Innovations

Assessment of Leadership Practice in Secondary Schools of Sidama National Region State, Ethiopia

Habteab Sherbo

PhD Scholar, Dilla University, Institute of Education and Behavioral Sciences,
Department of Educational Policy and Leadership
Corresponding author: **Habteab Sherbo**

Abstract

This study was set out to assess the Leadership practice in secondary schools of Sidama National Region State, Ethiopia. Primary data were collected through questionnaire and interview. Leadership practice to promote communication among teachers, supporting professional development of teachers, and providing individual support for teachers and developing best practice of the school to improve instructional leadership practices were poorly performed. The study also showed that heavy administrative work load and lack of facilitating favorable condition to make parents to participate in different school activities are major internal challenges that affect leadership. Finally, the study uncovered that lack of training, lack of super visor activity in the school and budget constraints are major external challenges that affect external activity. It is concluded that leaders are not playing their part in leadership. It is recommended that the school leaders need to play their leadership roles appropriately in participating stakeholders in practice. Moreover, education leaders especially Woreda and Regional education Bureau should provide appropriate training and support for school leaders in order to promote effective leadership practices of school principals in schools.

***Keywords**: 1.Assessment, 2.leadership practice, 3.secondary schools*

Introduction

A globalizing world is now the context with in which educational leaders need to frame their work. There are a number of forces occurring at the global level which profoundly affect the countries education policies, and which then result in significant pressures in the work of educational leaders (Bottery, 2006). Leadership is second to classroom instruction among all school related factors that contribute to what students learn at school. While evidence about leadership effects on student learning can be confusing to interpret, much of the existing research actually underestimates its effects. The total (direct and indirect) effects of leadership on student learning account for about a quarter of school effects (Kenneth, Thornton and Daughtery, 2004).

Indeed the professional standards for school instructional leaders require engaging in continuous inquiry about effectiveness of curricular and instructional practices and working collaboratively to make appropriate changes that improve students' academic achievement. This requires very particular knowledge, skills, attitudes and personal status to effectively lead and manage (Solomon, 2016).

Educational leadership is possibly the most important factor of an effective learning environment and is defined as the ability of a principal 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 execute their tasks as effectively as possible (Grift &Houtveen, 2003). The primary responsibility of a principal is to facilitate effective teaching and learning with the overall mission of improving student achievement. Education today requires a leader who is willing to foster student achievement in some of the most complex environments. Maehr (2009) contends that a positive "psychological environment" can strongly influence student achievement. He asserts that leaders can create this environment by establishing policies that stress goal setting, by offering students choices in instructional settings, and by rewarding students for their achievements. Maher also describes this environment as fostering team work through group learning, replacing social comparisons of achievement, teaching time management skills, and offering self-paced instruction when possible.

One of the key measures in addressing the school performance is through effective instructional leadership which creates conducive environment for students. However today improving instructional leadership ranks high on the list of priorities for school reform. School and district administrators, policy makers and other declared principal leadership as among the most pressing matters on a list of issues in public school education (Wallace, 2012). The role of the principal covers many different areas including leadership, teacher evaluation, students discipline and several others. Being an effective instructional leader is hard work and is time consuming. A good instructional leader is balanced within all their roles and works hard to ensure that they are doing what they feel is best for all constituents involved (Derrick, 2010).

Leadership demands a search for ways to support others while simultaneously requiring self-support. Leaders often provide a behavioral model for educational personnel. Schools depend on leadership throughout the organization to shape productive futures through a process of self-renewal (Senge, 2009). While instructional leadership appears to be relatively straightforward and simple in theory, in practice it is complex, messy, and unpredictable (Harris, 2004).

Instructional leadership is expected to create effective school to promote learning environment. These include leading, teaching and learning, monitoring and developing staff (Bass, 2008). For school improvement is one basic thing that sets out the school needs to improve the level of student achievement. To effect real change, however, the process needs focus on use curriculum deliver strategies that specially address the needs of their students, when school improvement is positive and parents are involved in their children education. Whereas to increases significance of the learning acceptance and discipline of students and well instructional leadership and administration for teaching-learning process to develop students outcome (Hopkins, 2009).

According to Sergiovani and Starrat (2002) the purpose of supervision of instruction helps to increase the opportunity and capacity of schools to contribute more effectively to school success by avoiding these and other factors which are more related to instructional leadership through their effective principal ship in order to improve instructional leadership practices.

AdisShonde (2014) agree with this general view of the instructional leadership roles and expands this general definitions of leadership and management to be an active collaborative form of leadership where the principals work with teachers to shape the school as a work place in relation to share goals, teachers collaboration, teaching-learning opportunities, teacher certainty, teachers commitment and student learning.

In spite of major investments in improving the numbers and the qualifications of teachers and the availability of equipment, students' achievement has not sufficiently improved. The gains in access are of little meaning if they are not accompanied by improved students learning. It is necessary therefore, to shift attention to quality concerns in general and to those inputs and processes which translate more directly into improved student learning and which help change the school into a genuine learning environment (such as : quality focused school supervision, internal instructional leadership increased school community partnership (MoE, 2010).

As clearly stated in the ministry of education (2004) educational management would be decentralized specially at institutional level and schools become autonomous in their internal administration. This means that the role of managing the schools and teaching and learning carried out in schools distributed to all individuals involving in school activity, not limited only to principals.

According to Marks and Printy (2003) description, all high schools depend on leadership throughout the organization to shape productive futures for students; however, what does the contribution of the instructional leadership. Students' academic achievement can be influenced by many different factors. Although there might be various reasons for this low achievement of students, many raise the instructional leadership practices as one major problem.

Instructional leadership and academic achievement are significantly related as reflected in the works of a few leadership researchers. For instance, Andrews' (2007) study found that principal's instructional leadership is positively related to student achievement in school examinations. Andrews proved that teachers do have positive perceptions towards the effectiveness of instructional leadership when the classroom environment is good.

Studies on leadership have focused at principals when it should be on the classroom teachers. Teachers play a key role in the delivery of quality instruction. Their responsibilities include ensuring educational strategies are in place that support effective learning for all students (Wango, 2009). They serve as a facilitator, guide and provider of quality instruction (Bakhda, 2006). Good subject teachers understand that that quality instruction is essential for improving students' academic achievement.

