



DILLA UNIVERSITY

**INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL
SCIENCES**

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND
MANAGEMENT**

**Practices of Instructional Leadership in Supporting
Teachers' Teaching in Government General Secondary
Schools of Guji Zone**

By:

TESFAYE KEBEDE

DECEMBER, 2019

DILLA, ETHIOPIA

**PRACTICES OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP IN
SUPPORTING TEACHERS' TEACHING IN GOVERNMENT
GENERAL SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF GUJI ZONE**

BY:

TESFAYE KEBEDE

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE
STUDIES DILLA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTERS OF ART
IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP**

ADVISOR: DESALEGN BEYENE (PHD)

CO- ADVISOR: BERHANU MOYATA (MA)

**DILLA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND
MANAGEMENT**

DECEMBER, 2019

DILLA, ETHIOPIA

ADVISOR’S APPROVAL SHEET

As the thesis research advisor, we hereby certify that we have read and evaluated this thesis prepared under our guidance by **Tesfaye Kebede** entitled a study on “*practices of instructional leadership in supporting teachers’ teaching in government general secondary schools of Guji Zone*”.

I recommended that it could be submitted as fulfilling the thesis requirement.

Name	Signature	Date
DESALEGN BEYENE (PhD)	-----	-----
Advisor:		
BERHANU MOYATA (MA)	_____	_____
Co- Advisor:		

BOARD OF EXAMINERS' APPROVAL SHEET

DILLA UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

As members of the Board of Examiners of the M.A thesis open defense examination, we certify that we have read and evaluated the thesis prepared by **Tesfaye Kebede** and examined the candidate. We recommend that the thesis be accepted as fulfilling the thesis requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in School Leadership.

Name	Signature	Date
.....
Department head		
.....
Chair person		
.....
External examiner		
.....
Internal examiner		

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis entitled, “ *Practices of Instructional Leadership in Supporting Teachers’ teaching in Government General Secondary School of Guji Zone*”, is my original work. I also declare that all the sources of material used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged with complete references.

Name: Tesfaye Kebede

Signature: _____

Date: _____

This thesis entitled, “*Practices of Instructional Leadership in Supporting Teachers in Government General Secondary School of Guji Zone*”, has been submitted for examination with our approval as academic advisor.

Advisor’s Name: **Desalgn Beyene(PhD)**

Co. Advisor’s Name: ***Berhanu M. (MA)***

Signature: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Date: _____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and for most, I would like to thank God, who is great and brought me to this level. Next, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my advisor, **Desalegn Beyene (PhD)** and co. advisor **Berhanu M. (MA)** for their valuable advice and constructive comments. Apart from my advisors, I would like to thank school principals, teachers and cluster supervisor of the sampled schools for their cooperation during data collection. Next, my deepest thank also goes to my wife, **Birtukan Wale**, for her tolerance, devotion and shouldering the greatest share of responsibility to our family during my study years. Finally, I would like to thank Dilla University for its financial support to accomplish my work in appropriate manner.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

	Page
DECLARATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES	xi
ABBREVIATIONS/ACRONYMS	xii
ABSTRACT	xiii
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	3
1.3. The Basic Questions	6
1.4. Objectives of the study	6
1.4.1. General objectives	6
1.4.2. Specific Objectives	6
1.5. Significance of the Study	6
1.6. Delimitation of the study	7
1.7. Limitations of the study	7
1.8. Operational Definitions of Key Terms	8
1.9. Organization of the Study	8
CHAPTER TWO	8
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	8
2.1. Conceptual Definitions of Instructional Leadership	9
2.2. Models of Instructional Leadership	10
2.3. The Roles and Responsibilities of Instructional Leadership	11
2.3.1. The roles of instructional leadership	11
2.3.1.1. Program coordination	12

2.3.1.2. Program evaluation	12
2.3.1.3. Direct Assistance	12
2.3.1.4. Action Research	12
2.3.1.5. Curriculum Development:.....	12
2.3.2. The roles and responsibilities of principal as instructional leader.....	14
2.3.3. The roles and responsibilities of teachers as instructional leaders.....	16
2.3.4. The roles and responsibilities of department heads as instructional leaders.....	17
2.3.5. The Roles and responsibilities of Supervisors as Instructional leaders.....	18
2.3.5.1. As coordinator.....	18
2.3.5.2. As consultant.....	18
2.3.5.3. As group leader	19
2.3.5.4. As evaluator	19
2.4. Practice of Instructional Leadership	19
2.4.1. Setting school vision and defining the school mission.....	19
2.4.1.1. Setting the school vision	19
2.4.1.2. Defining the school mission.....	21
2.4.2. Managing curriculum and instruction.....	23
2.4.3. Supervising and Evaluating Instruction.....	23
2.4.4. Monitoring instructional program.....	24
2.4.5. Creating conducive and healthy school environment.....	24
2.4.6. Teaching-learning roles instructional leadership.....	26
2.4.6.1. Promoting Professional Skill Development:.....	27
2.4.6.2. Encourage initial leadership training	29
2.4.6.3. Organize induction programs:.....	29
2.4.6.4. Ensure in-service training to cover need and context	29
2.5. Building Effective Relationship in Schools	30
2.6. Conflict Management Role of Instructional Leaders in School.....	30
2.7. Overview of Instructional Leadership in Ethiopia	31
2.8. Challenges for Instructional Leadership Effectiveness.....	33
2.8.1. Lack of skills and training.....	34

2.8.2. Lack of cooperation from superiors and community.....	35
2.8.3. Lack of time.....	35
2.8.4. Lack of adequate resource.....	35
2.8.5. Lack of vision, will and courage.....	35
CHAPTER THREE	36
THE RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY.....	36
3.1. Design of the study	36
3.2. Research Methodology	37
3.3. Sources of Data.....	37
3.4. Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques.....	38
3.5. Data Collection Instruments	39
3.5.1. Questionnaires.....	39
3.5.2. Interview.....	40
3.5.3. Focus group discussion.....	40
3.5.4. Document analysis.....	41
3.6. Validity of the Instruments	41
3.7. Reliability of the Instruments.....	42
3.8. Procedures for Data Collection.....	42
3.9. Method of Data Analysis	43
3.10. Ethical Considerations	43
CHAPTER FOUR.....	45
DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	45
4.1. Background of Respondents	46
4.2. Data Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of the study	50
4.2.1. Practices of Instructional Leadership as a Role of Instructional Leaders.....	50
4.2.2. School Instructional Leaders Provide Professional Support for Teachers.....	55
4.2.2.1. Engaging of Teachers in Setting the School Vision and Mission	55
4.2.2.2. Promoting the Implementation of School Curriculum and Instruction.....	61
4.2.2.3. Supervising and Evaluating Instruction Program	67

