

**THE EFFECTS OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP ON QUALITY  
EDUCATION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF BORENA ZONE**

**MA Thesis**

**By**

**Addisu Mekkona Boru**

**April 2016**

**Haramaya University, Haramaya**

**THE EFFECTS OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP ON QUALITY  
EDUCATION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF BORENA ZONE**

**A Thesis submitted to the Postgraduate Program Directorate  
(Department of educational planning and management )**

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSTIY**

**In Partial Fulfillments of the requirement for the Degree of  
MASTERS OF ARTS IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP**

**By**

**AddisuMokkona**

**April 2016  
Haramaya University**



## **DEDICATION**

This scholarly work is dedicated to my Mother, BuchukuDukkalle, for having struggled tirelessly in educating me to what I am.

## STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR

First, the author declares that this thesis is my own work and that all sources of materials used for this thesis have been properly acknowledged. This thesis has been submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for MA degree at the Haramaya University and is deposited at the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules and regulations of the Library. The author declares that this thesis is not submitted to any other institution anywhere for the award of any academic degree, diploma, or certificate.

Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission provided that accurate acknowledgement of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by Dean of School of Graduate Studies or the Head of the EDPMDepartment when in his or her judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

Name: AddisuMokkona

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

Place: Haramaya University, Haramaya

Date of submission: \_\_\_\_\_

## **BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH**

The author was born on 1 September 1976 E.C in BorenaZone, BildimiRaso rural kebele. He attended his elementary and secondary education at Finchawa Elementary School and BuleHora High School respectively. He then joined Bahir Dar University and graduated with B.Ed in English language teaching in 1999 E.C. After his graduation, he has been teaching English in SouthernOromia, in BorenaZone, Finchawa Secondary school since 2001. He also served as vice principal and secondary Schools coordinator in Woreda office in 2002 and 2003 respectively. In 2004 and up to now he serving as Preparatory school principal. Then, he got the opportunity to follow his MA in School leadership at Haramaya University in 2005. In the same year, he joined Haramaya University to peruse his graduate studies for the MA in Leadership.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank the almighty God for his assistance throughout my life.

Next, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude and deep appreciation to my advisors, MaereguBeyabeyen (Assistant Professor) and WakgariTasisa (Assistant professor) for their immense guidance, constructive comments, encouragement, follows up and professional expertise throughout the study. Without a doubt, the completion of this work would have been unattainable if they had not afforded me their passionate and scholarly support.

Ialsoexpressmy genuinethankto sampled High Schools principals,teachersandsupervisors of Borena Zone for their cooperationduring data collection.My heartfelt thanks also go to my wife Dana Galma for her financial and moral support.

Moreover, I greatly interest to extend my thank to my colleagues who offered me moral support throughout my research work. Lastly, I also thankful to Haramaya University for its research grant.

## **ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

EPL	Executive Professional Leadership
ESDP	Education Sector Development Program
ETP	Education and Training Policy
FDRE	Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia
GEQIP	General Education Quality Improvement Program
ILE	Instructional Leadership Effectiveness.
LAMP	Leadership and Management Program
LED	Leader’s Effectiveness in Each Dimension.
MoE	Ministry of Education
PIMRS	Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale.
SIP	School Improvement Program

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>DEDICATION</b>	<b>II</b>
<b>STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH</b>	<b>IV</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>V</b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS</b>	<b>VI</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>XI</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	3
1.3. Research Questions	6
1.4. Objectives of the Study	6
1.4.1. General Objective	6
1.4.2. The Specific Objectives	6
1.5 Significance of the Study	7
1.6. Delimitation of the Study	7
1.7. Limitation of the Study	8
1.8. Operational Definition of Key Terms	9
1.9. Organization of the Study.	9
<b>2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1. The Concepts of Instructional Leadership	10
2.2. Leadership Theory	11
2.2.1. Trait Theory	11

**...Continued**

2.2.2. Behavioral Theory	12
2.2.3. Contingency Theories	13
2.2.4. Situational Theories	13
2.2.5. Participative Theories	13
2.2.5. Management Theories	13
2.2.6 Relationship Theories	14
2.3. Instructional Leadership	14
2.4. Historical Context of Instructional Leadership	16
2.5. Instructional Leadership and Teaching and Learning	18
2.6. The Role of Instructional Leadership on School Success	19
2.7. School Leadership Development in Ethiopia	21
2.8. Factors Affecting Leadership Effectiveness	24
2.8.1. Organizational Characteristics	24
2.8.2. District or Zone Education Department Characteristics	26
2.8.3. Personal Characteristics and Leadership	27
<b>3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLGY</b>	<b>28</b>
3.1. Description of the Research Site	28
3.2. Research Design	29
3.3. Sources of Data	29
3.3.1. Primary source of data	29
3.3.2. Secondary source of data	29
3.3. Population, Sample size and Sampling Techniques	30
3.4 Data Collection Instruments	33
3.4.1 Questionnaire	33
3.4.3 Interview guide	34
3.4.3 Document	34

3.6. Procedures of Data Collection	34
3.7. Methods of Data Analysis and Interpretation	35
3.8. Ethical Consideration	35
<b>4. RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS</b>	<b>36</b>
4.1 Participants Personal Information	36
4.2. Instructional Leaders Engagement	39
4.3. Factors Affecting Instructional Leadership Effectiveness	56
4.3.1 Organizational factors	56
4.3.2. Administrative Elements.	58
<b>5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>61</b>
5.1 Summary	61
5.2. Conclusions	63
5.3. Recommendations	64
<b>6. REFERENCES</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>APPENDICES:</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>APPENDIX- A</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>APPENDIX B</b>	<b>78</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
Table 1:Description of Sample Population and Sample Techniques.	32
Table 2: Characteristics of respondent.	37
Table 3: Defining and communicating School mission.	40
Table 4: Managing Curriculum and Instruction	43
Table 5: Supervising Instruction	46
Table 6: Monitoring Student Progress	49
Table 7: Promoting School Learning Climate	52
Table 8: Summary distribution of Leaders in the Three LED Levels	54
Table 9: Summary of correlation of organizational factors and ILE.	56
Table 10: T-test of Mean Differences for more Constrained and Less Constrained Leader on Their ILE.	59

# THE EFFECTS OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP ON QUALITY EDUCATION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF BORENA ZONE

ADDISU MOKKONA

## ABSTRACT

*The purpose of this study was to assess the effects of instructional leadership on quality of education in secondary Schools of Borena Zone. The descriptive survey method was employed in this study. A descriptive survey describes and interprets what is there currently. In this study, both primary and secondary data sources were employed. The study was conducted in 8 Secondary Schools selected from 8 woredas by using a combination of simple random, stratified and available sampling techniques 42 school leaders, 95 teachers and 8 supervisor were used as the subjects of the study to obtain the necessary data. Questionnaire, document analysis and unstructured interview were the instruments used for data collection. The data collected through the questionnaire were analyzed using percentage, mean, standard deviation Pearson's correlation coefficient and t-test statistical analyses procedures. Findings from the data analysis revealed that most school leaders are not strong (effective) neither in each dimension nor in their overall instructional leadership role. Of the personal characteristics treated, only experience as department head, a leader appeared to have significant relationship with Instructional Leadership effectiveness. Following the findings the drawn conclusion was, the quality of instruction plays a leading role in realization of quality education while the poor instructional leadership delivery greatly affect the quality of education. As a result of research finding shows, in the Borena zone the area in which this research was conducted, the effects of weak instructional leadership greatly affect the quality of education. Based on this finding recommendation made by the researcher was that, Regional Education Bureau in collaboration with zone and district education department should define the instructional leadership roles of leaders clearly in terms of the five dimensions, provide trainings in the area, revise and improve the selection and appointment criteria of leadership positions.*

# 1. INTRODUCTION

This Introduction part emphasized on the background of the study, statements of the problem, basic research questions, general and specific objectives, significance of the study, delimitation of the study and operational definition of key terms.

## 1.1. Background of the Study

Most educational commentators, certainly those writing during the past ten or twenty years tend to conflate their own views about what leadership should be with their description of what leadership actually is, and fail to discipline either position by reference to empirical research. A leading American commentator on school reform explains it this way principles of best practice related to teaching learning have difficulty taking root in schools for essentially two reasons; a) they require content knowledge and pedagogical skill that few teachers presently have, and b) they challenge certain basic patterns in the organization of schooling. Neither problem can be solved independently of the other, nor is teaching practice likely to change in the absence of solutions that operate simultaneously on both fronts (AgelaKwanda, 2002).

Instructional leadership is the dynamic delivery of the curriculum in the classroom through strategies based on reflection, assessment and evaluation to ensure optimum learning (Heywood, 2008). The increasing emphasis on managing teaching and learning as the core activities of educational institutions had led to instructional leadership being endorsed In the building, the formal school leader is expected to understand the tenets of quality instruction, as well as have sufficient knowledge of the curriculum to know that appropriate content is being delivered to all pupils (Bush, 2003).

Instructional leadership represents behavioursof school leaders. Through synthesis of different instructional leadership models Murphy (1990), the following dimensions of instructional leadership have emerged. An instructional leader is one who: defines and

communicates shared goals. This means that the leader works collaboratively with staff to define, communicate, and work toward data-driven shared goals of the school. Goals are used in making organizational decisions, aligning instructional practice, purchasing curriculum materials, and providing targets for progress. These goals focus the staff around a common mission to achieve.

Monitors and provides feedback on the teaching and learning process. This describes the activities of an instructional leader around the academic curriculum. These activities include being visible throughout the school, talking with pupils and teachers, providing praise and feedback to teachers, pupils and the community regarding academic performances, and ensuring that the instructional time of the school is not interrupted. The instructional leader encourages teachers to learn more about pupil achievement through data analysis, provides professional development opportunities that are aligned to school goals, and provides professional literature and resources to teachers (Murphy, 1990).

In the last two decades, the Ethiopian government has embarked on a massive expansion of the national education system with the intention to transform the country. The increasing access to education was also fueled by the government's promise to meet its official educational goals such as achieving universal primary education in 2015 and secondary education in 2020. Though tremendous achievement has been made in terms of quantitative expansion, the quality of education has been deteriorating and student achievement declining (Fekede & Fiorucci, 2012).

The Ethiopian education system which lasted for a long period is now in a process of implementing school Improvement Program (SIP) that gives emphasis for quality of education. The most promising results of the 1994 ETP are increasing access to education and then to work with quality of education. Recently, the Ministry of Education has launched General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP) which comprises six programs. School Improvement Program (SIP) & Leadership and

Management Program (LAMP) are of GEQIP among the others. The launching of GEQIP shows that the government has now found its attention to improve the quality of education.

Therefore; to achieve success in the realization of quality education keep fit, carrying out a research on the effective instructional leadership in Oromia Regional state in particular Borena zone is very important. In such a way it requires to investigate to which extent principals, supervisors, department heads and teachers play their roles as well. The need for professional and effective instructional leadership at secondary schools for overall success of school development is the rationale that initiated the researcher to undertake this study. In addition, the concept and practices of instructional leadership is critical in learning and teaching is poorly understood and practiced by almost all of secondary principals. Thus, this study was attempted to assess the magnitude of the problem in eight selected schools from which deduction was made.

## **1.2. Statement of the Problem**

The role of leadership is vital to bring transformative changes in the school improvement initiative. Sergiovanni (2001), underlines that principals are key players in the instructional improvement. The delivery of quality instruction is the constant theme of visionary school leaders. The visionary leaders examine existing practice to assure that all activities and procedures contribute to quality of education. The success of any school improvement and high students' performance is highly linked to the leadership capacity of the principal. The effectiveness of the school could be described by the strong instructional leadership to support the staff in improving instructions for best and high academic achievement of the students.

Effective educational leadership coordinate the interrelationships of the educational environment, There are three levels of social forces that influence curriculum and

instruction: national and international, local community and school culture. (parkay and Hass 2005). Therefore educational leaders must be informed leaders in all these area.

Instructional leadership is internationally recognized as being a key role for school administrators to advance in their relationship with teachers. They can contribute indirectly to improvestudents outcome. Sergiovanni (2001), suggested that when principals emphasize the building ofeffective learning and caring communication for teachers within school, teaching learningimprove and student achievement benefit is a result. By continuing “it is important for instructional leader torecognize that many content areas. School based instructional leadership has potential toenhance the quality and quantity school effectiveness.Improved classroom instruction is the prime factor to produce studentachievement. To improve classroom instruction, instructional leadership needs to be inexistence.

In the Ethiopian education context, success has been shown in access for thelast couple of decades. For instance, as indicated in the MoE annual statisticalabstract (2005), the total enrolment for secondary level education was increasedfrom 426, 495 students in 1996/97, to 953,217 in 2004/05 which is increased by123%. This shows improvement in the rate of access to all citizens. However, thisachievement has not been accompanied by adequate improvement in quality ofeducation.

The Borena zone administration, as part of governmental structure, could not be free from such implementation and swing around of the problems. As far as my experiences are concerned, the implementation of instructional leadership in the secondary schools in the zone faced several challenges. For instance, low student achievement (particularly secondary schools),poor instructional supervision, lack of effective and continuous staff development, weak evaluation of students performance as well as poor instructional curriculum development due to the concerned bodies be deficient in awareness, skill and devotion to handle the challenges.