Loeb et.al(2010) asserted that school leaders must have or develop the competence to become knowledgeable in instructional strategies and effective methods of content delivery. They noted that the supervision of teachers should be viewed as instructional leadership's efforts to improve classroom management. Instructional leadership entails being responsible for developing teachers' capabilities and paying attention to administrative matters such as budgeting, building maintenance, and school nutritional programs.

With this regard researcher has frequently heard of blame and dissatisfaction from most teachers who are currently teaching at secondary schools say that the support service rendered by instructional leadership practice may not be adequate and even in some occasions it seems not relevant to demand of teachers. Besides some principal have no positive attitude to make the way and lack of professional knowledge known to encouraging teachers to acquire the latest method of teaching-learning skill and due to inadequate instructional leadership knowledge on their approaches or lack of good leadership practice in tackling problem while implementing the curriculum and various instructional approaches.

In the study area researcher observed that there are gaps that affects the improvement of quality of education and students' academic performance on the side of instructional leadership practice and school principals did not exert much effort for the success of student out comes teachers with the help supervision or school principal did not design and conduct training need assessment from the basis of teachers' pedagogical gaps. Ineffectively implementation of instructional leadership roles to enhance school leader practices in the schools still one of the challenges in the study. Therefore, instructional leadership is a central element in the schools. Effective instructional leaders can increase school performance in a group or individuals. In this study researcher intended to conduct on the practices and challenges of leadership in selected secondary schools of Sidama Region.

Statement of the Problem

Educational systems depend on instructional leadership practices to control and improve instruction by improving the quality of teachers and the achievements of learners (Fauve & Gavin, 2008). It has been useful in equipping teachers' with the necessary knowledge and skills to solve educational problems by creating awareness about the dynamic methodology changes in the teaching learning process (Goker, 2002). In addition the researcher has find related to the past instructional leadership practices in school indicated that there are some problems with its practices. To list some opportunities that help to improving teaching and learning process were in adequate training programs were not relevant to real professional development of teachers, there was properly designed systematic follow up and support system (Chayalew, 2005).

As to Leithwood and Riehl (2003) the highest influence on students' achievements is the practice of instructional leadership. Instructional leadership has significant influences on students' learning, quality curriculum and teachers' instruction. Moreover, there have been many studies related to instructional leadership. The secondary school principals, who must also be the instructional leaders, must focus on processes related to teaching and instruction and also support the achievement of students in every other conceivable fashion (Marks &Printy, 2003), because instructional leader is one of the role player in school leadership to improve students' achievement (MoE, 2007). It is unknown the level of instructional leadership that would be a positive or negative contribution to a student's academic achievement or the practice of instructional leadership on students' academic achievement. Moreover, there have been many studies related to instructional leadership. Aklilu (2011) in his assessment of "Instructional leadership practice in the secondary school of Sheka Zone" he found out that instructional leaders do not perform the necessary knowledge and skills that help them in leading the school community as they were all subject specialist. Similarly, Alemayehu (2013) study of "instructional leadership problems of government secondary school principals in East Shewa Zone of Oromia Regional State" he found out that the focus of the principals in their instructional leadership activities were not in academic activities, as much of their time was spent on administrative tasks. It is obvious that the previous studies were focused on instructional leadership styles, practice, leadership problem and role of instructional leadership.

However, it is found that the first two studies is very much general. Moreover, most researches including the mentioned ones were done abroad and the local studies as far as the present knowledge of the practitioner are concerned. However, in the study area research could not found which focused on instructional leadership practices such as setting mission and vision, managing curriculum and supervising instruction, monitoring students' progress, creating conducive environment and providing and utilization of resources. These are the gaps that the researcher may try to fill and initiated to conduct this study on this specific area.

In addition, in the study area it seems that there is lack of training in instructional leadership and inefficiency and lack of commitment.In light with this, the researcher look in to the gaps that affects the improving students' academic achievement on the side of instructional leadership practice stakeholders did not give a much effort for the success of student academic achievement with the help supervision. Instructional leadership did not design conduct training need assessment from the basis of pedagogical gaps. However, to the best knowledge of the researcher, no studies have been conducted to show the extent of instructional leadership practices in study area. The purpose of this study was to investigate practices and challenges of leadership in selected secondary schools of Sidama Region. In order to address this purpose the study tried to answer the following questions:

1) How effective are school leaders in the implementation of leadership activities in secondary schools of Sidama Region?
2) What is the perception of teachers about the leadership practices in secondary schools of study area?
3) What are the challenges faced by school leaders in the process of practicing leadership?

Objective of the Study

General Objective

The general objective of the study was to investigate practices and challenges of leadership in selected secondary schools of Sidama Region.

Specific Objectives

Specific objectives of the study were:

- To examine the school leaders practice leadership in selected secondary schools of Sidama Region.
- To explore the perception of teachers about the leadership practices in secondary schools of study area.
- To identify the challenges faced by school leaders in the process of practicing leadership.

Significance of the Study

This study is very important because of the following benefits:

- This study may help government officials; supervisors, principals, aspiring principals, and assistant principals by identifying those key leadership behaviors perceived used in successful schools and linked to student achievement could be beneficial.
- The results of this study may help to create awareness about instructional leaders by revealing what sort of instructional leadership competences while they were leading their schools and how should they fill these gaps in order to bring changes in their respective secondary schools.
- Participants in preparation programs may benefit from learning about seasoned principals' perceptions of effective leader behaviors that can improve student achievement as well.
- Local and international level policy makers may able to benefit from this study by describing instructional leadership practices that are grounded in research and that educators sanction to improve school performance.
- Identification of instructional leadership the work behaviors that educators perceive to impact student achievement positively should be a useful component of future principal preparation programs to ensure that principals have access to better training.

