnaire has paramount importance for the study. Thus, you are kindly requested to fill out the questionnaire carefully and frankly as much as possible.

Direction:

A/ No need of writing your name on the questionnaire.

B/ Please supply brief responses to open ended questions wherever needed.

C/ Please try to answer every question according to the instruction given.

Thank you in advance for your genuine opinion

Part I: General information

1. / Name of the woreda: _____

2/ Name of school: _____

3/ school level: Grade 9-10 ☐ Grade 9-12 ☐

4/ Sex: Male ☐ Female ☐

5/ Age: 20 years and below ☐ 21-30years ☐ 31-40years ☐

41-50 years ☐ 51 and above ☐

6/ Educational qualification:

a) College Diploma b) (BA/BS c/ B.Ed.) degree c) MA/MSc degree

7Area of Specialization: a) Field of study: Major _____. Minor _____.

b) Any training received relevant to your position: _____

8) Work Experience: a) ≤ 5 years ☐ b) 6-10 years ☐ c) 11-15years ☐

d) 16-20 years ☐ e) 21 & above ☐

Part II: Instructional leadership practices

The following are some statement about the instructional leadership practices on education quality of secondary school. Please indicate by putting the mark '√' under your degree of response.

How do you rate the following items that are related with School improvement program, Resource Management, Decision-making process and creating conducive and healthy environment based on the current practices of instructional leadership in your school? Where;

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

No	**Items**	Degree of response				
1	**School Improvement Program**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
1.1	The school conducts school's self-assessment consistently					
1.2	Having participatory SIP plan to improve education quality					
1.3	Encourage teachers to have their own plan					
1.4	Ensure the provision of basic operational resources					
1.5	Consistent monitoring and evaluation system is designed					
1.6	Takes corrective actions during implementation					
1.7	Make the school environment safe and healthy					
1.8	Encourage community participation on school issues					
1.9	Translate the vision of into practices					
2	**Resource Management**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
2.1	Effective time resource management					
2.2	Wise use of material resources					
2.3	Capable to optimum utilization of available financial resources					
2.4	Enhance proper use of human resource					
2.5	Keep accurate and complete human resource record					
2.6	Facilitate inventory and monitoring of materials to reduce misuse of material resource					
2.7	Purchasing necessary materials on time					
2.8	Distribution of materials on time for departments and other subunits					
3	**Decision making process**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
3.1	Collect necessary facts before proposing solutions to a problem					
3.2	Evaluate various alternatives					
3.3	Seeking participation of teachers and input to make decision					
3.4	Deciding without stakeholders participation					
3.5	Seek collaboration and make decisions with stakeholders					
3.6	Letting others decide					
3.7	Follow up for continuous improvement					

Part III

How do you rate the following items that related to factors affecting school leaders'' leadership roles according to their degree of seriousness on the status of your school? Where;

1=strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Uncertain 4=Agree, and 5=strongly agree.

No	**Items**	Degree of response				
5	**Factors affecting instructional leaderships' roles**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
5.1	Professional factors					
5.2	Educational background					
5.3	Work experience					
5.4	Socio-political factors					
5.5	Lack of human resource					
5.6	Lack of financial resource					
5.7	Lack of educational materials					
5.8	Leaders personal qualities (personal competencies)					
5.9	Lack of motivation /low morale of teachers					
5.10	Low community participation					
5.11	Teacher's covert resistance against policy and strategic education					
5.12	Students' lack interest for education					
5.13	Inconsistent monitoring and evaluation					

Part IV

You are kindly requested to give short answer for the following questions based on the current practices of your school.

1. What measures should be taken by secondary school leaders to improve education quality?
2. What factors hinder instructional leaders from focusing on their leadership roles that improve learning out comes?
3. What are the major problems that instructional leaders faced while implementing the policy and strategies of education in secondary school?
4. What contributions does successful leadership have on quality education?
5. How do you motivate / encourage other members of the school to be involved in the shared leadership?

6. What possible solutions do you recommend to solve the existing problems of educational leadership?

HARAMAY UNIVERSITY

POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE

COLLEGE OF EDUCATIONAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCINCES

7.3. APPENDIX –III- Interview Guide for Principals and Supervisors

The purpose of this interview is to collect data that can be used as input to a thesis titled as "Contribution of instructional leadership practices on quality of education in secondary school of Kellem Wollega Zone" and to assess the performance of educational leaders and recommend reliable solutions to the problems that faced educational leaders to ensure quality of education.

1. How do instructional leaders carryout the implementation of School Improvement Program to ensure quality of education?
2. What favorable conditions exist in the school environment that encourages resources management?
3 What structures and incentives exist in your context that encourages school leaders to make friendly relations with other schools beyond their own school to the benefit of students learning?
4. How do other members of the school take part in the school leadership to share the burdens of principals?
5. How do you motivate/encourage other members of the school to be involved in the shared leadership?
6. What are the major problems that faced educational leaders in the current time?
7. What possible solutions do you recommend to solve the existing problems of educational leadership?

HARAMAY UNIVERSITY

POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE

COLLEGE OF EDUCATIONAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCINCES

7.4. APPENDIX- IV-Guide for Focus Group Discussion

The main purpose of focus group discussion is to collect relevant information regarding the current practices of educational leadership in secondary schools. Thus, as a participant of the discussion you are kindly requested to give necessary information as much as possible. Any information that you provide will be kept confidential and used only for the purpose of the study.

1. Name of school_____

2. Leading questions for focus group discussion
   A. What are the current practices of your school leaders concerning the following basic leadership functions**?**
   - School improvement program
   - Resource management(Human, Material, Financial and Time resource)
   - Decision making process

   B. What are major problems that face educational leaders of your school and affect their basic leadership roles?

   C. What possible solutions do you recommend to resolve the problems of educational leadership