These problems can be generally attributed to the leaders limited skills and abilities in managing the instructional program, of course, there may be some contextual factors which influence principals instructional leadership function. Although such problems and influences seem to be prevalent in the study area (Borena zone), and the caliber of leadership in a school can have a dramatic effect on student achievement, therefore, taken as a serious problem and given its considerable importance to a school success, principals' instructional leadership effectiveness as well as factors influencing it becomes a timely area of interest for research.

Moreover, as the data from the Zone Education Office indicated, the average national examination result of grade 10 students of three consecutive years (2012-2014) for those students scored 2 and above was below 50%. As to Hopkins et al., (2005) school improvement is about raising student's achievement through focusing on the teaching and learning process. But, regardless of this fact, annual reports of Regional Education Bureau and Zonal Education Office indicate that there is no significant change or improvements in students result of most secondary school of the zone. Moreover, the management of instructional leadership of secondary schools getting sufficient support from concerned stakeholders. They are very weak to enhance the learners quality of learning. As a result of low involvement of the principal and the concerned stakeholders, may contribute to the low performance of students.

As the researcher recognize, concerning the topic Frew (2010) and Jemal (2013) are some who conducted researches in different regions and zones focusing on implementation of school leadership practices and challenges facing the principals on different qualities of leadership but not specifically on instructional leadership and quality of education. But, the researcher's intention was to investigate the issues of effect of instructional leadership in assuring quality of education in secondary Schools of Borena zone. Generally, the purpose of this study were to assess the effectiveness of leaders in their instructional leadership role and to identity the major influencing factors affecting this role in secondary schools of Borena zone.

### **1.3. Research Questions**

The practice and role of leaders' in instructional leadership effectiveness and implication for quality of education were addressed through the following basic research questions.

1. Is there any significant relationship between leaders personal characteristics and Instructional Leadership effectiveness ?
2. To what degree instructional leaders execute their role of instructional leadership in secondary schools of Borena Zone?
3. What are the factors that affect the Instructional leadership effectiveness in secondary schools of Borena zone?

### **1.4. Objectives of the Study**

The general and specific objectives are presented as follow.

#### **1.4.1. General Objective**

The general objective of the study was to investigate the effect of instructional leadership on quality of education in secondary schools of Borena Zone.

#### **1.4.2. The Specific Objectives**

Specifically, the specific objectives were intended to:

- ◆ Assess leader's effectiveness in their Instructional leadership Role.
- ◆ Investigate the degree to which instructional leaders executing their role of instructional leadership effectiveness in secondary schools of Borena zone.
- ◆ Identify the major influencing factors that hinder or facilitate the effectiveness of instructional leaders in their instructional leadership role in secondary schools of Borena zone.

### **1.5 Significance of the Study**

This study wereassumed to be very important since it is expected to benefit the following bodies. Higher official and policy makers may have clear insight into the existing pitfalls in instructional leadership role and the influencing factors so that appropriate measures that enhance instructional leadership could possibly be taken based on the findings and recommendations of the study. Principals and vice-principals may get directing ideas on how to become effective in their role of instructional leadership.

The study may contribute to the students in forwarding the appropriate instructional leadership practices. This enables the learners to grasp excellence of education delivery which will enable them to be enough competent in their future. The teachers may also benefited from the study by enriching their professional qualification while the activities of staff development programes extended and classroom based supervision and professional supports may added to their prior knowledge. As the study will try to directing the issue for the realization of quality of education, the community may also benefited through the high performance of their children. Researcher may also benefit from the study, in that it contributes additional information to the existing findings to serve as literature for related areas.

### **1.6. Delimitation of the Study**

It were more advantageous to include all schools in the Borena zone to be included in the study to attain a broader finding on the related topic. Even if the study area too much closer and appropriate to the researcher; in this study it impossible to address all required variety due the population are dispersedly settled. In other way, there is insufficient allocated financial resources to widen the study and the vastness of variables that have to be assessed. As a result this study wasdelimit to eight of the twenty nine government Secondary Schools of Borena Zone.

Thus, the cluster sampling technique was employed for clustering the Woreda of the zone. This is because of their geographical proximity to each other, having the same climate, socio economic and cultural pattern they share separately. Then, simple random sampling and available sampling technique were used to select teachers, principals, vice-principals, supervisors and department heads respectively. In this study instruments like questionnaire, unstructured interview guide and documents were used to collect necessary information from respondents. Then both qualitative and quantitative data analysis method were also applied and used.

The study were also focused on the variable like defining the school mission, managing curriculum and instruction, monitoring students progress and supervising instruction and promoting school learning climate as investigated variables of instructional leadership, while evaluation is excluded as not investigated variable for the sake of this study, due to it my emphasized by other researchers in future.

### **1.7. Limitation of the Study**

It is clear that research work cannot be free from constraints. For that matter, limitations were observed in this study. Lack of participating or including all the study population was the first limitation of this study because generalizing and applying results from few samples to the entire population cannot be assumed without a problem. The other limitation was lack of current local researches and reference materials even to compare results of the study. Despite the above problems, the researcher has exerted utmost effort and was able to overcome this problem by holding prolonged dialogue and discussion with the respondents.

## 1.8. Operational Definition of Key Terms

The following definitions describe important terminology which is related to this thesis.

**Borena Zone:**-zone that located south to Oromia Regional State.

**Instructional leadership Effectiveness:**-frequency of leaders engagement in the role behavior or practices used to represent the five instructional leadership dimensions (Hallinger and Murphy, 1987).

**Instructional leadership:**-represents behaviors of a school leader. In this study, specific behaviors of secondary school leaders will be examined ( Murphy, 1990).

**School Leaders:**-are anyone who play the role of facilitating for the achievement of educational organizational goal. In this study it refers to principals, vice-principals, department heads and teachers.

**Secondary schools:**-are schools that provide education from grade 9-10 level.

## 1.9. Organization of the Study.

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

## **2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

The chapter reviews the related literature on the definition of leadership and conceptual frame work of school leadership, leadership effectiveness, instructional leadership and teaching and learning, the role of instructional leadership on school success and school leadership development in Ethiopia.

### **2.1. The Concepts of Instructional Leadership**

The concept of instructional leadership is the notion that learning should be given to priority while everything else revolves around the enhancement of learning. So, instructional leaders need to know what is going on in the classroom. Developing teaching techniques and methods is a means for understanding teacher perspectives (Jenkins, 2009).

Enhancing the instructional quality and attempting to bring that vision are the top priority of the instructional leader. So, In learning communities, staff members meet on a regular basis to discuss their work, work together to solve problems, reflect on their jobs, and take responsibility for what student learns. They operate in networks of shared and complementary expertise rather than in hierarchies or in isolation (Phillips, 2011).

Hay and Hay (2003) asserted that the principal must communicate a clear vision of instructional excellence and continuous professional development consistent with the goal of the improvement of teaching and learning.

## **2.2. Leadership Theory**

Educational leadership theory has evolved during the last fifty years (Griffiths, 1999 for an extensive review). Several eras of leadership have emerged and are reviewed to provide an historical perspective of instructional leadership.

### **2.2.1. Trait Theory**

The trait approach may be categorized into two phases: early and modern. The early phase of trait theory professed that leadership capacity could be determined by a person's individual attributes such as personality, physical characteristics, intelligence, motives, temperament, and skills. This early development of the theory focused on comparing leaders to non-leaders. This theory dominated the research until Stogdill's review demonstrated that certain personal traits were associated with leadership. The five general categories include: Capacity- intelligence, alertness, verbal facility, originality, judgment; Achievement- scholarship, knowledge, athletic accomplishments; Responsibility- dependability, initiative, persistence, aggressiveness, self-confidence, desire to excel; Participation- active, sociability, cooperation, adaptability, humor; and Status- socioeconomic position, popularity (Stogdill, 1988).

However, Stogdill (1988) concluded that although traits could differentiate between leaders and non-leaders, they alone do not produce reliable empirical results. He proposed that situational factors must be considered: "A person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of the combination of traits...the pattern of personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities, and goals of the followers" (Stogdill, 1988).

The modern phase of trait theory produced more consistent results about the relationship between traits and leadership effectiveness. Stogdill's follow-up study (1989) reviewed 163 trait studies conducted between 1949 -1970. He determined that

many of the leadership traits that distinguished leaders from non-leaders were consistent with leadership effectiveness. "The leader is characterized by a strong drive for responsibility and task completion, vigor, and persistence in pursuit of goals, venture sameness and originality in problem solving, drive to exercise initiative in social situations, self-confidence and sense of personal identity, willingness to accept consequences of decision an action, readiness to absorb, interpersonal stress, willingness to tolerate frustration and delay, ability to influence other persons' behavior, and capacity to structure social interaction systems to the purpose at hand"(Stogdill, 1989).

Trait theory and research have provided researchers and practitioners with useful information about leadership traits and effectiveness. It is important that when selecting an educational leader for a particular district or building, a balance and fit are made between the person's personal traits and the environmental situations that are involved.

### **2.2.2. Behavioral Theory**

The conceptualization of leadership behaviors has centered around two main characteristics: interpersonal relations or consideration for others and task-oriented behaviors such as goal attainment, production and structure (Hoy and Miskel, 2000; Yukl, 1998). Behavioral theories of leadership are based upon the belief that great leaders are made, not born.

Rooted in behaviorism, this leadership theory focuses on the actions of leaders not on mental qualities or internal states. According to this theory, people can learn to become leaders through teaching and observation.

### **2.2.3. Contingency Theories**

Contingency theories of leadership focus on particular variables related to the environment that might determine which particular style of leadership is best suited for the situation. According to this theory, no leadership style is best in all situations. Success depends upon a number of variables, including the leadership style, qualities of the followers and aspects of the situation. They embrace leadership traits, characteristics of a situation, and how these factors impact leader effectiveness (Yukl, 1998).

### **2.2.4. Situational Theories**

Situational theories propose that leaders choose the best course of action based upon situational variable. Different styles of leadership may be more appropriate for certain types of decision-making.

### **2.2.5. Participative Theories**

Participative leadership theories suggest that the ideal leadership style is one that takes the input of others into account. These leaders encourage participation and contributions from group members and help group members feel more relevant and committed to the decision-making process. In participative theories, however, the leader retains the right to allow the input of others.

### **2.2.5. Management Theories**

Management theories also known as “Transactional theories” focus on the role of supervision, organization, and group performance. These theories base leadership on a system of reward and punishment. Managerial theories are often used in business; when employees are successful, they are rewarded; when they fail, they are reprimanded or punished.

### **2.2.6 Relationship Theories**

Relationship theories also known as “Transformational theories” focus upon the connections formed between leaders and followers. These leaders motivate and inspire people by helping group members see the importance and higher good of the task. Transformational leaders are focused on the performance of group members, but also want each person to fulfill his or her potential. These leaders often have high ethical and moral standards.

### **2.3. Instructional Leadership**

The definition of leadership in literature has been very diverse. Generally, leadership is defined in terms of traits, behaviors, roles and processes. Yuki's (1998), syntheses of definitions, "reflect the assumption that leadership involves a process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person over other people to guide, structure and facilitate activities and relationships in a group or organization". Said in another way, Hoy & Miskel (2000), assert that "leadership should be defined broadly as a social process in which a member of a group or organization influences the interpretation of internal and external events, the choice of goals or desired outcomes, organization of work activities, individual motivation and abilities, power relations, and shared orientations".

The leadership definition continues to evolve and expand, especially in education. Van de Grift and Houtveen (1999), demarcate educational leadership as "the ability of the head teacher to initiate school improvement, to create a learning oriented educational climate, and to stimulate and supervise teachers in such a way that the latter may exercise their tasks as effectively as possible". Instructional leadership exemplifies this definition in practice. Instructional leadership consists of head teacher behaviors that set high expectations and clear goals for student and teacher performance, monitor and provide feedback regarding the technical core teaching and learning of schools,

provide and promote professional growth for all staff members, and help create and maintain a school climate of high academic press (Edmonds, 1990).

Furthermore, Hoy & Hoy (2003), tells us "Above all, the head teacher must communicate a clear vision on instructional excellence and continuous professional development consistent with the goal of the improvement of teaching and learning". The definition is supported by Blasé and Blasé (1999), when they contend that instructional leadership is a blend of several tasks such as shaping and communicating school goals, supervising and evaluating instructional practices, developing and coordinating the curriculum, developing staff and evaluating progress on learner achievement.

According to Leithwood (2005), instructional leadership is a series of behaviors that is defined to affect classroom instruction. In this environment instructional leaders are responsible for informing teachers about new educational strategies, technologies and tools that apply to effective instruction. instructional leaders must also assist teachers in critiquing these tools to determine their applicability to the classroom (Leithwood, 2005).

Instructional leadership encompasses those actions that a instructional leaders takes or delegates to others to promote growth in pupil learning and it comprises of the following tasks: defining the purpose of schooling, setting school wide goals, providing the resources needed for learning to occur, supervising and evaluating teachers, coordinating staff development programs and creating collegial relationships with and among teachers (Van De Grift, 1999).