Methodology

Research Design

Based on a research question, descriptive survey research design was used in this study. This is because this design allows the researcher to gather data from relatively large number of respondents with in short period of time with minimum cost. Descriptive research design was used to collect, analyzes, and interprets data using quantitative and qualitative research. Some of the research designs may be familiar; others may be new, such as how these paths can converge with two designs called mixed methods research and action research. The discussion of design was providing a more advanced understanding of educational research on your journey (Creswell, 2012). Moreover, it is recommended when gathering data about respondents' perceptions, beliefs, opinion scores, and outcomes (Creswell, 2003). Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007) asserted that many scientific disciplines, especially social science and education, use descriptive survey design.

Research Method

This study was used concurrent mixed (QUAN and QUAL) approach through collecting and analyzing data. The researcher firstly used quantitative method through survey questionnaires while researcher also used semi-structured interviews to substantiate the quantitative data. There are some rationales to use qualitative and quantitative approach for this study. First, using such method is advantageous to examine the same phenomenon from multiple perspectives (Cohen, Manionad&Marrison, 2007). Second, qualitative and quantitative approach important to build upon the strength that exists between quantitative and qualitative methods in order to understand a given phenomenon than is possible using either quantitative or qualitative methods alone (Creswell, 2003).

Sources of Data

The sources of primary data are those which were collected the first time and thus happen to original in character. The major sources of primary data were teachers, principals, supervisors and Woreda education officers' experts. Secondary data were obtained from documents including teachers file, decisions made in school, departments, clubs etc, which were related to what is carried out regarding the practices of instructional leadership in secondary schools in the study area.

Sampling design

Population

A population is a group of individuals who have the same characteristic. For instance, all teachers would make up the population of teachers, and all secondary school leaders in a school district would comprise the population of

administrators. A target population (or the sampling frame) is a group of individuals with some common defining characteristic that the researcher can identify and study (Creswell, 2003). In this regard, the target populations of the study were secondary school principals, supervisors, teachers' and Woreda education office experts. In this study the student researcher believes they are the right source of information on the issue under investigation. In Sidama Region, there are 30 woredas and 6 administrative towns, with total of 95 secondary schools (SRSEB, 2021).

Sampling and Sample Size

A sample is a subgroup of the target population that the researcher plans to study for generalizing about the target population (Creswell, 2003). For this study, the student researcher selected six woredas by using simple random sampling techniques which is the best way to get representative samples and to have every subject equal chance to be selected (Creswell, 2003). These selected woredas, namely, Boricha, Gorche, Shabadino, Bilate Zuria, Darara and LokaAbbaya. In the selected woredas there are 19 secondary schools, out of which 10 secondary schools were selected through using simple random sampling techniques (n=10) 53% of the schools in the selected areas, this is because of researcher believed that from these secondary schools can get sufficient information on the issue under investigation. These secondary schools include: Yirb, Gorche, Kenera, Dilla Anfarara, Telamo-Tumao, ShamanaGodo, Dilla Anole, Darara, Hantate and Balela secondary schools. In the selected schools, there are 420 teachers and 84 school leaders. Out of these, 35% (147) of the teachers, and 100% (84) of the school leaders were selected to be the participants of the study. Moreover, 10(100%) secondary school supervisors and 6(50%) Woreda Education Office experts were included in the study. In order to select samples from target population, the researcher use simple random sampling for teachers, while purposive sampling was used to select Woreda Education office experts and supervisors and comprehensive for school leaders.

Instruments of Data Collection

The relevant data for the study was collected through different instruments: questionnaire, interviews and document analysis and they are explained as follows:

Methods of Data Analysis

In this study both qualitative and quantitative data analysis techniques were employed. The quantitative data obtained through questionnaires were edited, categorized and tabulated. The data, then, were analyzed using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistics. Thus, descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentage, mean standard deviation and inferential statistics like independent sample t-test were used. In addition, descriptive statistics were used in the study under consideration is that it helps to describe the characteristics and the relationship between variables. The results were obtained and the relationship of each variable is thoroughly interpreted and discussed on the basis of key question. Quantitative analysis was done through software called Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) 21 version.

The qualitative data gathered through open-ended questionnaire, interviews and document analysis was described as supplementary evidence in addition to the discussions of quantitative data. The data were analyzed using narrative description and quoting as it is. Finally, conclusions were drawn from the major findings and possible recommendations from the identified problems were suggested.

Results

This chapter deals with presentation, analysis and interpretation of data collected through questionnaire, interview and focus group discussion. The subjects of the study were teachers, school leaders, supervisors and woreda education office experts. To analyze and interpret data on variables related to practices and challenges of instructional leadership in selected secondary schools of Sidama National Region State.

Description of the Study Participants

By describing characteristics of the respondents, it is possible to know some background information about the sample population who participated in the study. The following four tables show the general characteristics (sex, age, educational qualification, work experience in year in teaching/leading and your current position).

Table 3: The Respondents Characteristics

SN	Items	Variables	Respondents Type			
			Teachers (N=135)		School Leaders (N=80)	
1	Sex		No.	%	No.	%
		A) Male	116	85.9	64	80.0
		B) Female	19	14.1	16	20.0
		Total	135	100	80	100
2	Age	A) 21-25	26	19.3	18	22.5
		B) 26-30	81	60	32	40.0
		C) 31-35	13	9.6	16	20.0
		D) 36-45	10	7.4	10	12.5
		E) 46 and above	5	3.7	4	5.0
		Total	135	100	80	100
3	Academic Qualification	A) Diploma	2	1.5	-	-
		B) 1st Degree	126	93.3	72	90.0
		C) 2nd Degree	7	5.2	8	10.0
		Total	135	100	80	100
4	Work experience in year in teaching/leading	A) 1-5 years	28	20.7	14	17.5
		B) 6-10 years	59	43.7	32	40.0
		C) 11-15 years	26	19.3	18	22.5
		D) 16-20 years	11	8.1	16	20.8
		Total	135	100	80	100
5	Your current Position	Principal	-	-	10	12.5
		Vice Principal	-	-	30	37.5
		Department Heads	-	-	40	50.0
		Teachers	135	100	-	-
		Total	135	100	80	100

Key: - No= Number and %=Percentage

As can be seen from item 1, Table 3, sex distribution of teachers 116(85.9%) of them were males and 19(14.1%) females. The study indicates that there is few numbers of females participating in school leadership position in Sidama Region. On the other hand, 32(80%) of school leaders were males and 8(20%) of them were females. This indicates that the majority of the secondary school leadership position was dominated by males in the Sidama Region. To identify the instructional leadership among male and female of school principals in the study area.