4.2.2.4. Promoting Teachers’ Professional Skill Development	71
4.2.2.5. Building Effective Relations in School.....	75
4.2.2.6. Promoting Supportive Role of Instructional Program	80
4.2.2.7. Monitoring and Directive Instructional Program.....	85
4.2.2.8. Ensure the Sustainable Way of Conflict Management	89
4.2.3 . Major Challenges that Affect Practices of Instructional Leadership	93
CHAPTER FIVE	98
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	98
5.1. Summary	98
5.2. Conclusions.....	104
5.3 Recommendations.....	105
REFERANCE	108
APPENDICES	114

LIST OF TABLES

Tables

	Page
Table 1: Target Population and Sample Size of respondents	39
Table 2: Background of the Respondents	47
Table 3: Practice of instructional leadership in school	51
Table 4: Engaging of teachers in setting school vision and mission	56
Table 5: Promoting the implementation of school curriculum and instruction	62
Table 6: Supervising and evaluating instructional program	67
Table 7: Promoting teachers professional skill development	72
Table 8: Building effective relationship in school	76
Table 9: Promoting supportive roles of instructional program	81
Table 10: Monitoring and directive program	86
Table 11: Ensuring the sustainable way of conflict management	90
Table 12: Major challenges that affect the practices of instructional leadership	94

ABBREVIATIONS/ACRONYMS

CPD-	Continuous Professional Development
ETP-	Ethiopian Training Policy
FGD-	Focus Group Discussion
MoE-	Ministry of Education
PTA -	Parent Teachers Association
SPSS-	Statistical Package for Social Science
TGE-	Transitional Government of Ethiopia

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate practices of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in the government general secondary schools of the Guji Zone. In order to meet the objectives of the study, an explanatory sequential mixed design and descriptive survey mixed research method was employed. Six Woredas: (Bore woreda, Ana Sora woreda, Adola Woyu, Adola Rede woreda, Wadara Woreda and Negele woreda) were addressed by this study. The researcher incorporated 59.34% (162) of the sample populations as respondents. Fifty four instructional leaders (main and vice principals, unit leaders and department heads) in the schools, 102 teachers, 6 school cluster supervisors were primary sources of data. Questionnaires, interviews and document analyses and focus group discussion were used for the purpose of collecting relevant data. Data obtained through questionnaires were analyzed using statistical tools like mean, grand mean, average mean, standard deviation and an independent sample t-test. Moreover, data gathered through interview, document analysis and focus group discussion were considered to supplement the questionnaires in narrative form. The finding of this study revealed that practices of instructional leadership roles as a practice of instructional leaders in school were highly recognized by respondents of teachers and instructional leaders while practices of school instructional leaders to provide professional support for teachers were ineffective implementation in the sampled schools because, (91.94%) instructional leaders and cluster supervisors were subject graduate who lack knowledge, skill and training aspects of instructional leadership profession. Based on the findings, it was concluded that the practice of instructional leadership were ineffective in supporting teachers in teaching instruction due to overburdened of instructional leaders: most of the time with non-academic administrative task, inadequate providing the necessary instructional material, absence of cooperation between teachers and instructional principals, lack of adequate training towards instructional leadership professions. It is good if instructional leaders give pay attention to promoting teachers' professional skill development program through identifying training needs for teachers and enhance teachers' capacity in teaching through workshop, short term training, and seminars.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter specifically deals with the background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study operational definition of key terms and organization of the study.

1.1. Background of the Study

Education is a very important sector in any country (Orji and Job, 2013). That means, without education any nation can't create & update technology, as well as there is no economic development and prosperity of a given nation. Oji and Job (2013) Struggled that being a major investment in human capital growth, education plays a significant role in a long-term productivity and development at both micro and macro levels. So, we can say that education is the corner stone for rapid economic and social development of any country in the world. Specially, quality education must be realized to accelerate the sustainable economic development of Ethiopia, because it is the base to achieve the development of all other sectors. It should be quality education that uses quality and relevant inputs to produce quality output. Among major contributors to the quality education, the role of instructional leadership practice to support teachers' performance on teaching is the major one. Instructional leadership including principals, vice principals, head department, unit leaders, cluster supervisors, PTA (parent teachers/students association) and school board (Tadese, 2014). But for this study, instructional leadership including only main principal, vice principal, head department, unit leaders and school cluster supervisors were incorporated, because of shortage of time and finance.

Different scholars' defines instructional leadership in different condition. Mc Ewan (2003) define instructional leadership is the creation of good climate where the principal, department, students, parents, and school board are able to work together to accomplish the task of education. In support of this idea King (2002) asserted that the role instructional leadership differs from that of traditional school administrator in a number

of meaning full ways: whereas the conventional head of school spends majority of his/her time dealing strictly with administrative duties, the head of school who is an instructional leader is charged with redefining his/her role to become the primary learner in a community striving for excellence in education. Jita (2010) again stated that instructional leaders go beyond the traditional role of school administrators and spend a lot more time focusing on developing knowledge and implementation of the curriculum, as well as instruction and assessment. As such, it becomes the head of school's responsibility to work with teachers to manage the instructional programme.

Hoy & Miskel, (2008) added that instructional leadership is an educational leadership that focuses on the core responsibility of a school teaching and learning, by defining the school vision, mission and goals, managing the instructional programme and promoting the school climate Instructional leadership is crucial for the success of school based leadership. Whitaker (1997) explained effective instructional leadership to be resource providers, to be instructional resources, to be good communicators, and to create visible presence at school. Spillane (2004, cited in Silvestre, 2011) state instructional leadership as the identification, acquisition, allocation, coordination and use of social, material resources necessary to establish the conditions for the possibility of teaching and learning. Globally, scholars agree that instructional leadership is one of the most useful tools for creating an effective teaching and learning environment (Heaton & Lewis, Pustejovsky, Spillane, 2009; Hal linger & Walker, 2014).

As national concept in Ethiopia after the downfall of the Derg regime education has been given due attention and direction with an education and training policy declared during Transitional Government of Ethiopia (1994). As clearly stated in the ETP document (1994), educational management will be decentralized specially as institutional level and schools become autonomous in their internal administration. MoE (2013) provided different strategies, programs, guidelines, standards and giving education opportunities for instructional leadership and teachers through up-date and up-grade how to develop of their professionals at school.

However, the implementation of proper monitoring, follow up and take measurement by the government is not serious. Because, the changes observed and the results obtained in government general secondary schools were very low, the problem is the way of practical implementation at work place. That means the role of instructional leadership is not properly touch the ground to support teachers in order to supporting teachers in teaching as it expected. Duke and Leithwood (1998) described instructional leadership as focusing on the behaviours of teachers as they engage in activities directly affecting the growth of students learning.