It is in the spirit of the above definition that Weber, J. (1996), refers to instructional leadership as the high visibility and involvement of the head teacher in every phase of the school program. Basom and Basom (1994), contended that, to create a visible presence in day to day activities instructional leaders must model behaviors consistent with the school's vision, live and breathe their beliefs in education. They must organize resources to accomplish goals, informally "drop in on classroom", make staff

development activities a priority and most of all to help people do the right things and to reinforce those activities.

The above leadership theories provide framework for the historical evolution of instructional leadership. Leadership in social organizations evolves as the social and political climate influence the organization. Thus, the instructional leadership construct amalgamates trait, behavior, contingency, charismatic, transformational and transactional theories. Strong instructional leaders possess specific traits and behaviors, such as charisma, which can be applied in different situations and environments. The premise of instructional leadership is to lead teachers and pupils to reach full potentials by creating climates characterized by defining and communicating shared goals, monitoring the teaching and learning process, and promoting life-long learning of stakeholders and the organization.

#### **2.4. Historical Context of Instructional Leadership**

The historical context section of the literature review examined the emergence of the instructional leadership concept in the educational field, and its evolution from the principal being the sole instructional leader to instructional leadership being the shared responsibility of all staff members. According to Mitchell and Castle (2005), the concept of the principal as instructional leader emerged in the educational field during the 1970s as a factor of improving school effectiveness. The principal became the leader who shaped the organization into the instructional leadership model. Hallinger (2003), identified instructional leadership models in the 1980s as "strong, directive leadership focused on curriculum and instruction from the principal" . The top-down approach became apparent in leadership that "focuses predominately on the role of the school principal in coordinating, controlling, supervising, and developing curriculum and instruction in the school" (Hallinger, 2003).

Hallinger (2003), synthesized essential elements of various researchers' explanations of instructional leadership and noted that the principal's expertise and the principal's character both needed to be goal-oriented, and that there must be a focus on student outcomes and achievement. The principal also needed to help improve teaching and learning through curriculum and instruction. Hallinger (2003), pointed out principals who "shared leadership responsibility with others would be less subject to burnout than principal 'heroes' who attempt the challenges and complexities of leadership alone" Brewer (2001), outlined the focus of instructional leadership as the focusing on instruction; building a community of learners; sharing decision making; sustaining the basics, leverage time; supporting ongoing professional development for all staff; redirecting resources to support a multifaceted school plan and creating a climate of integrity, inquiry, continuous improvement.

The historical role of instructional leadership has evolved from an individual responsibility, to a school-based responsibility. However, the principal's leadership is the central element as facilitator of the instructional leadership in the school, which is connected to the purpose of instructional leadership. The purpose of this research was to examine current trend in schools concerning understanding of instructional leadership; to be aware of the level to which principals are contributing for quality class room lesson deliver and teachers professional development and to identify major barriers of principals to fully realize and carry out instructional Leadership role.

A major concept continued to be emphasized in the literature on instructional leadership: The concepts of instructional leadership and realization of educational quality are interconnected and must exist simultaneously in order to increase teachers' skills, abilities and promote the students learning out come. The concepts work to obtain the ultimate goal of education student learning or student success. This chapter will provide an examination into the body of literature on the concepts of instructional leadership and its contribution on the quality of students learning (Brewer, 2001).

## **2.5. Instructional Leadership and Teaching and Learning**

In-depth studies of teachers perceptions about characteristics of school principals that influence teacher's classroom instruction have conclude that the behaviors associated with instructional leadership positively influence classroom instructions (Larson-knight, 2000; Sheppard, 1996, and Chrispeels, 1992). Especially, Blasé and Blasé (1999), findings indicate that when instructional leaders monitor and provide feedback on the teaching learning process, there were increases in teacher reflection and reflectively informed. Instructional behaviors, in implementations of new ideas, greater variety in teaching strategic, more responses to students diversity, lessons were prepared and planned more carefully teachers were more likely to take risks and more focus on the instructional process, and teachers used professional discretion to make changes in classroom practice.

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

Locke and Latham (1990), assert that goal setting is effective way to increase motivation and performance. They postulate that goals increased attention to obtainment of the task, increase the effort expended on goals relevant to activities,

increase persistent to achieve, increase the development of strategies to obtain the goal. This is true even loosely coupled organizations, such as public schools. Bookbinder (2001), explains frequent communication of school goals by instructional leaders promote accountability, a sense of personal ownership, and instructional improvements. A principal that define and communicate shared goals with teachers provides organizational structures that guide the school toward a common focus. This common focus on academic press challenges teacher's behaviors with in the class room, which leads to more effective schools (Book Binder, 2001).

## **2.6. The Role of Instructional Leadership on School Success**

Early studies of Hollinger and Heck (cited in Mcewen, 2003), wallence (cited in Harris and Muijs 2005) asserted that principal's role has significant impact on the achievement of students, their studies demonstrate that high students achievement has direct relation with the function of strong instructional leadership. However, many of the recent finding state that the influence of the instructional leadership impact is rather indirect Bell et al, (cited in Harris and Muijs, 2005). In the same way, Deal and Lec (cited in Heck, 2006) suspected the direct link between school success and effective instructional leadership is very complex than easy to link.

Blasé and Blasé (1999), Further forwarded their argument that early researchers could not give enough evidence, which validate the direct link between strong instructional leadership and improved learning outcome. Regardless of the discrepancies observed on the point of view of the intellectuals, nowadays, instructional leadership are being accountable and unlike the customary management function like planning, organizing ,allocating resources, creating equilibrium, controlling etc, the present function of leadership mostly focused on developing and communicating mission and purpose, motivating and

inspiring of followers towards the achievement of shared goals (Mctwen, 2003 and Locke, 1991) Leadership, as to Locke (1991), is the power of inducing others towards some commonly perceived goals, his definition encompasses three basic elements, namely followers, function and influencing powers first, leadership is rational action that exhibits the presence of followers willing to act, second as a process, there is something to be done finally as a power, the leader has to possess either formal or informal power that influences others, leaders at the higher post may use their legitimate power to facilitate situation, however there are many other ways that formal and informal leadership motivate followers to get things done (Blasé and Blasé, 1999).

In addition, it is the leader's responsibility to communicate picture of what the organization should be, convince followers and channel all activities towards accomplishing it (Hoy and Miskel's,2000). Definition of leadership appears to be more recent perspective; defines leadership as the art to transform people and organization with aim of improving the organization. Leaders in this perspective define the task and explain why the job is being done, they oversee the follower's activities and responsible for improved learning outcomes. Most of the responsibilities in improving instructions by developing teachers leaders are the province solely left for instructional leaders at whatever levels (Sergivanni, 2001).

However, stressed that the link between instructional leadership and school effectiveness is yet unclear and best indirect (Heck, 2006; Sergiovanni, 2001). Responsibility and accountability for effective instructional outcome calls leaders to design better ways those students can learn and highest school outcome could be produced the role of the principal as instructional leaders through complex, over loaded and unclear in the past, now it is in the way of transition towards transformational leadership (Chell, 1991).

The role of principals as instructional leadership is still in the state of transition from administrative emphasis to more instructional, democratic and participatory

leadership. The pressure of globalization and social expectation is inducing principals take the lead in the instructional activities such as setting goals, leading academic programs, examining and evaluating teachers' performance. Hence, the contemporary thinking of facilitative instructional leadership requires school leaders to have vision, quality and value to transforming their school towards envisioned success. Thus, elaborations of instructional leadership dimensions that support learning centered schools building can be tapped (Dimmock, 2000).

The components include the following focus areas of the leader: Goal emphasis particularly towards students learning outcome; technical knowledge and management of effective teaching and learning; knowledge and management of technology, computer, internet and etc. knowledge and management of organization structure for service; capacity and willingness to desirable model behaviors; building organizational culture that value learning of all; leadership of human resource and management of other resource; monitoring and reviewing performance in the school accountability and strategies for organizational change and innovations that contribute for building learning centered School (Dimmock, 2000).

Brundret et al., (2003), identified the following main functions that instructional leader, conducive learning climate, providing feedback of class and evaluation of instructional performances. And they argued that aligning individual interest to common vision, value and belief is changing that needs continuous effort and dialogue of the principal with school members until collegial leadership practice become the culture of the school.

## **2.7. School Leadership Development in Ethiopia**

Principalship in schools is one of the influential administrative positions in the success of school plans with respect to the historical back ground of principalship, authorities give their own argument. As indicated in Knezevichin Ahmed, (2006) the origin of

principalship can be traced to 1515 to the time of Johann Sturm in United States of America. The position developed from classroom teacher with a few administrative duties to principal teacher and then to supervising principal. The history of Ethiopian education system traces its origin to the introduction of Christianity about fourth century A.D. Ethiopia for a very long time had found schools for the children of their adherents (Teshome in Ahmed, 2006). However, the western type of education system was formally introduced in to Ethiopia in 1908 with opening of Menilik Secondary School and there was no government owned high school in this country until 1943.

And it was in this year that the first high school which was dominated by expatriates was opened. According to Ahmed the history of principalship in Ethiopia, at its early stage was dominated by foreign principals. In all government owned schools that were opened before and few years after the Italian occupation expatriates from France, Britain, Sweden, Canada, Egypt and India were assigned as school principals. After the restoration of independence in 1941, education was given priority which resulted in opening of schools in different parts of the country. As there was not enough educated Ethiopians to teach and run schools, most of the teachers and principals in schools were from foreign countries such as United Kingdom, United States of America, Canada, Egypt and India .

According to MOE (2002), prior to 1962, expatriate principals were assigned in the elementary and Secondary Schools of different provinces of Ethiopia during the 1930's and 1940s'. During this time Indian was given the principalship position which may be for their higher educational level and experiences in principalship. However, the history had developed in to a new phase where Ethiopians began to replace expatriate which started in 1964, According to Teshomein Ahmed (2006).

This new phase of principalship started with supervising principal such a person was responsible not only for one school but also for the education system of the

community where the school was located from the second half of 1940's, documents prove that Ethiopian school Heads were directly assigned in elementary schools without competition among candidates. Only educational level and teaching experience were given highest priority of principalship.

However, during the first few years of 1960's it was understood that those graduates of B.A degree in pedagogy were directly assigned in secondary schools. On the other hands career structure, promotion that secondary school principals were those who held first degree, preferably in educational management field and those who had at least worked for a limited time as a unit leader or department head, or teacher. It is also stated in the job description of the MOE issued in 1989 that secondary school administration and supervision including sufficient work experiences.

To sum up, considering education as key element for economic, social and technological development many countries invest substantial amount of their national resources for the improvement of their education. Similarly, the federal Government of Ethiopia, recognizing the role of education in developing other sectors, by undertaking teachers' continuous professional development program and other (MOE, 2007). School improvement program in Ethiopia, since the formulation of new education and Training policy (1994), Ethiopian Government has made different educational reforms.

Similarly, Ethiopian has been found implementing the newly launched school improvement program. It is one of the components of the General Education Quality Improvement Program (GEQIP) (MOE, 2007). The current school improvement program framework was developed based on the result of the review of the best practices of the schools all over the country, related literatures and positive experience obtained from its pilot program implemented in 2006 (MOE, 2007). The main objective of the program is to maximize students learning outcomes by improving the conditions might have impact on it.

As it was mentioned before, the program focuses on four major domains of the school namely improving the teaching and learning, creating conducive learning environment, improving school leadership and enhancing community participation in school affairs. The basic objectives of the school performances in the manual are congruent with dimensions of instructional leadership (MOE, 2007). The Ethiopian education and training policy (1994) states that educational management should be democratic, professional, coordinated efficient and effective. In addition, the management of teachers and other educational personnel will be organized based on professional principle.

## **2.8. Factors Affecting Leadership Effectiveness**

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

### **2.8.1. Organizational Characteristics**

Organizational characteristic in this context refers to the factors existing in the school. The first variable is resource availability regarding (Human, material, and financial). In instructional leadership process the availability of teachers, text books, equipment, supplies and finance are crucial for its success. Hence, leaders instructional leadership functions may be constrained or facilitated by the extent of resources available in their

school. Confirming this, a research conducted in elementary schools of developing countries revealed that the instructional improvement effort of principals are highly constrained by the chronic shortage of materials, operating funds and staff development resource (Lockheed, 1991).

Experience also shows that shortage of qualified teachers makes instructional leadership process problematic. Role diversity is the other organizational factors, to which most of secondary school leaders complain reviewing different studies on principals' time allotment to their work Jacobson et al., (1973), reported that the variety of roles that the principals assumed made them unable to devote enough time to matters that concern instruction. So the multiplicity of roles and expectations by parents, students and teachers tend to fragment whatever vision the principal maybe attempting to Shape in the school. Professional norm is also another factor that influences instructional leadership effectiveness. Teachers in secondary school are sensitive, intelligent people who feel that their professional preparations and experience have equipped them to do a job skillfully (Corbally et al., 1990).