Table 3, item 2, concerning to age structure, 26(19.3%) of teachers and 9(22.5%) of school leaders were in the age category between 21-25 years, 81(60%) of teachers and 16(40%) of school leaders were between 26-30 years; 13(9.6%) of teachers and 8(20%) of school leaders were between 31-35 years old; 7(5.2%) of teachers and 5(12.5%) of school leaders were between 36-40 years old and only 5(3.7%) of teachers and 2(5%) of school leaders were 41 years and above years old. This shows that majority of teachers and school leaders were found between 26-30 years or they are active working age groups and they can know that the factors that influencing school leader's leadership practices in improving instructional leadership practices.

As illustrated in Table 3, item 3, regarding the educational qualification of the respondents, 2(1.5%) of teachers were diploma holders, 126(93.3%) of teachers were first degree holders, while 9(5.3%) of them were MA/Msc degree holders. On the other hand, concerning the educational level of school leaders, 36(90%) of school leaders respondents had first degree and the remaining 4(10%) of school leaders possessed 2nd degree. According to the new education and training policy of Ethiopia, degree is the minimum requirements of qualification for teachers to teach in the secondary schools (MoE, 1994). But most of the principals in the study area were under qualified i.e. currently government has given high attention for employed qualified competent school leaders, but still now majority of secondary schools/study areas/ were 1st degree holders. This calls for special attention to enhance those school leaders according to standard for the better improving instructional process in the school. This indicates that majority of the principals in the study area were below the standard set by MoE 2004 or they were not trained in school leadership profession.

As it can be seen in Table 3, item 4, indicates that the service year of the respondents 28(20.7%) of teachers and 7(17.5%) of school leaders belongs to experience years ranging from 1-5, 59(43.7%) of teachers and 26(19.3%) of school leaders belongs to the range of 6-10 years' experience, 26(19.3%) of teachers and 9(22.5%) of school leaders belongs to the range of 11-15 years' experience. Similarly, 11(8.1%) of teachers and 8(20.8%) of teachers belongs to the range of 16-20 years' experience. This result showed that the majority of respondent's school leaders and teachers had less work experience on current position or has less than 10 years' experience. This may affect the effective implementation of institutional leadership practices.

As can be seen from item four in Table 3, item 5, in relation to current work position of respondents, 10(12.5%) of respondents were principals, 30(37.5%) of them were vice principals, 40(50%) of department heads and 135(100%) were teachers who carried out teaching learning process in the classroom. This showed that majority of current work position of respondents were department heads who participated in the study.

School leaders practice instructional leadership

This section presents the analysis and interpretation on instructional leadership practices such as: setting mission and vision**,** managing curriculum and instructional program, supervising instruction and monitoring school progress in the section below.

Setting Mission and Vision

The following table presents about the setting mission and vision such as setting common vision, mission and goals are reflected in highly visible displays in the schools, work cooperatively with staff for solving problems and making participatory decisions and provides useful assistance to teachers in setting short term goals for teaching and learning were viewed in the following table below.

Table 4: **Setting Direction**

SN	Items	Respondents Type				t-value	p-value
		Teachers (N=135)		School Leaders (N=80)			
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1	Developing a set of annual school-wide goals focused on student learning	2.40	1.34	2.95	.998	-2.16	.031*
2	Express confidence on the direction of goals to be achieved	2.48	1.22	3.14	1.12	-4.25	.000*
3	Setting common vision, mission and goals of the future for instructional leadership improve	2.62	1.24	2.86	1.05	-1.53	.127
4	Use data on student academic performance when developing the school's goals	2.35	1.16	2.71	1.26	2.31	.022*

5	Communicate the school's goals effectively to staff, student and parents	2.42	1.32	2.79	1.29	2.22	.027*
6	Ensure the school's goals are reflected in highly visible displays in the schools	2.27	1.11	2.84	.956	-1.12	.007
7	The school plan have clear objectives of what can be achieved in the future	2.57	1.22	2.65	1.23	-.476	.634
8	Demonstrate high expectations for teachers' work with students	3.18	1.36	2.67	1.14	3.12	.002*
9	Provides useful assistance to teachers in setting short term goals	2.44	1.42	3.03	1.21	-2.12	.035*
10	Establish measurable goals aligned to the vision and mission of instructional improvement for every leaders	2.32	1.29	2.83	1.42	.575	.566
11	Provide direction through actions that demonstrate his/her expectations for quality and high performance from staff	2.76	1.27	2.53	1.25	1.42	.155

Note: VL= Very Low (1.00-1.49) L=Low (1.50-2.49) M= Medium (2.50-3.49) H=High (3.50-4.49) VH=Very High (4.50-5.00). M- is mean, SD- is standard deviation, t-is independent sample t-test and p-value.

As it can be seen in Table 4, item 1, regarding school develops a set of annual school-wide goals focused on student learning. In this regard, the computed mean score result of teachers (M=2.40, SD=1.34) indicated as low developing a set of annual school-wide goals focused on student learning and school leaders (M=2.95, SD=.998) reported as medium level on the issue. On the other hand, the calculated t-value (t= -2.16, $p < 0.05$) show there is a significant difference between two groups. Interview supervisor asserted that:Regarding to setting mission and vision in relation developing a set of annual school-wide goals not focused on student learning. This is due to school leaders do not effectively participate stakeholders during developing school annual wide goal.

Table 4 item 2, concerning to express confidence on the direction of goals to be achieved. In this regard, the computed mean score result for teachers (M=2.48, SD=1.22) and school leaders (M=3.14, SD=1.12) indicated that express confidence on the direction of goals to be achieved is medium. On the others hand, the calculated t-test value (t=-4.25, $p<0.05$) showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. One of the interviewed Woreda education office expert asserted that most of time in our education office monitor and evaluate of school leaders leadership practice particularly setting direction were poorly express confidence on the direction of goals to be achieved. This is because school leaders lack of confidence on the direction of goals to be achieved.