Moreover, the fact that instructional leadership is the crucial one in promoting teachers' instructional practices and students' leanings (World Bank, 2010). Therefore, the study attempts to measure the role of instructional leadership practice related in supporting teachers in teaching in government general secondary schools of Guji Zone.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The practice of instructional leadership is one of the most crucial in supporting teachers in teaching. So instructional leaders to be success he /she exercise the necessary support, guide, advice and close interaction with teachers. Because without teachers no more effective student learning and achievement. Hopkins (2001) explained instructional leadership is the collegial practice of working together with teachers and others in order to improve the quality of teaching and learning in schools. In support of this idea Goddard & Miller (2010) defend as instructional leadership is the most prevalent in educational leadership. Adisu (2014) elaborated the major objective of any instructional leadership activity is to enhance the effectiveness of teaching and learning program being carried out by creating conducive learning environment. An effective instructional leadership is a mandatory in order to create successful school that makes a difference to both teachers and students though their skills as instructional leaders (Dimmock, 1993).

As internationally, in most cases the problem with instructional leadership is related to the fact that many school leaders were not perceived as their roles as educational experts rather than their roles to be administrative only they purposely distance themselves from the classroom environment. In relation to this, Hollinger (2003) stated that in many cases

school leaders have low experts than teachers they supervise. Traditionally, the instructional roles of principals included several dimensions of administrative responsibilities (Hollinger, Lashway, 2002). According to this model, the principal were primarily responsible for managing all instructional and non instructional process in the schools. However, in current practice, principals have been expected to share their leadership responsibility with teachers and collaborative with them in supporting teachers in teaching on curriculum, instruction and assessment in order to enhance the quality of teaching and learning (Marks and Printy, 2003).

The instructional leadership has particular importance in educational administration because of its far reaching effects on the accomplishment of school programs, objectives, and educational goals (Kamal, 2016). In support of this idea, Tadese (2014) describe as instructional leadership able to promote, support and create conducive environment for effective learning and teaching activities as the whole in the schools. Instructional leadership includes principals, vice principals, head departments, unit leaders and cluster supervisors. The practices of instructional leadership vary according to the country, the conceptual frameworks developed by different leadership theorists can be implemented in different countries with different rate. In Ethiopia, especially, after the downfall of the Derg regime, education has been given due attention and direction with an education and training policy declared during transitional government of Ethiopia (TGE, 1994).

However, different researchers studied the problem facing them to implement the instructional leadership activity to bringing changes in the school systems as effective as possible. Mc Ewan (2003) described some challenges affecting the effectiveness of instructional leadership including lack of skill and training for principals, lack of teachers' cooperation, lack of time to perform instructional activities, lack of support from superintendents, and lack of vision, will or courage from principals toward instructional activities. Similarly Tesfaye (2010) Alemayehu (2011) the two prominent studies in different places, Bale and Addis Ababa respectively, verify that the role of instructional leadership practice was not effective. Accordingly, they identified the following factors, namely, teachers' resistance to change, pressure from non instructional jobs, lack of instructional feedback and lack of staff cohesiveness, and lack of training

and inefficiency in administration are the major obstacle for successful implementation of instructional leadership in the secondary schools.

Hence, as Guji Zone is one of the zones in Oromia regional state of Ethiopia, is not free from ineffective and inefficient role of instructional leadership practice in government general secondary schools. Different researchers conduct about practices of instructional leadership roles were inefficient in school in general but not focus specifically in line of practices of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in teaching. This is the research gap that differentiates from others. Particularly no any study was conducted on practices of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in teaching.

Regarding the practice of instructional leadership in the government general secondary schools of Guji Zone, since the researcher himself has been working in some of the secondary schools as teachers, department head and school principal, he has faced a lot of challenges of instructional leadership practice. In addition, there were a bitter complain from educational officials of the woreda and zonal levels regarding the poor performance of instructional leaders in relation to their leadership responsibilities, training, providing instructional resource and commitment. Because of this reason, the practice of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in teaching in the government general secondary schools of Guji Zone is inefficient as it expected. This is the gap knowledge of the researcher that has been covered. No study has been conducted to assess the role of instructional leadership practice in supporting teachers in teaching in government general secondary schools of Guji Zone. If teachers are more supported in teaching, the teachers' instructional activities will be more improved; indirectly the students' learning and achievement become more improved. Due to this reason the study area become as the researcher best knowledge. Therefore, this study attempts to assess on the role of instructional leadership practice in supporting teachers in teaching in government general secondary schools of Guji Zone in Oromia Regional state of Ethiopia with the following three basic questions:

1.3. The Basic Questions

1. What are practices of instructional leadership as a role of instructional leaders in teaching in government general secondary schools of Guji Zone?
2. To what extent do school instructional leaders provide professional support for teachers in government general secondary schools of Guji Zone?
3. . What are the major challenges that affect practices of instructional leadership in government general secondary schools of Guji Zone?

1.4. Objectives of the study

1.4.1. General objectives

The general objective of this study was to assess practices of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in government general secondary schools of Guji zone.

1.4.2. Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of this study were:

- To identify practices of instructional leadership as a role of instructional leaders in school in government general secondary schools of Guji Zone.
- To assess the extent to which school instructional leaders provide professional support for teachers in government general secondary schools of Guji Zone.
- To identify the major challenges that affects practices of instructional leadership in government general secondary schools of Guji Zone.

1.5. Significance of the Study

The results of this study would help to create awareness among government general secondary schools instructional leaders by concluding what sort of instructional leadership competences do they lack while they were leading their schools and how should they fill these gaps in order to bring changes in their respective general secondary schools. The beneficiaries of the study are including Zone educational office, Woreda education office, general secondary schools (grade 9-10) and other researchers for farther studies.

Moreover, the benefit of the study would help to create awareness for instructional leaders about practices of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in school, it will also serve as information source for Zone educational office, Woreda, educational office and Zone general secondary schools to identify the gaps existed in relation to practices of instructional leadership in supporting teachers and address the problems in the future, it will serve as stepping-stone for those who want to carry out in-depth research on the topic in the study area and it will also provide valuable information to the schools about how do they practice instructional leadership roles and enable them to take corrective actions for the major challenges they faced. Generally, based on the findings of this study, other researchers and practitioners may have a clear picture on practices of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in government general secondary schools level in the zone

1.6. Delimitation of the study

The study was carried out on the practice of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in teaching in government general secondary schools (grade 9-10) of Guji Zone, Oromia Regional State. The Zone was selected because of ease of access as well as being an area where the researcher has been working. Some of the activities of the instructional leadership there in the government general secondary schools of Guji Zone encouraged the researcher to carry out the study. There were 17 Woredas in Guji Zone and the study was delimited to 6 Woredas namely Bore, Ana Sora, Adola Woyu, Adola Rede, Wadera and Negele. And again the study was further delimited from 14 general secondary schools only to 6 government general secondary schools including Bore, Sora, Shakiso Boke, Wadera, Adola Woyu, and Negele because of the shortage resources.