Such professional norm makes the relationship between teachers and school leaders on the matters of instructional loosely coupled and leave educational decisions to teachers. Consequently, such professional norm limits the frequency and depth of principal's classroom visits as well as their initiatives of consulting teachers about instructional matters (Hallinger& Murphy, 2002). Many authors and research findings also, identified school size as one factor that influences principal's Leadership. Zenebe(1992), For example, found that "the size of the school stress the job demands of the principal" (Holmes,1993).

Again confirmed that the learning priorities and needs of children can easily be detected in small schools than in larger ones. The findings also reveal that principals' leadership effectiveness increases in small schools of the principals. Time budgeting

over concluded that. Principals of small schools spent more time in teaching while principals of longer schools spent more time in curriculum and instruction, guidance and problem of the staff. These implies, that school size and instructional leadership effectiveness have a direct relationship. Other studies shows that principals have multiple roles they play information over load, paper work, too many reports, many non academic demands and work over load consume much of the Principals time, Hence ,only principals committed to instructional improvement can choose and their time for the enhancement of the class room instruction and teachers development (Sergiovanni, 2001).

### **2.8.2. District or Zone Education Department Characteristics**

The third source of influence of the principals leadership is district or zone office characteristics, one of such factors is expectation of higher administrative officers. Different authors suggest that the expectation set by the administration of higher offices can influence the principal's role. As Hallings and Murphy (1990), pointed out that the informal culture of school district which emphasize managerial efficiency and political stability than instructional leadership constrains the principal effort in instructional improvement.

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

### **2.8.3. Personal Characteristics and Leadership**

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

Work experience as a second factor, has been commonly used as criteria in selecting principles and assistant principals. MOE (1996), For instance, has set criteria for selecting principals who requires at least five years teaching experience or experience as a unit leader, department head, and head of pedagogical center or school supervisor. Educational attainment and qualification are other personal factor more often used as criteria for selecting leaders for principalship. For instance, MOE (1996), requires educational attainment of at least a Masters degree and more preferably qualified in educational planning and management. For instructional leadership role, training in educational areas is highly considered for leader effectiveness. In this connection with, Halinger and Murphy (1990), suggested that lack of knowledge in curriculum and instruction determine the instruction leadership role.

### **3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY**

This Chapter deals with description of the research design, sources of data which are primary and secondary, data collection instruments, procedures of data collection, methods of data analysis, pilot test for the reliabilities of instrument and means of ethical consideration for data collection procedure.

#### **3.1. Description of the Research Site**

The Borena zone is one of 18 administrative zones within Ethiopia's Oromia state. It is located in the Southern part of the state (between 3°36 – 6°38' North latitude and 3°43'- 39°30' East longitude) and borders Kenya. Yabello is the capital town of the Zone and lies 570 km south of Addis Ababa. The zone covers 48,360 km<sup>2</sup> of which 75% consists of lowland. The zone consists of thirteen districts. As the data taken from the National Meteorological Organization for stations shown in different representative areas within Borena and average values; Currently mean annual temperatures lay around 19°C in the Borena zone (Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, 2001). The total population of the Borena zone is approximately 1,1 million, 84 percent living in rural areas and 16 percent living in urban areas.

The major ethnic groups are Borena Oromos and Guji Oromos, the former are living in the lowland areas and the latter in the highlands. The smaller ethnic groups in the zone are Gebra, Burji, Geri and others. The people have a dynamic and territorial palatal system called the Gada system. This system regulates social, economic, and political conditions of the people (BZDPPD, 2003). In the highlands people predominantly grow (cash) crops with some livestock for additional income. The people in the lowlands keep livestock as major economic activity, based on traditional pastoralist systems. The pastoralist grow some crops for own use in the valleys.

As the vivid description of site in which this study will be conducted given above; the Zone also consists of twenty nine secondary schools. Each school has one principal & one vice principal. In order to secure the necessary data and information for this study, 8 secondary schools: Finchawa, Soda, Burka Arbicho, Hidha Korma, BuleHora, Gerba, KilensoMokkonisa and Kilenso Rasa are selected to conduct on the research by the researcher due to the sampled secondary schools have the geographical proximity to the cluster.

### **3.2. Research Design**

The descriptive survey method was employed in this study. A descriptive survey describes and interprets what is there currently. This is because the intention of the study was to assess the existing situation and to describe opinions that are held on school leadership practices by participants of the study and to look into school leadership problems. This is also believed to be helpful in drawing valid conclusion about events or activities of target population.

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

In this study, both primary and secondary data sources were employed to obtain reliable information about the effects of instructional leadership on quality of education in secondary schools of Borena zone.

#### **3.3.1. Primary source of data**

The major sources of primary data werethe information collected from teachers, Instructional leaders(principals, vice principals and department heads) and external supervisorsof secondary schools.

#### **3.3.2. Secondary source of data**

For the secondary data the documents like staff minute and profiles of instructional supervision were incorporated to supplement the data obtained through questionnaire and unstructured interview.

### **3.3. Population, Sample size and Sampling Techniques**

A study population is the entire group of people to which a researcher intends the results of a study to apply. Therefore, the populations of the study were all secondary schools (9th- 10th) and all teachers of secondary schools in the Borena zone. To obtain the necessary sample units, simple random sampling technique were employed. According to Abiyet *al.*, (2009), cluster sampling technique is used when a single appropriate sampling technique does not exist or cannot be obtained and it uses a collection of preexisting units or clusters to stand in for a sampling frame. Accordingly, first from the total number of 29 secondary schools in the zone 8 (27%) were taken by taking into account the manageability within the given time and resources.

The pre-identified clusters were Pastoralist (cluster 1), Semi-pastoralist (cluster 2). This classification were done in agreement of zone administrative and Woreda education offices to make the monitoring and controlling system of activities easy in the zone. Concerning the location and distribution of the 29 schools, 13 secondary schools in semi-pastoral (cluster 1), 16 secondary school in the pastoral (cluster 2). To have a representative sample school from each cluster, 4 schools from cluster 1 and 4 schools from cluster 2 were selected by simple random sampling techniques.

Therefore, the 8 sample schools were selected from each cluster. The total number of teachers in the 8 sample schools were 221 and from this, 142 (64.2%) were taken as a sample by using simple random sampling technique. The number of teachers and in each school varied due to differences in the number of students. Thus, making

proportional allocation of teachers in each school, equalize the representativeness of the schools having larger as well as the smaller number of teachers. Therefore, to determine the sample size of teachers to be drawn from each selected school, the stratified random sampling was used. Moreover, 8 school principals, 8 vice principals, 8 external supervisors and 32 department heads were selected by available sampling techniques.

**Table 1:Description of Sample Population and Sample Techniques.**

Schools	Teachers		Principals		Vice principals		External supervisors		Department heads	
	Population	Sample	Population	Sample	Population	Sample	Population	Sample	Population	Sample
Finchawa	42	22	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4
BuleHora	62	33	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4
Gerba	28	15	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4
KilensooRassa	18	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4
KilenssoMokonisa	17	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4
Burka	14	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4
Arbicho	26	14	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4
Malka Soda	13	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4
Hidha Korma	221	115	8	8	8	8	8	8	32	32
Total										
Sampling techniques	Simple random sampling		Available sampling		Available sampling		Available sampling		Available sampling	

**Source: Borena Zone education office.**

### **3.4 Data Collection Instruments**

The instruments like, questionnaire, interview and document were used for collecting information from respondents as it discussed follow.

#### **3.4.1 Questionnaire**

Separate questionnaires were prepared for teachers and instructional leaders. They contained four parts designed to address the variables in the study and provide information in conformity with the leading questions. A first part of the questionnaire was designed to obtain information on personal characteristics of the respondents. An item in the second part was designed to obtain information on the critical job related behaviors of the principles in the five dimensions of instructional leadership. The items in each dimension were prepared in five point interval scale. Some of them were adopted from Hollinger's PIMRS and others were developed by the researcher based on the literature. The respondents indicate the extent of their engagement to a particular behavior or practice scale choosing one of the five point scale ranging from "almost always" (5) to "almost never" (1).

##### **3.4.1.1. Pilot test**

Before the actual data collection, pilot test were conducted to see the quality of the instruments. Accordingly, a pilot test were conducted by distributing 22 questionnaires to the respondents who were not participated in the study, in opposite shift who were participated in the study in Moyale Secondary School. The main purposes of the pilot test were to see the readability of the items, the time given, the consistency and content of the items. Accordingly, the format and order of the question were improved. A thorough editing were done both by the researcher and other language experts. The time were found to be sufficient. The reliability of the questionnaires were measured

by using Cronbach's alpha method by the help of SPSS version 20. Consequently, the Alpha results were 0.852, which indicated the questions constructed were measuring a similar concept highly. As suggested by Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007), the reliability coefficient above 0.7 are generally found to be internally consistent. Then, the questionnaires were administered to the research respondents for actual data collection of the study.

### **3.4.3 Interview guide**

In addition to the questionnaires, unstructured interview and document analysis were used to substantiate the information gathered by the questionnaire. The interview mainly addressed the frequency of supervisory service offered to secondary schools, the area supervision mainly focused on, and issues on the assignment of leaders according to the current policy and its effect on the instructional leadership process by using any voice recording instrument and the idea was put in the written form. Because, interview has great potential to release more in-depth information to provide opportunity, to observe non-verbal behavior of respondents, to give opportunities for clearing up misunderstandings and to meet many diverse situations (Abiyi et al., 2009).

### **3.4.3 Document**

Documents like Staff minute and instructional supervision profiles incorporated to supplement the data obtained through questionnaire and unstructured interview. According to Abiyi et al., (2009) document can give an expert understanding of the available data and it is cheap.

## **3.6. Procedures of Data Collection**

To answer the research questions were raised, to confirm, cross-validate or corroborate findings within a study, student researcher were passed through a series of data gathering procedures. The expected relevant data were gathered by using

questionnaires, interview and document. Having letters of authorization from Haramaya University and Borena Zone education office, the researcher was directly lead to each sampled school according to the schedule that were outlined. Then, the researcher in every step was followed all importantethical procedures until all required data were collected and completed from intended sampled schools.

### **3.7. Methods of Data Analysis and Interpretation**

Depending on the nature of the basic questions and variables treated, different statically tools were employed. In order to determine the current status of instructional leadership effectiveness, leader's engagement in each dimension standard deviation, percentage, mean and t value has been employed. The relationship between ILE and personal characteristics like age, work experience were computed by percentage. While the factors affecting instructional leadership effectiveness was computed by Pearson's correlation coefficient. The observed relationship between personal characteristics and ILE was used to determine those personal factors affecting instructional leadership effectiveness.

### **3.8. Ethical Consideration**

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

## **4. RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS**

This section of the thesis deals with the description of the sample analysis and interpretation of the data. The chapter deals with to assess and describe the effects of instructional leadership on improving the quality of education. This chapter set out the findings with regard to the role of instructional leaders, engagement in instructional leadership activities help them ensure education quality and the degree to which principals who are accountable for learners achievement and school improvement are currently. In order to achieve this purpose, 190 questionnaires were distributed to 142 academic staff, 32 department heads and 16 principals and vice principals. The return rate of the questionnaires was 75.26%. Which means from the questionnaires distributed to 142 teaching staff 95 of questionnaires were filled and returned. Interview held with supervisor and information from document analysis is used as supplementary.

### **4.1 Participants Personal Information**

The main purpose of having respondents' personal information is expected to be very necessary, because the researcher assumed that any social related factors such as sex, age, work experience and level of education may influence the leaders from practicing effectively their role of instructional leadership. Therefore, the below table 2 indicates participants' personal information like age, sex, work experience and level of education.

**Table 2: Characteristics of respondent.**

No	Variables	Respondents				Mean	Std. deviation	
		Teachers		Instructional leaders				
		N	%	N	%			
<b>1</b>	<b>Sex</b>							
		M	69	72.6	50	100		
	F	26	27.3	-	-			
<b>2</b>	<b>Age</b>	N	%	N	%			
		30 or younger	28	29.4	8	19.0		
		31-35 years	44	46.3	28	66.6		
		36-45 years	19	20	4	9.5		
		46 or older	4	4.2	2	4.7		
<b>3</b>	<b>Level of education</b>	F	%	F	%			
		Diploma	-	-	-	-		
		Bachelor Degree	85	89.4	50	100	2.6	1.084
		Masters Degree	10	10.5	-	-		
		Others	-	-	-	-		
<b>4</b>	<b>Work experience</b>	F	%	F	%			
		1-3 years	37	38.94	25	50		
		3-6 years	34	35.8	19	38	2.8	1.077
		7-10 years	14	14.73	6	16.28		
		11 and above	10	10.52	-	-		

As Table 2 Shows, the sex of respondent indicates that 72.6% of teachers were males and 27.3% of teachers were females, but 100% of instructional leaders were males which means there is no any female leader in the position. Hence, females participation is completely absent in any leadership positions.

Regarding the age distribution, 29.4% of teachers and 19.3% of instructional leaders were 30 years or younger. 46.3% of teachers and 66.6% of leaders were between 31 and 35 years, 20 % of teachers and 9.5% of leaders were 36-45 years old, whereas the remaining 4.2% of teachers and 4.7% of leader's age were 40 years or older. The supervisors are, however, mainly over 30 years, which may be due to their long years of services in their previous positions as teachers and school leaders.