As indicated in same Table of item 3, the mean score of teachers (M=2.62, SD=1.24) and school leaders (M=2.86, SD=1.05) showed that medium level about the setting common vision, mission and goals of the future for instructional leadership improve. This is proven by calculated t-test value (t=-1.53, $p>0.05$). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. In general, data showed that school leadership setting common vision; mission and goals of the future for instructional leadership improve not enough. In the same way, Hallinger's (2003) school leadership found that mission-building activities on the part of principals are the most influential set of leadership practices and the synthesis of evidence by practices they associated with establishing goals and expectations. In addition, one the interview participant of Woreda education office expert reported that during monitoring and evaluation school leaders are inadequately capable enough to establishing a common vision, mission, values and beliefs and not communicate these issues. This is due to schools leaders' lack of commitment and continuous support from supervisors in order to improving instructional leadership practices (Personal communication, January, 2022).

Further, it can be observed from the same Table of item 4, respondents were requested school leaders use data on student academic performance when developing the school's goals. The mean scores of teachers (M=2.35, SD=1.16) indicated that medium and that of school leaders (M=2.71, SD=1.26) showed that use data on student academic

performance when developing the school's goals is medium. This is proven by calculated t-test value (t=2.31, p>0.05) shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue with regard to the use of data on student academic performance when developing instructional leadership practices.

As indicated in Table 4, item 5, asks for communicate the school's goals effectively to staff, student and parents. In this regard, the computed mean score for teachers are performed low (M=2.42, SD=132) and school leaders (M=2.79, SD=1.29) showed that medium on the same issue. On the other hand, t-test value (t=1.29, P<0.05) showed that there is medium significant difference between teachers and school leaders respondents in relation to communicate the school's goals effectively to staff, student and parents. On the other hand (William & Carolyn, 2005) critical aspect of leadership work is helping a group develop shared understandings about the organization and its goals that can frame a sense of purpose or vision.

As can see in Table 4 of item 6, regarding to ensure the school's goals are reflected in highly visible displays in the schools. In this regard, the computed mean for teachers (M=2.37, SD=1.11) showed low level on the issue and while school leaders (M=2.84, SD=.956) indicated medium level on the same issue. This is confirmed by the t- test value (t=-1.12, P<0.05). It showed that there is a significant difference between teachers and school leaders' respondents in relation to ensure that the school's goals are reflected in highly visible displays in the schools. Leadership that influences classroom practice to develop compelling missions and goals, establish cultures of collaboration and trust and encourage instructional leadership improvement, draw teachers together to engage in joint work to improve teaching and learning (Printy, 2010).

As indicated in Table 4, item 7, the school plan has clean objectives of what can be achieved in the future. In this regard, the computed mean score for teachers' are performed medium (M=2.57, SD=1.22) and school leaders (M=2.65, SD=1.23) showed that medium on the same issue. On the other hand, t- test value (t=-.476, P>0.05) conformed that there is significant difference between teachers and school leaders respondents' about the school plan have clean objectives of what can be achieved in the future. Therefore, it is possible to realize that the school plan have no clean objectives of what can be achieved in the future. The success of institutional planning depends on the dynamism and interest of the head and effective school leaders should look at the system as whole, asses the strengths and weaknesses and carefully create a feeling of readiness for change (Temesgen, 2011).

As it can be seen in Table 4, item 8, asked for school leaders demonstrate high expectations for teachers' work with students. In this regard, the calculated mean of teachers (M=3.18, SD=1.36) and school leaders (M=2.67, SD=1.14) showed that leaders demonstrate high expectations for teachers' work with students. On the other hand, the calculated t-test value (t=3.12, p<0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the teachers and school leaders on the issue. Therefore, data showed that school leaders demonstrate expectations for teachers' work with students are substandard.

Table 4, item 9, respondents were requested that school leaders provides useful assistance to teachers in setting short term goals for teaching and learning or not. On this concern, the calculated mean of teachers (M=2.44, SD=1.42) showed medium level on the item and on the other hand school leaders (M=3.03, SD= 1.21) performed medium level about school leaders provides useful assistance to teachers in setting short term goals for teaching and learning. On the other hand, the calculated t-test value (t=-2.12, p<0.05) showed that there is statistically significant difference between the teachers and school leaders on the issue. School leaders provide useful assistance to teachers in setting short term goals for teaching and learning is low. Similarly, Cotton (2003) state that principal's role seems very far disinterested from the daily routines of teaching and learning that most affect instructional leadership improvement. On the other hand, leaders' skill in motivating and supporting teachers in using the most effective instructional approaches, many principals report that they feel a bit "helpless" in directly affecting instructional leadership improvement.

Further, it can be seen from above table of the item 10, the respondents were needed to show their level of the agreement about school leaders establishes measurable goals aligned to the vision and mission of instructional improvement for every leaders or not. In this regard, the calculated mean of teachers (M=2.32, SD=1.29) indicated

low and school leaders (M=2.83, SD=1.42) showed that moderate about school leaders establish measurable goals aligned to the vision and mission of instructional improvement for every leaders. On the other hand, the calculated t-test value (t=.575, p>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the teachers and school leaders on the issue. Similarly, data showed that school leaders unable to establish measurable goals aligned to the vision and mission of instructional improvement for every leader.

As indicated in same Table 4, item 11, respondents were requested school leaders provide direction through actions that demonstrate his/her expectations for quality and high performance from staff. On this concern, the calculated mean of teachers (M=2.76, SD=1.27) and school leaders (M=2.53, SD=1.25) showed that medium concerning to provide direction through actions that demonstrate his/her expectations for quality and high performance from staff. On the other hand, the calculated t-test value (t=1.42, p>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the teachers and school leaders on the issue. Therefore, data showed that school leaders provide direction through actions that demonstrate his/her expectations for quality and high performance from staff were inadequate. In addition, (William & Carolyn, 2005) describes high expectations can help organizational members see the challenging nature of the goals being pursued, while also making it clear that the expectations are feasible.