1.7. Limitations of the study

This study had a number of limitations. The first important limitation was lack of to get relevant local literature because of shortage of 'internet' and 'wif' access in the area. The other limitation was that the study was conducted only on six government general secondary schools which, as the researcher feels, may affect generalization of the findings. Other important shortage of this study was failure to incorporate school Parent

Teacher Association and Woreda Educational Office which was due to shortage of time as well as financial resources. Despite the limitations, however, the researcher had made a relentless effort to manage and bring this study to a completion.

1.8. Operational Definitions of Key Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following terms were contextually defined as follows:

Government General Secondary Schools: Refers to schools grades 9–10 education levels which are financial and administrative control of under government (MoE, 1994).

Instructional Leaders: Refers to school leader namely, principals, supervisors, department heads, and unit leaders that take part in the leadership of the teaching-learning and management (Sergiovanni, 2001)

Instructional Leadership Practices: Refers to role of behavior (or) of school leaders in defining the school mission, managing curriculum and instruction, supervising instruction, monitoring student progress and promoting school learning, monitoring student progress and promoting effective learning climate

1.9. Organization of the Study

This study was organized in to five chapters. The first chapter was an introduction of the study including background, statement of the problem, basic question, objectives, significance, delimitation, limitation and operational definition of key terms of the study. The second chapter provided the review of literatures pertinent to the study. The third chapter presented the research methodology while the fourth chapter presented analysis and interpretation of the collected data through both quantitative and qualitative methods. The fifth chapter was about the summary, conclusions, and recommendation of the study.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter discussed and analyzed studies related to the practice of instructional leadership in general and in Ethiopia in particular were presented about conceptual

definitions of instructional leadership, practices of instructional leadership and finally the challenges that affect the practice of instructional leadership in school was presented.

2.1. Conceptual Definitions of Instructional Leadership

Fundamentally instructional leadership has no uniform definition that satisfies every one (Kruger, 2002). Different authors' defined instructional leadership is perceived as the behaviors and actions taken by the principal so as to enhance learners' achievement growth (Leithwood, 1999). These actions include the provision of resource, staff development and support, supervision and evaluation of instruction, protection of instruction time, and creation of an environment that is conducive for effective teaching and learning (Blasé, 2000 and Hopkins, 2001).The above definitions implies that instructional leadership means the behaviors of and actions taken by the principal towards ensuring effective teaching and learning, as well as the development and achievement of all learners. In doing so, the principal makes sure that the environment is conducive and positive for improved learners' achievement in the school.

However, Conley (cited in Kruger, 2002) define instructional leadership as specific part of educational managers' function that is carried out by the school leaders to help and provide service to teachers both as individuals and group to improve instruction and there by improve student learning. All those involved in improving instructions for the purpose of promoting student achievement that can be assumed as the role of instructional leadership.

The role of school principals has been twisted as instructional leaders play a great role in giving direction, allocating resources, supporting teachers to improve school performance in the learning outcome rather than focusing on administrative issues (McEwen 2001). Moreover, as Blasé (1999) indicated effective instructional leaders who posses both managerial and instructional leadership qualities to create conducive learning environment; help teachers to improve classroom performance; maintain academic standards and stimulates students for higher academic achievements. Fullan (2001); Anderson and Still Bennett, (2003), extending the definition state that instructional

leadership as function that emphasizes: goal and high students achievement; allocation of adequate resources for learning improvement; organization and coordination for effective and efficient outcome; and maintaining effective human relation to create collaboration and commitment among school members.

2.2. Models of Instructional Leadership

Some researchers define instructional leadership through the traits, behaviors and processes a person needs to lead a school effectively. Thus, a multitude of conceptual models that demonstrate instructional leadership exist. The three major functions of instructional leadership were defining mission, managing the instructional program and promoting a positive school climate (Hallinger, 2005). Mission focuses on framing school goals, communicating school goals; instruction was elaborated in terms of supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating curriculum and monitoring student progress. Principals created positive school climate by protecting instructional time, promoting professional development, maintaining high visibility, providing incentives for teachers, enforcing academic standards and providing incentives for students. The principal's functions consist of mostly indirect activities that help create a positive learning environment. These include creating a positive school culture, engaging in activities like making a point to visit each teacher before his or her class begins, greeting students as they enter the building, and providing common planning time for teachers who in turn develop both the students' capacity for learning and success.

Murphy (2002) broke down this dimension in to the following two major roles or behaviors of the principal: framing school goals and communicating school goals. Framing school goals refers to a principal's role to determine the areas on which the school staff will focus their attention and resources during a given school year. The emphasis is on fewer goals around which staff energy and other school resources can be utilized. A few coordinated objectives, each with manageable scope, appear to work best. The goals should incorporate data on past and current student performance and include staff responsibilities for achieving the goals. Staff and parent input during the development of the school's goals seem important. Performance goals should be

expressed in measurable terms. Communicating and explaining school goals is one of the crucial roles of the principal as an instructional leader. Clear goals and high expectations commonly shared among members of the school community are some of the characteristics of an effective school. Framing school goals encompass setting goals that emphasize achievement by all students, incorporating data on past and current student performance and including staff responsibilities for achieving the goals. Communicating goals frequently, formally and informally, to students, parents, and teachers highlights the fact that school goals guide the activities of the school.

The above concept is vital to this study because, instructional leaders can have common understanding of clear and focused mission, high expectations for students, a climate conducive to learning, opportunities to learn, and regular monitoring of students and classrooms. They can also share the understanding of the following: positive home school relations, ties, collegiality, collaboration, positive school outcomes, school culture, change, and improvement.

Success is more likely when teachers are collegial and work collaboratively on improvement activities. When teachers and administrators work cooperatively, the level of commitment, energy, and motivation is likely to be higher and change efforts are more easily implemented. Schools with professional collaboration exhibit relationships and behaviours that support quality work and effective instruction. Such a situation is conducive to complex problem-solving, extensive sharing of knowledge and stronger professional networks to share information. The results are increased job satisfaction, identification with the school and more continuous and comprehensive attempts to improve the school.

2.3. The Roles and Responsibilities of Instructional Leadership

2.3.1. The roles of instructional leadership

Regarding to this idea, George E. Pawlos and Peter F. Oliver (2008) states that, the instructional leaders have to play the following important roles in the schools. These roles

of instructional leadership are as follows: program coordination, program evaluation, direct assistance, action research, curriculum development.