From the same table, the leaders work experience with the mean score of 2.8 whereas standard deviation is 1.077. This shows that the mean score of leaders work experience is below the ideal mean or grand mean. Besides, the variation between leaders work experience is high. Based on this, it is possible to say lack of long years work experience can be one of the factors that hinder the leaders from playing significant role to lead the instruction effectively. This implies that, in the most schools in which this research was conducted, the instruction activities highly performed by less experienced or newly deployed teachers as well as newly appointed instructional leaders to the position. In addition to this, the result from interview with one of supervisor and as he said,

*First of all our leaders have no long experience on providing effective leadership for instruction, because of lack of experience. They were newly assigned to the position. Most of the time they spend their duty on the another routine tasks. The department heads were also selected and delegated to accomplish departmental share of instructional leadership role in each academic year. This may hinder them from getting adequate experience in providing effective instructional leadership.*

Apart from professional preparation, the selection and placement of leaders commonly requires work experience on the job as well as on related tasks such as teaching, unit leader, department head and other responsibilities (MOE: 1996). This was so because of the belief that such experiences improve the competency as well as effectiveness of leaders in their position. Therefore, Instructional leader's work experience has its own impact on exercising effective instructional leadership.

However, consensus has not yet been reached about the contribution of such experiences to instructional leadership effectiveness. Hollinger and Murphy (1990) and Gross and Herriott (1985) can be mentioned in this vein in this book. Yet, MOE uses it as policy alternative in the appointment of leadership position. This debatable fact initiated the researcher to consider the relationship of such experiences and instructional leadership effectiveness, which shown that teachers who have participated in assessing leaders' instructional leadership effectiveness were with different number of years of teaching experience and a considerable size of them were also department heads who have had close contact with instructional leadership activities.

Regarding the educational level of respondents, the data denoted that the leaders level of educational qualification with the mean score of 2.6 whereas standard deviation is 1.084. This shows that the mean score of leaders level of education is below the ideal mean or grand mean.

Based on this, it is possible to say lack of standardized educational qualification can be one of the factors that hinder the leaders from playing significant role to lead the instruction effectively. It may, therefore, be inferred that most considerable number of instructional leaders were did not satisfy the standard set by MOE (1996) which requires at least Masters degree for principals, supervisor and teachers of secondary and preparatory school. Thus, it would be possible to assume the placement of these principals was on appointment basis rather than on proper educational background.

Generally as the data shows, majority of schools are not headed by professional instructional leaders and as the same time the instructional activities also performed by less experienced teachers. This shows that, when the instructional delivery in the classroom takes place by less experienced teachers and the required instructional supports for needy teachers and follow up over all instruction shows such gap, the quality of education may fall due to these factors. Because, the key element in school leaderships is the principal. Without well qualified principal the goal of achieving high standard of educational plans will be threatened (McEwen, E.K, 2003).

## **4.2. Instructional Leaders Engagement**

To obtain information under this point, twenty seven items were designed to gather information concerning the extent in which the instructional leaders are engaged effectively for the realization of quality education. The items from one-twenty seven are shown in table three-eight. The responses were tabulated as follows and all required desiccations were made under each item.

**Table 3: Defining and Communicating School Mission.**

No	Items	Respondents	Ratings										Mean	Over all mean	P-value
			Almost never		Rarely		sometimes		Many times		Always				
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
1	Develop a set of annual School-wide goals focused on Student learning	Teachers	20	21.05	25	26.3	15	15.9	35	36.8	-	-	2.49	2.90	.030
		Leaders	-	-	23	46	15	30	8	16	4	8	3.31		
2	Frame the school's goals in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them	Teachers	35	36.84	10	10.5	20	21.05	15	15.8	15	15.78	2.31	2.34	.815
		Leaders	5	10	15	30	20	40	5	10	5	10	2.38		
3	Use data on student academic performance when developing the school's goals	Teachers	15	15.78	25	26.3	25	26.3	20	21.05	10	10.52	2.61	2.73	.424
		Leaders	6	12	24	48	19	38	1	2	-	-	2.92		
4	Communicate the school's goals effectively to staff, student and parents	Teachers	10	10.52	20	21.0	15	15.9	15	15.8	35	36.84	2.66	2.75	.598
		Leaders	5	10	15	30	20	40	5	10	5	10	2.85		
5	Refer to the school's goals when making curricular and instructional decisions	Teachers	35	36.84	30	31.6	25	26.3	5	5.3	-	-	2.49	2.63	.503
		Leaders	-	-	23	46	15	30	8	16	4	8	2.77		
6	Ensure that the school's goals are reflected in highly visible displays in the schools	Teachers	15	15.78	20	21.0	15	15.9	30	31.6	15	15.78	2.25	2.58	.081
		Leaders	6	12	24	48	19	38	1	2	-	-	2.92		

Note: P-value was calculated at  $\alpha = 0.05$  levels. Scales 1.49 = almost never, 1.49- 2.49, rarely, 2.5-3.49 = sometimes, 3.5-4.49 many times and  $\geq$  always.

In Table 3 item 1, respondents were asked about the developing a set of annual School-wide goals focused on Student learning in the secondary schools. Accordingly, the mean ratings of the teachers were 2.49, and that of the instructional leaders were 3.31 which show low performance and moderately performance. The overall mean 2.9 also shows that developing a set of annual School-wide goals focused on Student learning in the schools on a moderate level. The p-value of  $0.03 < 0.05$  proves the two groups of respondents was significantly difference in their response on the item.

Regarding item 2, or about to frame the school's goals in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them, the mean scores teachers and instructional leaders were 2.31 and 2.38 respectively indicate the low performance of framing the school's goals in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them. The overall mean 2.34 is also found in the same verbal interpretation of low performance. The p-value of this item was  $.815 > 0.05$  proves that the two groups of respondents are not significantly difference in their response on the item. Concerning the use of data on student academic performance when developing the school's goals the mean score was 2.61 for teachers and 2.92 for instructional leaders while overall mean of the two groups was 2.76 indicate that this activity was moderately practiced. The p-value of  $0.424 > 0.05$  proves that the two groups of respondents was not significantly difference in their agreement on the level of use of data used on student academic performance when developing the school's goals.

Moreover, mean scores on the availability of microscope 2.66 and 2.85 for teachers and instructional leaders respectively show that the effectively communicating school's goals to staff, student and parents is moderately performed in their schools. The p-value of  $.598 > 0.05$  proves that the two groups of respondents were not significantly difference in their response on the item. An overall mean 2.75 of the two groups also shows that similar verbal interpretation towards on the item. The mean scores of respondents on the referring to the school's goals when making curricular and instructional decisions were 2.49 and 2.77 respectively with a verbal interpretation of moderately exercising the activities. The p-value of  $0.50 > 0.05$  proves that the two groups of respondents was not significantly difference in their agreement on the item. In addition to that, the respondents mean scores on the ensuring that the school's goals are reflected in highly visible

displays in the schools was 2.25 for teachers and 2.92 instructional leaders. The p-value of 0.081 > 0.05 proves that the two groups of respondents was not significantly difference in their agreement on the item. From the Table, it is evident that the secondary schools of Borena zone seem to be in relatively weak position in terms of defining and communicating school mission in the schools to achieve the intended quality of education.

**Table 4: Managing Curriculum and Instruction**

No	Items	Respondents	Ratings										Mean	Over all mean	P-value
			Almost never		Rarely		sometimes		Many times		Always				
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
1	Ensure the timely allocation of resources (human, material and financial) necessary for instructional process	Teachers	15	15.7	25	26.31	25	26.3	20	21.0	10	10.5	2.91	2.53	.211
		Leaders	6	12	24	48	19	38	1	2	-	-	2.77		
2	Control class size for effective instructional process	Teachers	10	10.5	20	21.05	15	15.7	15	15.7	35	36.8	2.25	2.43	.328
		Leaders	-	-	23	46	15	30	8	16	4	8	2.62		
3	Control student composition by maintaining overall achievement distribution in classrooms	Teachers	35	36.8	30	31.57	25	26.3	5	5.26	-	-	1.93	2.23	.073
		Leaders	5	10	15	30	20	40	5	10	5	10	2.54		
4	Schedule co-curricular activities in support of the formal instructional process	Teachers	15	15.7	20	21.05	15	15.7	30	31.5	15	15.7	2.51	2.56	.781
		Leaders	6	12	24	48	19	38	1	2	-	-	2.62		
5	Consider factors affecting teaching while assigning tasks for teachers	Teachers	10	10.5	20	21.05	15	15.7	15	15.7	35	36.8	2.32	2.54	.251
		Leaders	-	-	23	46	15	30	8	16	4	8	2.77		

Note: P-value was calculated at  $\alpha = 0.05$  levels. Scales 1.49 = almost never, 1.49- 2.49, rarely, 2.5-3.49 = sometimes, 3.5-4.49 many times and  $\geq$  always.

According to table 4 item 1, the mean scores on ensuring the timely allocation of resources (human, material and financial) necessary for instructional process was 2.29 and 2.77 teachers and instructional leaders respectively. The p-value of  $.211 > 0.05$  verifies that the two groups of respondents were not significantly difference in their agreement on the item. Also overall mean of 2.53 for ensuring the timely allocation of resources (human, material and financial) necessary for instructional process show that the practice of these activity is on a moderate level.

With regard to item 2 in Table 4, respondents mean score on the performance of controlling class size for effective instructional process was 2.25 for teachers and 2.62 for instructional leaders show that this performance is weakly and moderately accomplished respectively for the two group respondents. Also overall mean 2.43 shows the weak performance of this component. The p-value of  $0.328 > 0.05$  verifies that the two groups of respondents was not significantly difference in their response on the item. In addition, mean score of teachers and instructional leaders responses on the controlling student composition by maintaining overall achievement distribution in classrooms were 1.93 and 2.54 respectively in which the first mean indicate a verbal interpretation of weak management while the second show moderate performance of this task. Also overall mean 2.23 the two groups show the weak experiencing of the item. The p-value of  $0.073 > 0.05$  proves that the two groups of respondents were not significantly differ in their agreement on the item.

Concerning, Scheduling co-curricular activities in support of the formal instructional process, the mean score 2.51 for teachers and 2.62 for instructional leaders show that the engagement in this activity is moderate in the schools. The p-value of  $0.781 > 0.05$  proves that the two groups of respondents were not significantly differs in their agreement on the item. Also overall mean 2.56 shows similar verbal interpretation (moderately engagement) towards this item.

Finally, Table 4 item 5 shows that, the mean score of teachers and instructional leaders respondents on considering factors affecting teaching while assigning tasks for teachers were 2.32 and 2.77 respectively. This shows the weak performance and moderate performance respectively for the two groups. Also overall mean 2.54 shows the moderately exercising of the

item. The p-value of  $0.25 > 0.05$  shows that the two groups of respondents were not significantly differs in their response on the item.

From the Table, it is evident that the secondary schools of Borena zone seem to be in relativelyweak position in terms of managing curriculum and instruction in the schools to achieve the intended quality of educational.

**Table 5: Supervising Instruction**

No	Items	Respondents	Ratings										Mean	Over all mean	P-value
			Almost never		Rarely		sometimes		Many times		Always				
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
1	Make classroom visits for the purpose of improving instructional process.	Teachers	10	10.5	20	21.05	15	15.7	15	15.7	35	36.8	3.00	3.09	.481
		Leaders	-	-	23	46	15	30	8	16	4	8	3.19		
2	Confer with help needed teachers after the visit to discuss the problems and plan improvement together	Teachers	35	36.8	30	31.57	25	26.3	5	5.26	-	-	2.86	2.95	.513
		Leaders	5	10	15	30	20	40	5	10	5	10	3.05		
3	Hold regular meetings with each department for the purpose of improving curriculum and instruction	Teachers	15	15.7	20	21.05	15	15.7	30	31.5	15	15.7	2.76	2.95	.171
		Leaders	6	12	24	48	19	38	1	2	-	-	3.14		
4	Encourage teachers to use different instructional methods	Teachers	10	10.5	20	21.05	15	15.7	15	15.7	35	36.8	2.42	2.54	.396
		Leaders	-	-	23	46	15	30	8	16	4	8	2.67		

Note: P-value was calculated at  $\alpha = 0.05$  levels. Scales 1.49 = almost never, 1.49- 2.49, rarely, 2.5-3.49 = sometimes, 3.5-4.49 many times and  $\geq$ always.

In Table 5, teachers and instructional leaders were asked to give their response regarding the supervising instruction in the secondary schools of Borena zone. Regarding the making classroom visits for the purpose of improving instructional process, the mean scores of teachers and instructional leaders respondents were 3.00 and 3.19 respectively which show the performance of making classroom visits for the purpose of improving instructional process is in a moderate level. Also the overall mean 3.09 shows similar rating moderate towards the item. The p-value  $0.481 > 0.05$  indicates that there was not statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents towards the item. Data from the documents of instructional supervision and interview with supervisor disclose that this fact as they perform rarely and the intended purposes of classroom visits are not only for improving instructional process. For example, the result from interview with one of supervisor and as he said,

*We provide supervisory services for senior schools rarely. Sometimes we perform it once or twice in a year. The time when we do this is, if there is some complains among students regarding instructional delivery of the teacher, we supervise the activities of the teacher on the instruction to solve the problem. The remain duty of supervision may mainly be performed by in- built- supervision committee of the school.*

In addition to this, instructional supervision profile also show that instructional leaders including in-built supervision committee were not regularly follow up the instruction. The contents of check list formats school leaders used for the purpose of instructional supervision also do not emphasized that the main purpose of visiting classroom was not only for improving instructional process rather it related with the view of supervisors.