The perception of teachers about the instructional leadership practices

The following table presents about the perception of teachers towards instructional leadership practices such as develop different programs and time tables that improve the instruction, follow-up whether the educational activities are carried out in accordance with the plan or no, assist and give constructive feedbacks that improves teachers performance in teaching, considering ideas and suggestion of teachers in enhancing instructional practices in the school, working cooperatively with staff for solving problems and making participatory decisions, providing adequate school facilities that enable to facilitate the teaching learning process and actively working to enhance teachers instructional practices. These are presented in table 5 below.

Table 5: **The perception of teachers about the instructional leadership practices**

S N	Items		Descriptive Statics						
			Teachers (N=135)					Mean	SD
			SDA	DA	M	A	SA		
1	Skillfully develop different programs that improve the instruction	N	46	60	15	8	6	2.07	.940
		%	34.1	44.4	11.1	5.9	4.4		
2	Take more of their time to follow whether the educational activities are carried out in accordance with the plan or no	N	34	71	13	11	6	2.98	.851
		%	25.2	52.6	9.6	8.1	4.4		
3	Continuously give constructive feedbacks that improves teachers performance in teaching	N	63	36	13	13	10	2.57	.924
		%	46.6	26.7	9.6	9.6	7.4		
4	Consider ideas and suggestion of teachers instructional practices in the school	N	27	62	29	9	8	2.69	.948
		%	20	45.9	21.5	6.7	5.9		
5	Work cooperatively with staff for solving problems and making participatory decisions	N	61	50	9	8	7	2.54	.861
		%	45.2	37	6.7	5.9	5.2		
6	Provide adequate school facilities that enable to facilitate the teaching learning process	N	56	40	20	12	7	2.40	1.29
		%	41.5	29.6	14.8	8.9	5.2		
7	Encourage staff attendance at workshop, seminar and conference to update them on current issues	N	59	30	22	13	11	2.44	1.69
		%	43.7	22.2	16.3	9.6	8.1		
8	Actively work in enhance teachers	N	55	44	17	9	6	2.50	1.26

	instructional practices	%	40.7	32.6	12.6	6.7	4.4		
9	Encourage internal supervision to enhance the teaching learning process	N	55	46	16	10	8	2.39	1.51
		%	40.7	34.1	11.9	7.4	5.9		
10	Delegate responsibility of work to promote teachers instructional activities	N	61	43	13	9	9	2.29	1.31
		%	45.2	31.9	9.6	6.7	6.7		

Note: SDA= Strongly Disagree (1.00-1.49) DA= Disagree (1.50-2.49) UD= Undecided (2.50-3.49) A= Agree (3.50-4.49) SA= Strongly Agree (4.50-5.00). M- is mean, SD- is standard deviation.

As it can be seen in Table 5, item 1, concerning school leaders develop different programs that improve the instruction, in this regard, 78.5% of respondents indicated that school leaders didn't skillfully develop different programs that improve the instruction while 10.4% of participants revealed that principals skillfully develop different programs that improve the instruction. On the other hand, the mean score (M=2.07, SD=.940) indicated that school leaders inadequately develop different programs to enhance teachers instructional leadership practices.

Table 5, item 2, asked for instructional leaders take more of their time to follow whether the educational activities are carried out in accordance with the plan or not, in this regard, 77.8% of respondents indicated that school leaders didn't take of their time to follow whether the educational activities are carried out in accordance with the plan while 12.5% of take more of their time to follow whether the educational activities are carried out in accordance with the plan. On the other hand, the mean score (M=2.98, SD=.851) indicated that teachers inadequately take of their time to follow whether the educational activities are carried out in accordance with the plan.

Table 5, item 3, respondents were requested that school leaders continuously give constructive feedbacks that improves teachers performance in teaching or not. On this concern, 73.3% of respondents indicated that teachers don't give constructive feedbacks that improve teachers' performance in teaching while 19.2% of participants revealed that school leaders give constructive feedbacks that improve teachers' performance in teaching. On the other hand, 10% of participants indicated that school leaders continuously give constructive feedbacks that improve teachers' performance in teaching at medium level. On the other hand, the mean score (M=2.57, SD=.924) indicated that school leaders constructive feedbacks that improves teachers performance in the reasonable enhance teachers instructional leadership practices.

As it can be seen in table 5, item 4, respondents were requested that to show their level of agreement about school leaders consider ideas and suggestion of teachers' instructional practices in the school. In this regard, 65.9% of respondents indicated that school leaders don't consider ideas and suggestion of teachers' instructional practices in the school while 12.6% of participants revealed that school leaders consider ideas and suggestion of teachers' instructional practices in the school. On the other hand, the mean score (M=2.69, SD=.948) indicated that school leaders moderately consider ideas and suggestion of teachers instructional practices in the school.

Table 5, item 5, respondents were requested that school leaders work cooperatively with teachers for solving problems and making participatory decisions or not. On this concern, 82.2% of respondents indicated that school leaders don't work cooperatively with staff for solving problems and making participatory decisions while 11.1% of participants revealed that school leaders work cooperatively with staff for solving problems and making participatory decisions. On the other hand, 6.7% of participants indicated that work with staff for solving problems and making participatory decisions at undecided level. On the other hand, the mean score (M=2.54, SD=.861) indicated that teachers insufficiently work with staff for solving problems and making participatory decisions.

Table 5, item 6, asked for school leaders provide adequate school facilities that enable to facilitate the teaching learning process, in this regard, 71.1% of respondents indicated that school leaders don't provide adequate school facilities that enable to facilitate the teaching learning process while 14.1% of respondents revealed that school leaders provide adequate school facilities that enable to facilitate the teaching learning process. On the other hand, 14.8% of respondents indicated that leaders provide adequate school facilities that enable to facilitate the teaching learning process at medium level. On the other hand, the mean score (M=2.40, SD=1.29) indicated that school leaders inadequately provide adequate school facilities that enable to facilitate the teaching learning process.

As it can be seen in Table 5, item 7, concerning school leaders encouraging staff to attend workshops, seminars and conferences to update them on current issues, in this regard, 65.9% of respondents indicated that school leaders

encouraging staff to attend workshops, seminars and conferences to update them on current issues is low while 17.7% of respondents revealed that school leaders encourage staff to attend workshops, seminars and conferences to update them on current issues. On the other hand, 16.3% of respondents indicated that school encourages staff to attend at workshops, seminars and conferences to update them on current issues at medium level. On the other hand, the mean score (M=2.44, SD=1.69) indicated that school leaders insufficiently encourage staff to attend workshops, seminars and conferences to update them on current issues.