2.3.1.1. Program coordination: In the role of program coordination instructional leaders coordinate program, groups, materials and reports. Since it is assumed that the instructional leaders is knowledgeable about the details of the teaching-learning process to guide and direct teachers (Glickman,2004).In order to promote the professional growth of the staff, the instructional leader has to plan, organize, evaluate and conduct in service programs for teachers in consultation with the school management and teachers.

2.3.1.2. Program evaluation: In the role of evaluator the instructional leaders help teaching staff to address important issues of teaching-learning in the classroom and ensure the conditions for effective learning in the school. As evaluators, he/she helps teachers to identify, analyze, and solve learning problems, provide timely and constructive feedback, assessing teachers to identify strengths and weakness to guide them on the path for improvement (Hollinger and Murphy, 1985).

2.3.1.3. Direct Assistance: It can be used to gather classroom data on the extent to which moral principals are present in the classroom. Leaders can work with teachers to develop observational tools to describe classroom culture reflect on current conditions and engage in the classroom based improvement(McEwen,2003).The leaders gradually can increase teacher's decision making responsibility, empowering teachers and thus enhancing the teacher's capacity to empower students.

2.3.1.4. Action Research: It helps to gather data to assess the gap between the community vision of the school and current reality, plan for change aimed at bridging the gap, integrate the task of leadership to bring about change, evaluate results, and revise action plan in the cycle of continuous improvement (Glickman, 2004).

2.3.1.5. Curriculum Development: It can involve teachers by infusing moral principles throughout the curriculum. Teachers can design a curriculum that educates the whole child, teacher's compassion and justices including, all children in significant learning. As to (Weber, 1996) teachers can develop curriculum that can integrate learning within the school and connects academic learning with community service. Finally teachers can develop the curriculum that promotes democratic community of learners in the present as well as in the future.

Generally, the maintained above instructional leadership roles are used at the school level to improve students' learning, learning outcomes, teachers profession and produce a well educated citizens at all levels. While Responsibilities of Instructional Leaders apart from establishing a vision and setting goals, effective instructional leaders place high emphasis on achieving high level of student learning and provide resources towards the effort to improve the achievements and general well-being of the students (Waters et al., 2004). In practical, these leaders constantly encourage teachers and students to attain higher levels of academic achievements; adopt collaborative planning processes, problem solving and decision-making focus on school improvements while ensuring that all school development programs are geared to make all students learn. Other elements, emphasized by the instructional leaders in high-achieving school were: discussion of instructional issues including curriculum and instruction; classroom observations and feed back to teachers; support of teacher autonomy; and risk taking; provision of professional development opportunities together with recourse; protecting instructional time; monitoring student progress data for program improvements; and recognition and celebration of student and staff achievements (Waters *et al.*, 2004).

Research has shown that instructional leaders can make a difference in school and student performance if they are granted autonomy to make important decisions. However autonomy alone does not automatically lead to improvements unless it is well supported. In addition, it is important that the core responsibilities of instructional leaders be clearly defined and delimited. Instructional leadership responsibilities should be defined through an understanding of the practices most likely to improve teaching and learning.

Instructional leaders need time, capacity and support to focus on the practices most likely to improve learning. Greater degrees of autonomy should be coupled with new models of distributed leadership, new types of accountability, and training and development for instructional leadership. Instructional leadership frameworks can help provide guidance on the main characteristics, tasks and responsibilities of effective school leaders and signal the essential character of instructional leadership as leadership for learning. They

can be a basis for consistent recruitment, training and appraisal of school leaders. Frameworks should clearly define the major domains of responsibility for school leaders and allow for contextualization for local and school-level criteria. They should be developed with involvement by the profession.

2.3.2. The roles and responsibilities of principal as instructional leader

As instructional leader, the principal is the pivotal point within the school who affects the quality of individual teacher instruction, the height of student achievement, and the degree of efficiency in school functioning. 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 leader is still in the state of transition from administrative emphasis to more instructional, democratic and participatory leadership (Marks & Printy, 2003).

The pressure of globalization and social expectation is inducing principals take the lead in the instructional activities such as setting goals, leading academic programs, examining and evaluating teachers' performance. According to, Heck (2006) "effective principals are expected to be effective instructional leaders the principal must be knowledgeable about curriculum development, teacher and instructional effectiveness, clinical supervision, staff development and teacher evaluation (1987,). Bryce (1983) and Fullan (1991) agree with this holistic view of the principal's role. However, Fullan expands this holistic definition of leadership and management to be: an active, collaborative form of leadership where the principal works "with teachers to shape the school as a workplace in relation to shared goals, teachers collaboration, teacher learning opportunities, teacher certainty, teacher commitment, and student learning". Bernd (1992) states that "increased teacher involvement in school decisions are effective tools for focusing the staff on student's outcomes". Hallinger (1989) speaks of leadership teams at the secondary level to help carry out the critical functions of curriculum and instructional coordination and supervision.

Therefore, the contemporary thinking of facilitative instructional leadership requires school leaders to have vision, quality and value to transforming their school towards envisioned success. (Smith, 2003). Thus, elaborations of instructional leadership dimensions that support learning centered schools building can be tapped from the work of 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. (Brundret, Burton, & smith, 2003). Similarly, Weber (cited in Lashway, 2007) identified the following main functions that instructional leader create a conducive learning climate, providing feedback of class and evaluation of instructional performances.

In addition to this, Fullan (1991) perceives the role of the principal, in models of the future, will be to encourage collaborative groupings of teachers to play a more central role in the instructional leadership of the school. This, however, will require active participation of the principal to facilitate change by motivating the staff and students, by reaching out to the community, and by continually improving the school. The assumption inherent, here, is that effective leaders manage and lead (Fullan, 1991; Moorthy, 1992). In contrast, Highsmith and Rallis (1986) appear to disagree with the above statements by stating that “school management and instructional leadership are two separate tasks that cannot be performed by a single individual”, but they strongly agree with the idea of teacher empowerment where teachers have significant input into decisions concerning instruction, arguing that well managed schools “enable real instructional leaders to empower teachers who can create the effective schools reformers are seeking” .

2.3.3. The roles and responsibilities of teachers as instructional leaders

Several authors have provided definitions of teacher leadership that clearly delineate the differences with traditional leadership approaches. For example, Wasley (1991) defines teacher leadership as ‘‘the ability to encourage colleagues to change, to do things they wouldn’t ordinarily consider without the influence of the leader’’. In contrast to traditional notions of leadership, teacher leadership is characterized by a form of collective leadership in which teachers develop expertise by working collaboratively (Boles & Troen, 1994).