Regarding item 2 in the same Table, conferring with help needed teachers after the visit to discuss the problems and plan improvement together was also rated by each group of the respondents. The mean scores of the teachers and instructional leaders respondents were 2.86 and 3.05 respectively in which both show the weak performance of these task in their schools. The p-value  $0.513 > 0.05$  shows that there is not statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents towards the item. Moreover, item 3 of Table 5 depicts that holding regular meetings with each department for the purpose of improving curriculum and instruction are available in a moderate level as indicated by the mean scores of the teachers 2.76 and instructional leaders mean score 3.14.

The p-value of  $0.171 > 0.05$  verifies that there is not statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents towards the item. Also overall mean 2.95 show that the practices of these activity is found to moderate. With regard to, encouraging teachers to use different instructional methods in table 5 above, the mean scores of teachers were 2.42 and instructional leaders were 2.67 with a verbal interpretation of weak performance and moderately performance respectively. On the other hands, overall mean 2.54 showed that moderate involvement in such rarely towards on the item. The p-value of  $0.396 > 0.05$  indicates that there is not statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents.

**Table 6: Monitoring Student Progress**

No	Items	Respondents	Ratings										Mean	Over all mean	P-value
			Almost never		Rarely		sometimes		Many times		Always				
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
1	Meet individually with teachers to discuss students' academic progress	Teachers	35	36.8	10	10.52	20	21.0	15	15.7	15	15.7	2.42	2.80	.005
		Leaders	-	-	23	46	15	30	8	16	4	8	3.19		
2	Use test results to assess progress towards school goals	Teachers	15	15.7	25	26.31	25	26.3	20	21.0	10	10.5	2.81	3.07	.065
		Leaders	6	12	24	48	19	38	1	2	-	-	3.33		
3	Ensure the timely distribution of test results	Teachers	10	10.5	20	21.05	15	15.7	15	15.7	35	36.8	2.44	2.57	0.22
		Leaders	5	10	15	30	20	40	5	10	5	10	2.71		
4	Inform the school's performance results to teachers in a report form	Teachers	35	36.8	30	31.57	25	26.3	5	5.26	-	-	2.58	2.6	.891
		Leaders	-	-	23	46	15	30	8	16	4	8	2.62		
5	Encourage teachers to held the school's testing practice as integral part of the total instructional process than treating it as a separate function	Teachers	15	15.7	20	21.05	15	15.7	30	31.5	15	15.7	2.82	3.07	.064
		Leaders	6	12	24	48	19	38	1	2	-	-	3.33		

Note:P-value was calculated at  $\alpha = 0.05$  levels. Scales 1.49 = almost never, 1.49- 2.49, rarely, 2.5-3.49 = sometimes, 3.5-4.49 many times and  $\geq$ always.

The results in Table 6 focus on the monitoring students progress in Secondary Schools of Borena zone, as reported by respondents. Accordingly, the mean scores of the teachers was 2.42 and that of the instructional leaders was 3.19 in which meting individually with teachers to discuss students' academic progress in teaching learning process performed rarely and sometimes respectively. Also overall mean 2.8 shows the monitoring activity is performed sometimes. The p-value of  $0.005 < 0.05$  proves that the two groups of respondents were significantly difference in their response on the item.

On the other hand, using test results to assess progress towards school goals as reported by teachers and instructional leaders with the mean scores 2.81 and 3.33 respectively with verbal interpretation of "sometimes". Also overall mean 3.07 shows that the use of test results to assess progress towards school goals are practiced sometimes in monitoring students progress. The p-value of  $0.065 > 0.05$  shows that the two groups of respondents were not significantly difference in their response on the item.

When respondents asked how often they ensure the timely distribution of test results as shown in table 6, the teachers mean score was 2.44 and the instructional mean score was 2.71 which indicates rarely and sometimes practiced respectively. Also overall mean 2.57 shows that the leaders ensure that they use the timely distribution of test results sometimes. The p-value of  $0.22 > 0.05$  shows that the two groups of respondents was not significantly difference in their response on the item.

In the same Table 6 of item 4, mean score of respondents on the utilization of the play field for teaching were 2.58 for academic staff and 2.62 for administrative staff in which both indicated that the use of this school physical resource is used for teaching sometimes. Also overall mean 2.6 shows the teachers use the field sometimes. The p-value of  $0.89 > 0.05$  proves that the two groups of respondents was not significantly difference in their view on the item. Concerning, item 5 of similar Table, the mean scores of academic and administrative staff on the utilization of reference books were 2.82 and 3.33 respectively, in which both group's rating show the utilization with this regard is performed sometimes. Similarly, the overall mean 3.07 has similar

interpretation towards the item. The p-value of  $0.064 > 0.05$  shows that the two groups of respondents were not significantly difference in their response on the item.

**Table 7: Promoting School Learning Climate**

No	Items	Respondents	Ratings										Mean	Over all mean	P-value
			Almost never		Rarely		sometimes		Many times		Always				
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
1	Communicate to teachers and students that all students have the capacity to excel	Teachers	15	15.7	25	26.31	25	26.3	20	21.0	10	10.5	3.17	2.96	0.144
		Leaders	-	-	7	14	17	34	14	28	12	24	2.76		
2	Develop school level policy that communicate the need for protecting instructional time from disruptions	Teachers	10	10.5	20	21.05	15	15.7	15	15.7	35	36.8	3.18	3.14	0.766
		Leaders	6	12	24	48	19	38	1	2	-	-	3.10		
3	Communicate the need for enrichment effort to help students master the intended instructional objectives	Teachers	35	36.8	30	31.57	25	26.3	5	5.26	-	-	3.04	3.09	0.776
		Leaders	2	4	23	46	25	50	-	-	-	-	3.14		
4	Develop school level classroom practice policies requiring teachers to implement instructional practices that promote student achievement	Teachers	15	15.7	20	21.05	15	15.7	30	31.5	15	15.7	3.19	3.33	0.314
		Leaders	21	42	11	22	13	26	5	10	-	-	3.48		
5	Be absent from school for different reasons	Teachers	35	36.8	30	31.57	25	26.3	5	5.26	-	-	2.94	2.92	0.931
		Leaders	21	42	14	28	12	24	3	6	-	-	2.90		
6	Use different recognition or reward systems for greater achievement of students	Teachers	15	15.7	20	21.05	15	15.7	30	31.5	15	15.7	2.87	2.96	0.519
		Leaders	5	10	15	30	20	40	5	10	5	10	3.05		
7	Recognize and reward teachers for their productive work	Teachers	10	10.5	20	21.05	15	15.7	15	15.7	35	36.8	2.39	2.45	0.703
		Leaders	-	-	23	46	15	30	8	16	4	8	2.52		

Note: P-value was calculated at  $\alpha = 0.05$  levels. Scales 1.49 = almost never, 1.49- 2.49, rarely, 2.5-3.49 = sometimes, 3.5-4.49 many times and  $\geq$ always.

As shown in Table 7 item 1, teachers and instructional leaders were asked to show their degree of agreement on communicating to teachers and students that all students have the capacity to excel. The mean score of teachers respondents was 3.17 and that of the instructional leaders respondents was 2.76 in which respondents were unable to decide on the effective performance of this practice. Also overall mean 2.96 shows similar idea towards this item. The p-value  $0.144 > 0.05$  indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents towards the item

Regarding item 2 of the same Table, respondents were asked whether school level policy that communicate the need for protecting instructional time from disruptions developed or not. The mean scores of the teachers and instructional leaders respondents were 3.18 and 3.10 respectively still they did not decide on the effective performance of this practice. Also overall mean 3.14 shows that the respondents undecided view towards on the item. The p-value  $0.766 > 0.05$  shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents towards the item. But, the data obtained from interviews shows that developing school level policy that communicate the need for protecting instructional time from disruptions was moderately practiced in their school.

As can be seen in Table 7 item 3, the mean scores of the respondents on the communicating the need for enrichment effort to help students master the intended instructional objectives were 3.04 and 3.14 for the teachers and instructional leaders respectively in which the respondents unable to decide on the effective performance of communicating the need for enrichment effort to help students master the intended instructional objectives. The overall mean 3.09 showed that the respondents almost never on the item. The p-value of  $0.776 > 0.05$  established that there is not statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents towards the item. With regard to item 4 in the same Table above, the mean scores of teachers and instructional leaders were 3.19 and 3.48 respectively in which the verbal interpretation is weak on this practice. The p-value of  $0.314 > 0.05$  indicates that there is not statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents.

In Table 7 item 5, the mean scores of teachers and instructional leaders were 2.94 and 2.90 respectively showed that respondents did not decide on the effective performance of being absent from school for different reasons. The p-value of  $0.931 > 0.05$  indicates that there is not statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents.

With regard to item 6 in the same Table above, the mean scores of teachers and instructional leaders were 2.87 and 3.05 respectively. Also overall mean 2.96 shows critical divergence of respondents towards on the item. The p-value of  $.519 > 0.05$  indicates that there is not statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents.

Item 7 Table 7 the mean scores of teachers were 2.39 (which was almost never performance on the item) and as instructional leaders 2.52 (which was performed sometimes). But, the overall mean 2.45 shows the disagreement of the respondents towards the recognizing and rewarding teachers for their productive work. The p-value of  $.703 > 0.05$  indicates that there is not statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents.

**Table 8: Summary distribution of Leaders in the Three LED Levels**

Leader's LED Levels	Dimensions									
	Communicating school Mission		Managing curriculum & Instruction.		Supervising Instruction		Monitoring students progress		Promoting school learning climate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Weak	9	18	4	8	6	12	4	8	4	8
Moderate	36	72	40	80	38	76	40	80	38	76
Strong	5	10	6	12	6	12	6	12	8	16
Total	50	100	50	100	50	100	50	100	50	100

As the data in Table 8, reveals, most leaders' 72 % performance in managing curriculum and instruction were moderate whereas 10 % of them were strong. But a negligible proportion

18% was found to be weak. In other words, the majority 80% of leaders were also moderate in managing curriculum and instruction whereas 12 % of them were strong and 8 % of them were weak. Similarly, about 12 percent were effective and the majority 76 % was moderate in their engagement in supervising instruction, whereas the remaining 12 percent were weak in ILE. Most school leaders are not strong enough in monitoring student progress. Only 12 % were strong, whereas the majority 80 % moderate performers and the remaining 8 % were weak. Promoting school learning climate has also ineffective leadership. Only 16 % of leaders were strong in promoting their school learning climate whereas the great majority 76 % performed at a moderate level and 8 % were weak in ILE.

In general, the leader's effectiveness in each dimension ranges from weak to strong. However, almost all leaders are found at the moderate level. The information obtained from documents of school profile from 2006-2007, in each school confirms the described findings about leaders engagement in each dimension. The annual school plan, for instance, revealed most leaders set their plans without clear statement of goal for this reason, their plans were found non-development and mere repetitions of past years' experience. It also meant that they led their schools without clear vision of where to go and what to achieve. The other leaders, although they have stated the school goals they intended to reach through the activities included in their plans, they concentrated on administrative areas than student learning and achievement.

Besides such shortcomings of mission statements, the teaching staff minutes observed revealed that only few leaders discussed the school goals with teachers at the beginning of the year, and moreover, the statements were not revised and reframed subsequently following their implementation and success. In most cases as the minutes revealed discussions dealt with and issues raised at the staff meetings were disciplinary problems, organizational tasks and other administrative problems. Little attention was given to curriculum and instructional areas.

This had even come to the attention of leaders when it become a serious problem among the issues raised in staff meetings, problems in teacher performance evaluation for career promotion took the largest part. And the exercise of classroom visiting in almost all schools was intended for this purpose and not to diagnose or improve instructional problems. From the information

obtained from school documents and the interview with supervisors, it was evident that school level supervision was being introduced in all secondary schools of the zone. Although negligible size of leaders had started to implement it, the provision of in school supervision was in the form of staff development and was held by teachers mandated by the career ladder.

Regarding monitoring the progress of students, most schools conduct tests at most six times a year. However the test results are not used for informative purpose. And the progress of students in most schools, were reported to parents at most twice a year (semester ends) in most schools. In the staff meetings this aspect gets attention at the end of each semester and the discussions mainly focus on the administration of tests than other aspects of administrative issue. Thus, number of periods wasted, teachers' and students' disciplinary problems reported in staff meetings also dictate that leaders have problems in promoting school learning climate.