Table 5, item 8, respondents were requested that school leaders actively work in enhance teachers instructional practices or not, in this regard, 73.3% of respondents indicated that school leaders showed that instructional leaders insufficiently work in enhance teachers instructional practices while 11.1% of respondents revealed that school leaders actively work in enhance teachers instructional practices. On the other hand, 12.6% of respondents indicated that instructional leaders at medium level works in enhance teachers' instructional practices. On the other hand, the mean score (M=2.50, SD=1.26) indicated that school leaders poorly work in enhance teachers instructional practices.

As it can be seen in Table 5, item 9, concerning school leaders encouraging internal supervision to enhance the teaching learning process, in this regard, 73.3% of respondents indicated that school leaders encouraging internal supervision to enhance the teaching learning process is low while 11.1% of respondents revealed that leaders encouraging internal supervision to enhance the teaching learning process. On the other hand, 12.6% of respondents indicated that school leaders encouraging internal supervision to enhance the teaching learning process at medium level. On the other hand, the mean score (M=2.39, SD=1.51) indicated that school leaders encourage internal supervision to enhance the teaching learning process in order to enhancing teachers instructional practices.

As it can be seen in Table 5, item 10, respondents were requested that school leaders delegate responsibility work to promote teachers instructional activities or not, in this regard, 77.1% of respondents indicated that school leaders don't delegate responsibility of work to promote teachers instructional activities while 13.4% of respondents revealed that school leaders delegate responsibility of work to promote teachers instructional activities. On the other hand, 9.6% of respondents showed that school leaders delegate work to promote teachers instructional activities at medium level. On the other hand, the mean score (M=2.29, SD=1.31) showed that school leaders poorly delegate responsibility of work to promote teachers instructional activities.

4.5 The challenges faced by school leaders in the process of practicing instructional leadership

The following table presents about thechallenges encountered by school leaders in the implementation of instructional leadershipincludes lack of adequate training towards school leadership and management, lack of courage and commitment of the principals and lack of confidence on the part of principals to exercise leadership, lack of experience to manage and mobilize the school community towards shared goals, shortage of adequate guidance and support from higher official. These are presented in table 6 below.

Table 6: **The challenges faced by practicing instructional leadership**

SN	Items	Respondents Type				t-value	p-value
		Teachers (N=135)		School leaders (N=80)			
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1	Lack of adequate classroom in the school	3.56	1.23	3.76	.678	-1.66	.098
2	Lack of facilitating favorable conditions to make parents to participate in different school activities	3.55	1.22	3.86	.571	2.68	.078
3	Shortage of teaching materials such as text book and stationary	3.70	1.29	3.90	.402	1.94	.053
4	Lack of adequate training towards school leadership and management	3.63	1.22	4.23	.430	2.30	0.22

5	Lack of experience to mobilize the school community towards shared	4.12	1.51	3.66	.884	3.00	.003
6	Lack of regular supervisory support from the concerned education officials	4.40	1.20	3.70	.915	-1.86	.064
7	Administrative work load	3.42	1.46	3.80	.761	-1.46	.145
8	Resource constraint to each activity	3.95	1.24	3.63	.808	2.12	.035
9	Shortage of adequate guidance and support from higher official	3.60	1.59	4.10	.607	-.874	.383
10	Unwillingness of leaders to allow shared leadership	4.10	1.45	4.23	.430	-2.13	.034
11	Lack of courage and commitment of the principals	4.06	1.13	3.83	.647	2.91	.004
12	Lack of confidence on the part of principals to exercise leadership	4.31	.858	3.96	.182	3.00	.003
13	Teachers' resistance to change	4.29	.818	4.00	.000	-1.34	.181
14	Teachers lack of commitment	4.12	.982	3.80	.761	-.841	.402
15	Teachers turnover	3.50	1.47	3.93	.253	-.918	.360
16	Untimely transfer of teachers	4.08	.999	3.90	.305	-3.27	.001

Key: SDA= Strongly Disagree (1.00-1.49) DA= Disagree (1.50-2.49) UD= Undecided (2.50-3.49) A=Agree (3.50-4.49) SA=Strongly Agree (4.50-5.00). M- is mean, SD- is standard deviation, t-is independent sample t-test and p-value.

As it can be seen in Table 6, teachers rated lack of regular supervisory support from the concerned education officials (M=4.40, SD=1.20), teachers' resistance to change (M=4.29, SD=.818), lack of confidence on the part of principals to exercise leadership (M=4.31, SD=.858), teachers lack of commitment (M=4.12, SD=982), lack of experience to manage and mobilize the school community towards shared goals (M=4.12, SD=1.51), unwillingness of leaders to allow shared leadership (M=4.10, SD=1.45), lack of courage and commitment of the principals (M=4.06, SD=1.13), resource constraint to each activity (M=3.95, SD=1.24), shortage of teaching materials such as text book, stationary (M=3.70, SD=1.29), lack of adequate training towards school leadership and management (M=3.63, SD=1.22), shortage of adequate guidance and support from higher official (M=3.60, SD=1.59), lack of adequate class room in the school (M=3.56, SD=1.23), lack of facilitating favorable conditions to make parents to participate in different school activities (M=3.55, SD=1.22), teachers turnover (M=3.50, SD=1.47) and administrative work load (M=3.42, SD=1.46) were reported as the challenges faced by school leaders in the process of practicing instructional leadership.

On the other hand school leaders respondents rated that lack of adequate training towards school leadership and management (M=4.23, SD=.430), unwillingness of leaders to allow shared leadership (M=4.23, SD=.430), shortage of adequate guidance and support from higher official (M=4.10, SD=.607), teachers' resistance to change (M=4.00, SD=.000), lack of confidence on the part of principals to exercise leadership (M=3.96, SD=.182), teachers turnover (M=3.93, SD=.253), shortage of teaching materials such as text book, stationary (M=3.90, SD=.402), untimely transfer of teachers (M=3.90, SD=.305), lack of facilitating favorable conditions to make parents to participate in different school activities (M=3.86, SD=.571), lack of courage and commitment of the principals (M=3.83, SD=.647), teachers lack of commitment (M=3.80, SD=.761), administrative work load (M=3.80, SD=.761), lack of adequate class room in the school (M=3.76, SD=.678), lack of regular supervisory support from the concerned education officials (M=3.70, SD=.915), lack of experience to manage and mobilize the school community towards shared goals (M=3.66, SD=.884), resource constraint to each activity (M=3.63, SD=.808) were reported the challenges faced by school leaders in the process of practicing leadership.