A number of different roles have been suggested for teacher leaders that further explain the distinctive nature of the leadership activity. Katzenmeyer and Moller (2001) indicated that teacher leadership as having three main aspects: these are; leadership of students or other teachers, leadership of operational tasks and leadership through decision making or partnership. Leadership of students or other teachers: facilitator, coach, mentor, trainer, curriculum specialist, creating new approaches, leading study groups. Leadership of operational tasks: keeping the school organized and moving towards its goals, through roles as head of department, action researcher, member of task forces. Leadership through decision making or partnership: member of school improvement teams, member of committees, instigator of partnerships with business, higher education institutions and parent–teacher associations.

In connection to this, Gehrke (1991) also identifies quite similar functions of teacher leaders such as continuously improving their own classroom teaching; organizing and leading reviews of school practice; providing curriculum development knowledge; participating in in-school decision making; giving in-service training to colleagues; and participating in the performance evaluation of teachers. Furthermore, Harris (2002) suggests that there are four discernible and discrete dimensions of the teacher leadership role. The first dimension concerns the way in which teachers translate the principles of school improvement into the practices of individual classrooms. This brokering role remains a central responsibility for the teacher as leader. It ensures that links within schools are secure and that opportunities for meaningful development among teachers are

maximized. A second dimension of the teacher leader role focuses upon participative leadership where all teachers feel part of the change or development and have a sense of ownership.

Teacher leaders may assist other teachers to cohere around a particular development and to foster a more collaborative way of working (Anderson & Blasé, 1995). They work with colleagues to shape school improvement efforts and take some lead in guiding teachers towards a collective goal. A third dimension of teacher leadership in school improvement is the mediating role. Teacher leaders are important sources of expertise and information. They are able to draw critically upon additional resources and expertise if required and to seek external assistance. Finally, a fourth and possibly the most important dimension of the teacher leadership role are forging close relationships with individual teachers through which mutual learning takes place.

Finally, according to Ash and Persall (2000) teacher leadership roles have been identified as curriculum developers, bid writers, leaders of a school improvement team, mentors of new or less experienced staff, action researchers with a strong link to the classroom and spend most of their time in the classroom but take on different leadership roles at different times, following the principles of formative leadership. Barth (1999) also sees teacher leadership extending beyond just collaborating or participating in decision making. He views teacher leadership as fulfilling some of the functions possibly undertaken by senior management, including: choosing textbooks and instructional materials; shaping the curriculum setting standards for pupil behavior; deciding on tracking; designing staff development programs; setting promotion and retention policies; deciding school budgets; evaluating teacher performance; selecting new teachers; and selecting new administrators.

2.3.4. The roles and responsibilities of department heads as instructional leaders

It is increasingly the case that heads of departments, subject leaders and subject coordinators are expected to exercise leadership. Since 1998, there has been a radical shift in the role and responsibilities of curriculum subject and departmental leaders. The Subject Leader Standards represent a major redefinition of the role, expectations and

performance of leaders at departmental and subject level. The standards highlight the importance of high-quality teaching and improved standards of achievement (Teacher Training Agency 1998). They also acknowledge the importance of establishing high standards of teaching and learning in their subject as well as playing a major role in the development of school policy.

Team leaders have a powerful influence over classroom practices and are important gatekeepers to change and development within their subject areas. The Subject Leader Standards acknowledge the centrality of the subject leader in contributing to whole-school policy and development. The overall purpose of the subject leader's role is to contribute to school improvement and increased standards of performance through the provision of high-quality teaching within the subject area. To achieve this, the subject leader has to lead and manage the curriculum and to respond to the internal and external demands for accountability and quality. All of these demands have to be met in the particular context of the individual school and the community it serves.

2.3.5. The Roles and responsibilities of Supervisors as Instructional leaders

Supervisor's roles vary from locality to locality and from country to country. They are defined by the superintendents to whom the supervisors are responsible and, as happens in most positions of leadership, by the supervisors themselves. A supervisor assists teachers in the improvement of instruction, curriculum planning and improvement, and personal professional growth and development. According to Glickman (2004) some of the roles of supervisors are as follow: coordinator, consultant, group leader, etc.

2.3.5.1. As coordinator: the supervisor serves as a coordinator of program, groups, materials, and reports. It is the supervisor who acts as a link between program and people, and he/she knows the disparate pieces of the educational process and directs the actions of others to make the pieces bring together. As a director of the staff development, the supervisor plans with teachers, arranges, evaluates, and often conducts in-service programs for teachers.

2.3.5.2. As consultant: the supervisor serves in a consulting capacity as a specialist in curriculum, instructional methodology, and staff development. In this capacity, he/she renders serves to both teachers and groups and at the same times, the supervisor may

simply furnish necessary information and suggestions. At other times, the supervisor may help teachers to define, set, and pursue goals. The supervisor should be a prime source of assistance to teachers wishing to improve either their generic or general teaching skills. Though some will disagree with us, we believe the supervisor-consultant should be able to demonstrate a repertoire of teaching strategies.

2.3.5.3. As group leader: supervisor works continuously to release the potential of groups seeking to improve the curriculum, instruction, or themselves to perform this role the supervisor must be knowledgeable about group dynamics and demonstrate leadership skills. The supervisor assists groups in consensus building, in moving toward group goals, and in perfecting the democratic process. Finally as a group leader supervisor seeks, identifies, fosters leadership from within the group.

2.3.5.4. As evaluator: the supervisor provides assistance to teachers in evaluating instruction and curriculum. The supervisor helps teachers find answers to curriculum and instructional problems identify research studies that may have a bearing on their problems, and conduct limited research projects. Additionally, the supervisor helps teachers evaluate their classroom performance, assess their own strengths and weaknesses, and select means of overcoming their deficiencies.

2.4. Practice of Instructional Leadership

Mostly outstanding leadership has invariably emerged as a key characteristic of exceptional schools with successful and effective leaderships are generally characterized by the way they setting vision and defining the school mission, managing curriculum and instruction, supervising and evaluating instruction, providing professional skill development, and creating conducive and healthy school environment (Murphy,1990).

2.4.1. Setting school vision and defining the school mission

2.4.1.1. Setting the school vision a core function of school leadership is to create a common vision for improving students' learning. Creating a learning organization requires a deep rethinking of the leader's role. Instructional leaders must see themselves as 'learning leaders' responsible for helping schools develop the capacity to carry out their mission. A crucial part of this role is cultivating and maintaining a shared vision which

provides focus, generating questions that apply to everyone in the organization. Learning becomes a collaborative, goal-oriented task rather than a generalized desire to 'stay current'(Peter, 1990).