### 4.3. Factors Affecting Instructional Leadership Effectiveness.

#### 4.3.1 Organizational factors

**Table 9: Summary of correlation of organizational factors and ILE.**

	Organizational factors						
	Instructional resources	Professional. Norm	Student size	Teaching Staff size	Non Teaching, staff size	Time Devoted to Ins. Leadership	Extent Of role diversity
ILE r	0.523	0.651	-0.045	0.552	0.012	0.61	-0.193
P	0.006	0.003	0.827	0.003	0.954	0.001	0.344

*Significant at -1 to 1*

As shown in the table above, ILE has significantly positive relation with the extent of instructional resources available in the school ( $r=0.523$ ;  $p<1$ ) This implies that the extent of instructional resource, such as qualified teachers, student text books, teacher's guide, instructional equipment, supplies and operative funds jointly determine the ILE of leaders. The

observed significant positive relationship of ILE and professional norm implies that in schools where the staff value and accept leaders' participation in curricular and instructional issue, leaders' ILE increases. Thus, professional norm of a school has positive influence on ILE of leaders.

Regarding the correlation value of 0.827 in terms of student size, shows that there is strong relationship between students class size and ILE. This means that, if the number of students in the school is few the performance of leaders improves and the leader able to know the performance of students even to treat and evaluate the progress of instructional activities. In reverse to this point, if the number of students in the school is very large the leaders performance may be decline which means the leaders may face challenges to know students progress as well as the effectiveness of instructional deliverance.

Regarding the correlation value of 0.003 in terms of the size of teaching staff, shows that there is positive relationship between the size of teaching staff and ILE. This means that, if the number of teaching staff in the school is few the performance of leaders improves and the leader able to support the performance of teachers even to treat and evaluate the progress of instructional activities. In reverse to this point, if the number of teaching staff in the school is very large the leaders performance may be decline which means the leaders may face challenges to know and support the activities of teachers progress as well as the effectiveness of instructional deliverance.

The correlation value of 0.954 in terms of the size of none teaching staff shows that, there is strong relationship between the size of none teaching staff and ILE. This means that, if the number of none teaching staff in the school is few the performance of leaders improves and the leader able to manage the performance of the none teaching staff even to treat and evaluate the progress of instructional activities. In reverse to this point, if the number of the stated group in the school is very large the leaders performance may be decline which means the leaders may face challenges to know and control all progress as well as the effectiveness of staff performance. This result contradicts Zenebe's (1992) leadership effectiveness finding which states that "the size of the school stress the job demands of the principal".

Holmes (1993) and Gross and Herriott's (1985) findings, showed that larger school leaders devote more time to instructional leadership role than smaller schools. Thus, the possible reason for the relationship obtained may be due to the fact that leaders in smaller schools have little time for instruction leadership because of their engagement as teachers. As depicted in Table 8, the statistically significant positive relationship of time devoted to instructional leadership role along with the negative although not significant relationship of extent of role diversity with ILE means that role diversity has negatively influenced leaders' ILE. In other words, the lesser the extent of role diversity the higher will be the ILE.

#### **4.3.2. Administrative Elements.**

About six administrative elements expected to have potential influence on leaders' ILE were listed and leaders ranked them according to their constraining effect. For computation purpose the responses of leaders for each element were grouped into two categories. That is, if leaders' ranked an element 1,2, or 3 then they are more constrained by the element. And if leaders ranked an element 4, 5 or 6 then they are less constrained by the element. The element, Based on this grouping, t-test was computed to test the impact of each element on ILE of leaders. The assumption used in computing the t-test was leaders more constrained by an element are less effective in their instructional leadership role than otherwise.

**Table 10: T-test of Mean Differences for more Constrained and Less Constrained Leader on Their ILE.**

No	Elements	More Constrained N=35		Less Constrained N=15		t-Value			
		Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D	MD	Degree of freedom	TC	P
1	Policies, rules & regulations	2.20	1.033	2.25	0.957	-0.050	48	-0.083	0.985
2	Numerous reporting requirements	1.80	0.632	3.00	1.414	-1.200	48	0.495	0.630
3	Financial & supply delivery problem	1.20	0.422	2.00	0.816	-0.800	48	-2.469	0.080
4	Untimely teacher transfer	1.70	0.823	1.50	0.577	0.200	48	0.439	0.668
5	Teaching material delivery problems	2.80	1.229	2.75	1.50	0.050	48	0.065	0.949
6	Delayed substitute and deployment of teachers	4.80	1.814	5.50	1.00	0.150	48	-2.268	0.043

As shown in Table 10, the computed t-values for the leaders more constrained by Policies, rules and regulations, numerous reporting requirements, untimely teacher transfer and teaching material delivery of the elements between the two groups are not less than the critical t-value (2.179) at 0.05 level of significance and 48 degree of freedom. Thus, the null hypothesis is not rejected. Which means

the problems are almost equally effective in their instructional leadership roles as the less ones. Thus, the evidence does not support the influence of these elements on leaders' ILE.

However, since the computed t-values for each of the elements 3 and 6 are greater than the critical t-value (2.179) at 0.05 level of significance and 48 degree of freedom, the null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that the greater constraining degree of the two elements, financial and supply delivery problem and delayed substitute and deployment of teachers- resulted lower performance of leaders in their instructional leadership. The finding is supported by Gross and Herriot's (1985) findings that reveal high EPL by the principals when their superiors also have high EPL suggests that the district with a climate that promotes and rewards instructional leadership might enhance the ability and motivation of principal to successful leadership. Hence these two elements significantly affect ILE to the negative direction.

## 5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

### 5.1 Summary

This study is set out to explore the current status of instructional leadership role and to detect some of the factors influencing it in Secondary schools of Borena zone. To this end, basic questions addressing the adequacy of instructional leadership effectiveness and implication in general and in each dimension, leaders' personal characteristics and their relationship with instructional leadership effectiveness and the factors affecting its provision were raised. In order to answer the basic questions raised, the study was conducted in 8 secondary schools of Borena zone, selected on the basis of simple random, systematic and available sampling techniques. The subjects of the study used to obtain the necessary information include 42 school leaders, 95 teachers and 8 supervisors. The basic questions that this research dealt with were ;

1. Is there any significant relationship between leaders personal characteristics and Instructional Leadership effectiveness ?
2. To what degree instructional leaders execute their role of instructional leadership in secondary schools of Borena Zone?
3. What are the factors that affect the Instructional leadership effectiveness in secondary schools of Borena zone?

The information for the study was obtained through questionnaires, document analysis and interview. However, the latter two were supplements to the questionnaire to make the study more reliable and comprehensive. The data obtained were analyzed using different statistical tools such as mean, standard deviation, percentages, Pearson's correlation coefficient and t-test. According to the results of the data analysis, the major findings of the study are the following.

Q. 1 Is there any significant relationship between leaders personal characteristics and Instructional Leadership effectiveness?

- ♥ In search of relationships between instructional leadership effectiveness and personal characteristics, the correlation coefficient between ILE and experience as a leader ( $r=0.725$ ,  $p< 1$ ) revealed that personal characteristics have statistically strong significant relationship with ILE.

Q 2 To what degree instructional leaders execute their role of instructional leadership in secondary schools of Borena Zone?

- ♥ Most of the school leaders (76 %) were providing instructional leadership moderately; similarly, the majority of them were performing moderately on each dimension. Only 10 % of leaders were found very capable in defining the school mission, managing curriculum and instruction 12 %, supervising instruction 12 %, monitoring student progress and 12% are capable to promote school learning climate respectively. Thus, only the minorities of leaders were performing effectively (strongly), in each dimension as well as in overall instructional leadership role.

Q.3 What are the factors that affect the Instructional leadership effectiveness in secondary schools of Borena zone?

Regarding the factors affecting instructional leadership effectiveness of leaders, the study revealed that;-

- ♥ The two characteristics namely; Experience as department head and experience as a leader have positive significant influence on ILE.
- ♥ Regarding the educational level of respondents, the data denoted that the leaders level of educational qualification with the mean score of 2.6 whereas standard deviation is 1.084. This shows that the mean score of leaders level of education is below the ideal mean or grand mean. Based on this, it is possible to say lack of standardized educational qualification can be one of the factors that hinder the leaders from playing significant role to lead the instruction effectively.
- ♥ The availability of instructional resources ( $r= 0.523$ ,  $p< 1$ ) state of professional norm ( $r=0.651$ ,  $p< 1$ ) and teaching staff size as indicator of school size ( $r=0.552$ ,  $p< 1$ )

have been identified among organizational factors that affect ILE significantly in the positive direction.

## **5.2. Conclusions**

As the central goal of schools is providing learning through effective teaching, school leaders are expected to provide effective instructional leadership for the attainment of the school goal. However, the study revealed that most leaders have given moderate attention to this part of their role. As a result, instructional leadership is not provided strongly by most school leaders. Moreover, the majority of leaders did not also perform effectively in each instructional leadership dimension. However the findings revealed that majority of the principals were not in the area of educational management institution. They were assigned the post without having educational planning and management skills.

In the hope of shading light on practical problems of instructional leadership provision in Secondary school of Borena zone, the study attempted to find the correlates and factors affecting the effectiveness of leaders in this role. Accordingly, it has been found that some personal characteristics failed to discriminate significantly among leaders as to their ILE, among these are teaching experience, qualification and position attainment condition. The findings did reveal, however, the experience in leaders and greater experience as a department head, may have some predictive value in selecting leaders who promise effectiveness in providing instructional leadership. Thus, the cause for incapability of most leaders to provide leadership strongly may be attributed to their lack of such experiences.

Besides personal characteristics such as instructional leadership effectiveness has been found subject to the organizational factors, greater availability of instructional resources, a professional norm that gives high value to the involvement of leaders in curricular and instructional matters, and greater number of teachers in a school have contributed positively and significantly to the success of a leader in his/her instructional leadership role. On the other hand, a good range of role diversity has influenced ILE significantly to the success of a leader in his/her instructional leadership role.

Similarly, the study reveal that high degree of financial and supply delivery problems and delay in assigning substitutes and deployment of teachers have significantly influenced the ILE of leaders negatively. In general from the observed findings it can be concluded that instructional leadership effectiveness is a function of personal, organizational and administrative characteristics or factors.

### **5.3. Recommendations.**

Based on the findings and conclusion reached the following possible solutions are recommended so as to increase ILE of school leaders. As evidenced by the study the status of instructional leadership effectiveness in some secondary schools of Borena zone needs improvement. And this has to start with introducing leaders with appropriate instructional leadership role behaviors and skills.

- ◆ In doing so, Oromia Regional Education Bureau in collaboration with zone and woreda education department needs to define the instructional leader's duties in terms of the five dimensions: defining the school mission, managing curriculum and instruction, supervising instruction, monitoring student progress, and promoting the school learning climate as well as providing long and short term training climate as well as to equip them with appropriate knowledge and skill in the area.
- ◆ Moreover, reducing various factors influencing the provision for instructional leadership should be another alternative for the success of leaders. In this endeavor, the most important and worthy recommendation is, that the Oromia Regional Education Bureau with zone and Woreda education office need to given serious consideration for Level of educational qualification of instructional leaders. The characteristics identified to contribute significantly and positively are greater experience as department head and greater experience as a leader.
- ◆ Although the findings tend to give greater weight to the above two personal characteristics in the selection and appointment of school leaders, the smallness of

sample size and the study unfair to give less value to other personal characteristics to serve as selection and assignment criteria. The possible recommendation is, thus, that Oromia Education Bureau with zone and district education department needs to make wider study and revise the criteria used for selecting and appointing school leaders particularly for instructional leadership position.

- ◆ It is hardly possible for leaders to be engaged frequently in instructional leadership activities unless their involvement gets recognition and reward from both teachers and higher officials. To this end, the professional norm that limits the involvement of leaders in instructional matters should be improved. One means to attain this, developing leader's skills and knowledge in instructional leadership areas so that they can be influential and confident to suggest solutions for the instructional problems. In line with this the strategies in the selection of leaders should take into consideration the higher level of educational attainment of school leaders. Providing seminars, workshops or formulating policies on the improvement of teacher leader work relationships could be the other alternative. Above all leaders also need to create strong professional relationships with and among teachers through prolonged efforts.
  
- ◆ Moreover, higher officials should give greater emphasis to instructional leadership part of leaders' role. This could be attained by working closely with school leaders on instructional aspects and by giving greater value to it in the appraisal of leaders' performance and promotions. The administrative support from district or zone education department should also give great emphasis to the activities that have great influence on the instructional leadership role of leaders. This could be attained by providing the necessary budget and supplies adequately on time and making the transfer and deployment of teachers before the opening or after the closing of schools.