Therefore, both respondents reported that unwillingness of leaders to allow shared leadership (M=4.16), teachers' resistance to change (M=4.14), lack of confidence on the part of principals to exercise leadership (M=4.13), lack of regular supervisory support from the concerned education officials (M=4.05) were found to be very sever challenges

faced by school leaders in the process of practicing instructional leadership. Untimely transfer of teachers (M=3.99), teachers lack of commitment (M=3.96), lack of courage and commitment of the principals (M=3.94), lack of experience to manage and mobilize the school community towards shared goals (M=3.89), shortage of adequate guidance and support from higher official (M=3.85) and shortage of teaching materials such as text book and stationary (M=3.80) were reported as moderate challenges faced by school leaders in the process of practicing instructional leadership. On the other hand, resource constraint to each activity (M=3.79), teachers turnover (M=3.71), lack of facilitating favorable conditions to make parents to participate in different school activities (M=3.70), lack of adequate class room in the school (M=3.66) and administrative work load (M=3.61) were reported least challenges faced by school leaders in the process of practicing instructional leadership. Purkey and Smith (2002:341) have identified school leadership as one of the major factors in promoting' instructional leadership practices. They clarify that this factors emphasize strong leadership from administrator, teachers or integrated teams are important in initiating and maintaining the improvement processes. In order to achieve the school's main objective i.e. render the quality education and produce all rounded effective citizen, the healthy and conducive teaching and learning environment must be needed and effective instructional leaders expected to play great role to maintain it.

In the same way, the above items (4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12 & 16) t-test and p-value result conformed that there is statistically significant difference between the teachers and school leaders' respondents. Therefore, one can realized that teachers and school leaders were not rated the major factors hinders by practicing instructional leadership. This means two group of respondents reported different numerical data rated either agree or strongly are. Therefore, between teachers and school leaders respondents have rated different rating scale. Whereas the items (8) i.e. (1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 13, 14 & 15) t-test and p-value showed that there is no statistically significant difference between two groups of respondents about the major factors hinders by practicing instructional leadership. Therefore, the p-value conform that teachers and school leaders there is no difference in relation to major factors hinders by practicing instructional leadership. This means teachers and school leaders agreed up on the issue concerning major factors hinders by practicing instructional leadership.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions were drawn:

It can be concluded thattheschool leaders are practiced instructional leadership to treat other as individual, able to assemble resource for certain task achievement and extent of principals modeling best practice of the school were low. It can be concluded that if principals are not playing their practiced instructional leadership will be obviously hampered or affected teaching learning process in the schools under study. It can also be concluded that the perception of teachers towards instructional leadership practices to develop different programs and time tables to improve the instruction, assist and give constructive feedbacks that improves teachers performance in teaching and working cooperatively with staff for solving problems and making was low. This may affect the effective implementation of instructional leadership practices in general and teaching learning process in particular.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study and conclusion drawn, the following recommendations were forwarded. The school leaders need to play their instructional leadership roles appropriately in participating stakeholders in instructional practice. The school leader shall setting direction to promote school mission and vision in order to effective implementation instructional leadership practice in the school. School leaders are advised to spend more of their time on enhancing teaching and learning process in order to support students' learning by practicing instructional leadership. School leaders need to give chance or opportunity for the involvement of teachers, parents and students in decision making, delegation of authority so as to allow for better enhancing instructional practices of leadership. There should be Teachers' professional development which enhances instructional practices of teachers and student learning need to be strengthened in schools.

Acknowledgments

I am glad to thanks Furra institute of developmental studies and education for encouraging me to conduct this research.

Financial support

There is financial support from Furra institute of developmental studies and education for to conduct this research.

References

1. *Addis Shonde (2014). The challenges and roles of Instructional Leadership in Government preparatory Schools. (AAU, Unpublished MA Thesis)*
2. *Ahmed, Aragawe, (2006). A comparative study of managerial effectiveness between government and private high school of Addis Ababa. AAU: Unpublished MA thesis.*
3. *AkliluTefera (2011). Instructional leadership practice in the secondary school of Sheka Zone.*
4. *Alemayehu Temesgen (2013). Educational leadership problems of government secondary school principals in East Shewa Zone of Oromia Regional State.*
5. *Andrews, Bason and Basom (2001). Testing a conception of how school leadership influences student learning. Educational Administration Quarterly. 46(5):671–706.*
6. *Beare, H., Caldwell, B., & Millikan, R. (1999).Creating an Excellent School.London: Routledge*
7. *Bennis, W. and Nanus, B. (1995).Leaders, New York, Harper and Row.*
8. *Best and Kahn (2006).Research in Education (10thed.). New Delhi: V.K. Barta at Peart Offset Press Pvt. Ltd.*
9. *Best,J.W.,andKhan,J.W.(2003). Research in Education.(7th ed.). New Delhi:Prentice Hall of India Pvt.Ltd.*
10. *Cohen, L., Manion, L., and Morrison, K. (2007).Research methods in education.(5th ed.).London: Routledge.*
11. *Creswell, J.W. (2003). Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among five approaches (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.*
12. *Creswell, J.W., and Plano Clark. (2007). Research design; Qualitative, Quantities and mixed methods Approaches (3r Ed.).Los Angeles: SAG Publication, Inc.*
13. *Darling-Hammond, L., (2002).The research and rhetoric on teacher certification: Aresponse to "Teacher certification reconsidered." Educational Policy Analysis Archives.*
14. *Zaidatol A. L.andBagheri A. (2009). Entrepreneurship as a center choice: An analysis of entrepreneurial self- efficiency and intention of university student. European Journal of social science, 9(2): 338-346.*