Peter (1990) also notes that coherent vision specifies the particular values and beliefs that will guide policy and practice within the school. Ideally, the school board and superintendent set a broad vision for all schools in the district, and, within that context, the principal coordinates the process of arriving at a particular vision for each school. The creation of a vision is not a static event, because the vision must change as culture changes. Vision is increasingly regarded as an important component of leadership. There are different views about whether vision is an essential aspect of school leadership or, rather, a feature which distinguishes successful from less successful leaders.

Beare,et al. (1989), for example, say that “outstanding leaders have a vision of their schools a mental picture of a preferred future which is shared with all in the school community”. However, Bennis and Nanus (1985), they articulate 10 emerging generalization’s about leadership, four of which relate directly to vision. These are: - outstanding leaders have a vision for their organizations; vision must be communicated in a way which secures commitment among members of the organization; communication of vision requires communication of meaning and attention should be given to institutionalizing vision if leadership is to be successful. Articulation and communication o the vision need to be supported by a process of implanting the vision. The instructional leaders should work with others to implant the vision in the structures and processes of the school, something that calls for the technical and human skills of policymaking and planning. These generalizations are essentially normative views about the centrality of vision to effective leadership (South worth, 1997).

Responsible and accountable school leaders develop clear visions which focus on students’ academic achievements. Their activity inspires and leads new and challenging innovations. These leaders also establish clear goals and keep them in front of attention such leaders expect high performance with achievable goals and objectives through

planning and organizing (Leith wood, et al., 2006). Hatcher and Hyle (1996) investigated instructional leadership strategies and their relationship with achieving higher standard by students. They have concluded that excellent instructional leaders are very important and they are a vital part of effective's schools in bringing schools up to high standards of students achievement as expected and demand by most educators and communities. Accordingly, instructional leaders need to lead the teachers, students and community for creating excellent schools by collaborative establishing vision, developing trust, earning respect for school communities.

According to Day, et al. (2010) successful instructional leaders have very strong and clear vision and set of values for their school, which heavily influenced their actions and the actions of others and established a clear sense of direction and purpose for the school. These were shared widely, clearly understood and supported by all staff. They were a touchstone against which all new developments, policies or initiatives were tested.

2.4.1.2. Defining the school mission: - mission is what the school desires and tries to accomplish. It guides and controls the school's activities that it values. Krug (1992) emphasized the importance of mission for the success of the leader and the school when he suggested "operating without a clear sense of mission is like beginning a journey without having a destination in mind." Recent literatures on effective schools and effective leadership also placed the act of defining a school's mission as the primary task of school leaders (Clayton, 1994: Hoyel, 1988 and Bell, 1992). This refers to the leader's role in framing school-wide goals to which the school will focus its resources during a given school year (Wilson and Firestone, 1987).

Despite the existence of many more goals that pursue school resources, instructionally effective schools generally have a clearly defined mission or sets of goals which focus on student learning and achievement (Murphy and Walker, 1986; Lockheed and Verspoor, 1991). Such goals may be stated as: "taking students to their fullest intellectual potential" (Esmonds, 1982) or "the provision of thorough and systematic intellectual training in the fundamental disciplines." (Larkin and Kritek, 1982) Such emphasis on fewer goals to

which staff energy and other school resources are mobilized, increased the effectiveness of the school and the leaders.

For the practicality of school goals, leaders along with the staff members need to assess the past and present status of students' performances past experience of the school and resource flexibility while developing them (Guthrie and Reed, 1991). Adjacently, leaders of effective schools frame the school goals in terms of staff and student responsibilities to ensure their achievement (Hallinger, 1985). After defining the school goals, leaders are expected to build understanding of and commitment to those goals by communicating them widely and systematically to teachers, students and parents (Edmonds, 1982; Murphy and Walker, 1986). To this end, leaders discuss and revise the goals with staff on a regular basis during the school year, especially in the context of instructional, curricular and budgetary decisions (Hallinger, 1985).

Both formal communication channels (eg. displaying on notice board, placing up over the entrance of the school, the school handbook, assemblies) and informal ones (eg. parent conferences, teacher conferences, curricular meetings, other discussions with staff) can be used to communicate the school's primary purpose (Edmonds, 1982). The leader, therefore, through his/her articulation and dissemination of goals, can promote both accountability and instructional improvement in the school. This in turn improves students' achievement (Hallinger and Murphy, 1987).

According to Weber (1996) the school mission as a dynamic process that tells the purpose or reason for the school's existence. The school mission serves as a basis for assessing the organizations performance, setting the priorities, strategies, and plans of the organization with binding the staff, the students and parents to common vision. It is the task of instructional leaders to develop the mission statement in partnership with the school community which describes who, what and where of the school (Murpy, 1990). In general, leaders of effective schools work to develop a clear statement of mission where their schools are going, and understand how to build commitment to that mission. They have also the know how to disseminate it to staff, students, parents and others.

2.4.2. Managing curriculum and instruction

Curriculum and instruction are components of schooling to which educational leaders should pay attention (Guthrie and Reed, 1991). In managing curriculum and instruction, school leaders need not be specialists in all areas of subjects. Their great responsibility lies on the provision of necessary conditions that make teaching possible (Knezevich, 1969). The instructional leaders' repertoire of instructional practices and classroom supervision offers teachers the needed resources to provide students with opportunities to be successful.

The leaders help teachers to use the best practices and instructional strategies to reach school goals for student's performance. Managing the instructional program involves working directly with teachers in area related to curriculum and instruction (Hollinger and Murphy 1985). Therefore, instructional leaders promote quality instruction by conducting teaching conferences and evaluating, visiting classroom, providing specific suggestions and feedback on the teaching-learning process and determining teachers assignments in the best interests of the student learning.

2.4.3. Supervising and Evaluating Instruction

Various writers' defined supervision in different ways. Typically supervision is the activity carried out by instructional leaders that over see the improvement of instructional process progress of learners, and professional development of teachers and school development in general. Haughty and McEwen (1992) defined supervision as general leadership function that coordinates and manages those school activities concerned with learning. They emphasize instructional supervision as fundamental component of instructional leadership, viewing this role as imperative to improve instruction and students achievements. They are also pointed out that there is general agreement among writers that, the focus of instructional supervision is the enhancement of students learning but it is in the practice that they differ. Eye and Netzer (1985) states that supervision as a phase in school administration that mainly focuses on the provision of instruction in the classroom to achieve educational standards formally set.