## 6. REFERENCES

- Abiy et.al., 2009. Introduction to research methods. Graduate studies and research office: Addis Ababa University.
- Ahmed Aragawe. 2006. A comparative study of managerial effectiveness between government and private high school of Addis Ababa. AAU: Unpublished MA thesis.
- Angela Kwinda. 2002. *Instructional Leadership role of the School Principal*: University of South Africa.
- Basom, A. and Basom, M. 1994. *Instructional leadership: Supervision that makes a difference*. Theory into Practice. Stufflebeam, D.L.; Madaus.
- Blasé, J. and Blasé, J. 1999. Principals' instructional leadership and teacher developments Teachers perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35 (3): 349-378.
- Book binder, R. 2001. *The principals' Leadership for the effective and productive schools*. Springfield: Il Hares, Thomas publisher.
- Bossert et al., 1992. "The Instructional Management Role of the principal." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(3): 34-65.
- Brewer, H. 2001. Ten steps to success. *Journal of Staff Development*, 80 (3): 162-194.
- Brundrett et al., 2003. *Leadership in Education*. New Delhi: Sage Publication. Competing values and current tensions. *Journal of Education Policy*, 88 (6): 1162-1194.
- Bush, T. 2003. Theories of Educational leadership and management, Sage Publications Ltd.
- Burns, M. 1978. *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- BZDPPD (Borena zone disaster prevention and preparedness desk). 2003. Population census 2003.

- Chell, J. 1991. *Introducing principals to the role of Instructional leadership*.SSTA Resource center, 56 (3): 95-14.
- Chris, J. 1992. *Purposeful structuring creating a culture for learning and achievement in elementary schools*.Washington D.C: Palmer press.
- Corbally et al., 1990.*Educational Administration; The secondary School*.(anded). Boston; Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Dim mock, C. 2000. *Designing the learning centered schools*. London: Palmer press.
- Edmonds, R. 1990. *Effective schools for the urban poor*.Educational Leadership.Cambridge University press.
- Fekede, T. andFiorucci, M. 2012. Examining Quality Issues in Primary Schools in Ethiopia: implication for the Attainment of the Education for All Goals.*Journal of Educational, Cultural and Psychological Studies*.40 (4): 164-194
- FrewAmsale. 2010. Practice and challenges of Implementing School improvement in Secondary School ofOromia. Addis Ababa University.
- Griffith, J. and Houstveen, T. 1999. The school leadership/school climate relation: Identification of school configurations associated with change in principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 25 (4): 95-126.
- Hallinger, P. 2003. Leading education change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 45(1): 54 - 61.
- Harris, A. and Daniel, M. 2005 *Improving School Through teacher leadership*.New York: Open University press.
- Heywood, S. 2008. The Effect of Primary School Quality on academic Achievement AcrossTwenty-nine High and Low-income Countries.*The American Journal of sociology*,88(6): 1162-1194.

- Holmes, G. 1993. *Essential School leadership; developing vision and purpose management*. London: kogan page limited.
- Hopkins et al., 2005.*Instructional Leadership and School Improvement*. London: Routledge Flamer.
- Hoy, W. and Miskel, C. 2000. *Educational administration:Theory, research and practice*.(6th Ed.). New York. NY: McGraw Hill.
- Jemal Haji. 2013. Practice and Challenges of School Improvement Program in Secondary schools of Asosazone .Jimma, University.
- Jacobson et al., 1973.*The principal ship: New Perspectives*. New Jersey: Printice \_ Hall, Inc.
- Larson, A. and Knight, B. 2000.*Leadership, culture and organization learning in understanding the schools as Intelligent system*. Stanford: Ct, JAI press.
- Leithwood, K. 2005. Understanding successful principal leadership: Progress on a broken front. *Journal of Educational Administration*.80 (5): 1160-1193.
- Locke, A. and Edwin, A. 1991.*The essence of leadership*.New York: Macmillan Inc.
- Locke, E. and Latham, G. 1990. *Theory of good setting and task performance*.London. cliffs NG: Prentice Hall.
- McEwen, K. 2003. *Seven steps to instructional leadership Thousand oaks'*:California; corwin press.
- MoE. 2002. Responsibility and practices of school principal: unpublished material, Addis Ababa University.
- MoE. 2005.*The Education sector Development program Implementation Manual (ESDP III)*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- MoE. 2007. *Review of Ethiopian education and Training policy and Its Implementation*.Addis Abeba; USARD

- Mitchell, C. and Castle J. B. 2005. The instructional role of elementary school principals. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 40(3): 325-336.
- Murphy, J. 1990. Principal instructional leadership. *Advances in Educational Administration*, (B: *Changing perspectives on the school*), 24(4):163-200.
- Purkey, S. and Hass, M. 2005. Effective schools: A review. *The Elementary School Journal*, 83 (4): 427-452.
- Sheppard, B. 1996. Exploring the transformational nature of the instructional leadership. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 42(4): 325-334.
- Sergiovanni, T. 2001. *Leadership: What's in it for schools?* London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Stogdill, R. 1988. Personal factors associated with leadership: *A survey of the literature*. *Journal of Psychology*, 25(3): 35-71.
- Stogdill, R. 1989. *Handbook of leadership: A survey of the literature*. New York: Free Press.
- Van de Grift, W. and Houtveen, A. 1999. *Educational leadership and pupil achievement in primary education*. School Effectiveness and School Improvement.
- Weber, J. 1996. *Leading the instructional program*. In S. Smith & P. Piele (Eds.), *School leadership*. Clearinghouse of Educational Management. Eugene, Oregon.
- Yukl. 1998. *Leadership in organizations*. (4th Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- ZebebeBarki. 1992. Leaders role behaviors of senior Secondary school, principals in Ethiopia. Unpublished theses.

**Appendices:  
Appendix- A  
HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY**

**SCHOOL OF POST GRADUATE PROGRAMES**

**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES**

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT**

**Questionnaire for Teachers and Instructional Leaders.**

This questionnaire is designed to assess principals, Vice-principal's and department heads instructional leadership effectiveness and gather information on the factors affecting this role of the leaders. The information gathered through this questionnaire will be used by the researcher for strictly academic purpose. Your careful and honest responses determine the success of the study and the researchers as well. Thus you are kindly requested to complete the questionnaire carefully and honestly. Your responses will be kept confidential. Please read the instructions and each item in the questionnaire carefully before you give response. If you want to change any of your responses, make sure that you have cancelled the unwanted ones.

**Note**

- Each question has its own instruction to follow.

You have to return the questionnaire to the person for which you received as soon as possible after completion. Thank you in advance to your kind cooperation!

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

Location a. Woreda \_\_\_\_\_

b. Town \_\_\_\_\_

## I. Personal characteristics

Direction: Please check by writing an “X” mark on the space provided against the items.

1. Sex: Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_\_

2. Age: a. below 20 \_\_\_\_\_ b. 21 -25 \_\_\_\_\_

c. 26 – 30 \_\_\_\_\_ d. 31-35 \_\_\_\_\_

e. 36 – 46 \_\_\_\_\_ f. 41-45 \_\_\_\_\_ g. 46 – 50 \_\_\_\_\_ h. 51 – 55 \_\_\_\_\_

3. Work experience In years

3.1 In your present position. a. 1-2 \_\_\_\_\_ b. 3 – 6 \_\_\_\_\_

c. 7 – 10 \_\_\_\_\_ d. 11 and over \_\_\_\_\_

4. Level of educational attainment at present. a. Diploma (12 + 2) \_\_\_\_\_

b. B.A / B.Sc. Degree \_\_\_\_\_ c) M.A. / M.Sc. Degree \_\_\_\_\_

d. Other specify \_\_\_\_\_

5. Qualification (field of specialization) in

5.1 Under graduate program a. EDPM \_\_\_\_\_ b) Subject major \_\_\_\_\_

c. Pedagogical science \_\_\_\_\_ d. Other specify \_\_\_\_\_ 5.2 Graduate program a.

EDPM \_\_\_\_\_ b. Curriculum \_\_\_\_\_

c. Psychology \_\_\_\_\_ e. other specify \_\_\_\_\_ d. Subject area \_\_\_\_\_

## II. Instructional Leadership Dimensions

**Note:-** Instructional leadership is conceptualized as the activities of leader is setting school mission, managing and instruction, supervising instructional, monitoring student progress and promoting school learning climate. Each dimension is described in terms of the principal's and/or Vice-principals job behaviors/ practices.

**Direction:-**Read each statement carefully. Then circle the number that indicates the extent to which you are engaged with the specific job behaviors or practices described in each dimension.

### A. Defining and communicating School mission

**(Goals that the school is intended to attain)**

No	Item	Responses				
		Almost never	rarely	sometimes	many times	always
1	Develop a set of annual School-wide goals focused on Student learning					
2	Frame the school's goals in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them					
3	Use data on student academic performance when developing the school's goals					
4	Communicate the school's goals effectively to staff, student and parents					
5	Refer to the school's goals when making curricular and instructional decisions					
6	Ensure that the school's goals are reflected in highly visible displays in the schools					

## B. Managing Curriculum and Instruction

No	Item	Responses				
		Almost never	rarely	sometimes	many times	always
1	Ensure the timely allocation of resources (human, material and financial) necessary for instructional process					
2	Control class size for effective instructional process					
3	Control student composition by maintaining overall achievement distribution in classrooms					
4	Schedule co-curricular activities in support of the formal instructional process					
5	Consider factors affecting teaching (no. of preparation, Nature of the subject, etc.) while assigning tasks for teachers					

## C. Supervising Instruction

No	Item	Responses				
		Almost never	rarely	sometimes	many times	always
1	Make classroom visits for the purpose of improving instructional process.					
2	Confer with help needed teachers after the visit to discuss the problems and plan improvement together					
3	Hold regular meetings with each department for the purpose of improving curriculum and instruction					
4	Encourage teachers to use different instructional methods					

### D. Monitoring Student Progress

No	Item	Responses				
		Almost never	rarely	sometimes	many times	always
1	Meet individually with teachers to discuss students' academic progress					
2	Use test results to assess progress towards school goals					
3	Ensure the timely distribution of test results					
4	Inform the school's performance results to teachers in a report form					
5	Encourage teachers to held the school's testing practice as integral part of the total instructional process than treating it as a separate function					

### E. Promoting School Learning Climate

No	Item	Responses				
		Almost never	rarely	sometimes	many times	always
1	Communicate to teachers and students that all students have the capacity to excel					
2	Develop school level policy that communicate the need for protecting instructional time from disruptions					
3	Communicate the need for enrichment effort to help students master the intended instructional objectives					
4	Develop school level classroom practice policies requiring teachers to implement instructional practices that promote student achievement					

5	Be absent from school for different reasons					
6	Use different recognition or reward systems for greater achievement of students					
7	Recognize and reward teachers for their productive work					

### III. Organization Characteristics

**Direction:-**Below are sets of items concerning some characteristics of your school. Sub directions on how to give your response are included with the items. Please read the items and directions carefully and react accordingly.

#### 1. Availability of instructional resources.

Indicate the extent of availability of the following resources by labeling numbers. 1 upto 5.the numbers represent. 5= more than adequate 3= slightly deficient 1= almost none 4= adequately 2= very deficiently

- a. Qualified teachers \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Student textbooks \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Teacher guides \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Instructional equipment \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Supplies (paper, chalk etc.) \_\_\_\_\_
- f. Operative funds \_\_\_\_\_

## 2. Role Diversity;

2.1 what percent of your time do you devote on matters that concern for;

i. Instructional leadership \_\_\_\_\_%

ii. Administration \_\_\_\_\_ %

iii. Political Activate \_\_\_\_\_ % Other duties \_\_\_\_\_%

2.2 To what extent do the diversity of roles in your school constrain your instructional leadership? (circle one) 5, a great deal 4, a lot somewhat 2, a little 1, not at all

4. **Professional Norm** Please circle the numbers that indicate the extent to which the teaching staff in your school value the following professional norm indicators. The numbers represent;

**To what extent does the teaching staff in your school value.....?**

No	Item	Responses				
		not at all	a little	some what	a lot	a great deal
4.1	Principal's (or assistant) involvement in educational decisions					
4.2	Principal's (or assistant) initiative in consulting teachers about instructional matters					
4.3	Principal's (or assistant) initiative for frequent classroom visits					

## 2. Other administrative elements

Direction: Literature provides the following elements from the Zone/Wereda administration that may constrain the leader's instructional leadership role. From your experience as a school leader which elements did you find constraining your instructional leadership activities? (Rank them in their order of constraining effect i.e 1 for highest then 2....).

<b>Factors/elements</b>	<b>Rank</b>
2.1 Zone/Wereda policies, rules and regulations	_____
2.2 Financial and supply delivery problems	_____
2.3 Numerous reporting requirements	_____
2.4 Untimely teacher transfers	_____
2.5 Delay substitute of or deployment of teachers	_____
2.6 Teaching materials delivery problems	_____
2.7 If any more please describe and include in your ranking	_____

\* The item is reversed when scored.

## Appendix B

### INTERVIEW FOR SUPERVISORS

**Woreda:** \_\_\_\_\_

1. Background Information

Age \_\_\_\_\_

Sex \_\_\_\_\_

**Year of experience (service) as:**

i) a teacher \_\_\_\_\_

ii) a principal \_\_\_\_\_

iii) a supervisor (supervisory member) \_\_\_\_\_

**Qualification Major** \_\_\_\_\_

Level of educational attainment \_\_\_\_\_

2. How often do your Woreda provide supervisory services for senior secondary schools in a year?
3. Which areas of principal's activities are treated in the supervisory service? Which aspects got due attention?
4. How do you see the currently employed selection/election of leaders /for principal ship position from professional point of view?
5. What factors are influence the effectiveness of instructional leadership.