It involves integration of class room instruction and management with teachers, curriculum development, and team development and action research, all for improving

learning outcomes (Olive and Paulos, 1997; Sergiovanni, 2001) observing and improving instruction starts with the principal establishing trusting and respectful relationship with the school staff. Weber (1996) proposed that observations are opportunities for professional interaction. These interactions provide professional development opportunity for both the observer and the one being observed. Generally, the task and functions of instructional leadership are used at the school level to improve the quality of education, teachers and instruction and create well educated citizens at all levels.

2.4.4. Monitoring instructional program

The school's primary product is a population of the graduates who have the technical and life skills they need to cope up in increasing competitive world. Good instructional leaders to be aware of the variety of the ways in which students' progress can and should be assessed. Even more importantly, principals need to use assessment results in ways that help teachers and students improve and that help parents understand where and why improvement is needed.

Assessing the instructional program is essential for improvement of the instructional program (Weber, 1996). The instructional management job function of monitoring student progress refers to the principal use of test results for setting goals, assessing the curriculum, evaluating instruction, and measuring progress toward school goals (Hollinger and Murphy, 1985). The instructional leader initiates and contributes to the planning, designing, administering and analysis of assessments that evaluates the effectiveness of the curriculum. This continuous scrutiny of the instructional program enables teachers to effectively meet students need through constant revision and refinement.

2.4.5. Creating conducive and healthy school environment

School leaders' ability to select their teaching staff is central to their ability to establish a school culture and capacity conducive to better student performance. Lack of school leader involvement in recruiting and dismissing teachers may reduce their capacity to respond and it is difficult to hold school leaders accountable for learning outcomes when they have no say in selecting their staff (Weber et al., 1996).

A growing number of educators are focusing their efforts on improving the work environment of teaching. In place of the typical school's norms and practices that isolate teachers from one another, some schools are initiating new norms and practices that encourage teachers to cooperate with one another and with administrators on school improvement. The primary goal of these "collaborative schools" is effective teaching and learning; other objectives are that teachers will be accorded respect as professionals and that staff harmony will increase. School leaders can promote collaboration by such simple expedients as involving school members in setting the agenda for school meetings, giving school committees a meaningful role in matters of curriculum and instruction, and helping teachers to coordinate their schedules so that they have time to observe each other teach and provide each other with feedback on their observations.

Although formal structures and strategies can facilitate collaboration, collaboration ultimately depends on the development of norms of cooperation among the school's personnel. In this area the principal can lead by example. When teachers see the principal actively seeking their help and helping them to improve in their profession, they are likely to work with one another to improve their teaching. Because the principal plays such a crucial role in promoting norms of collaboration, he or she must actually exercise stronger leadership than would be necessary where norms of isolation prevail. A number of studies have shown that principals in collaborative schools are more actively involved in observing and evaluating teachers and in working with teachers on curriculum and scheduling than are principals in schools where teachers traditionally are isolated in their classrooms (Davis, 1986).

According to Weber (1996), healthy school environment for teaching and learning reflect confidence, trust and mutual respect for cooperation between staff, students, governments, parents and wider community is essential for purposeful effort and achievement. Best school leaders encourage good working relationship and overcome the worst effects by contrasting on developing positive environment, high achievement and progress. Murphy, (1990) indicated that good school leadership advocate, nurture and

sustain school environment and instructional based on data from stockholders, skilled on problem solving and conflict resolution, finally flexible in dealing with students learning needs, program conducive to students' learning and professional growth. In schools with such atmosphere principals treat all individuals with dignity and respect; make decisions.

Townsend (1997) conducted a comparative study between America and Australian schools on factors which mostly help the schools to be effective and concludes that an effective schools primarily characterized by good leadership and staff, good policies and a safe and/or supportive atmosphere in which staff, parents and students are encouraged to work as teams toward common goals. Purkey and Smith (1985) have identified school leadership as one of the major factors in improving academic performance. They clarify that this factors emphasize strong leadership from administrator, teachers or integrated teams are important in initiating and maintaining the improvement processes.

According to MOE (2006) parents can play an important role in improving and maintaining the school, including the classrooms, the sports field, the tree plantations, the vegetable gardens, the nursery, etc. this can be particularly important if parents feel that their contributions of knowledge, contribute to a building fund, to enable schools to increase their classrooms. This is usually done through a monetary contribution.

2.4.6. Teaching-learning roles instructional leadership

In detail studies of teachers perceptions about characteristics of school principals that influence teacher's classroom instruction have conclude that the behaviours associated with instructional leadership positively influence classroom instructions (Blasé and Especially, 1999; Larson-knight, 2000) 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 behaviours, 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. According to Chris peel, (1992) instructional leadership behaviours associated with promoting professional growth and staff

development yield positive effects on classroom practice. Conversely, instructional leaders that did not engage in monitoring and providing feedback of the teaching-learning process had negative effect on teachers and classroom practices (Blasé and Blasé, 1998).

In particular leaders that engage in behaviours 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. 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.

In relation to this, many writers explain that frequent communication of school goals by instructional leaders promotes accountability, a sense of personal ownership, and instructional improvement. 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 behaviours with in the class room, which leads to more effective schools.

2.4.6.1. Promoting Professional Skill Development: - instructional leaders can play a key role in providing and promoting in-service professional development programs for teachers. It is essential that instructional leaders understand this aspect of leadership as one of their key responsibilities. They can ensure that teacher professional development is relevant to the local school context and aligned with overall school improvement goals and with teachers' needs. To enhance school leaders' capacity to promote staff development, policy makers should emphasize the core responsibility of teacher professional development and consider devolving discretion over training and development budgets to the school level so that school leaders can offer and coordinate meaningful professional learning opportunities for all their teachers (Leithwood et al.,

2006). In-service training at school level is one of the means to achieve professional development of teachers.

The school leaders and supervision committee can deliver the training to all teachers of the school. Through the training, teachers could share useful ideas and experiences, acquaint with new teaching methodologies and curriculum innovations, develop mutual support and stand for common goals. To attain those activities, training programs have to be participatory. In addition, programs have to be supported by variety of teaching materials.

Moreover, sharing experiences and communal problem solving activities should be central to the training program. Schools that aim to build capacity and to generate professional learning communities will need to provide regular opportunities for teachers to engage in meaningful professional development. Professional development is continuous learning that it is the sum total of formal and informal learning pursued and experienced by the teacher, often under conditions of challenge. If the use of new practices is to be sustained and changes are to endure in schools, then teachers need to be able to engage in professional development that is collaborative and meaningful. Working collaboratively not only reduces the sense of isolation many teachers feel, but also enhances the quality of the work produced. Working as part of a professional development community helps focus attention on shared purpose and the goals that lead to school improvement and dynamic change (Harris & Muijs, 2005).

There are several important messages about the role of professional development in building leadership capacity for school improvement: It is important to foster deep collaboration and not superficial cooperation among the teaching staff; partnerships within schools and to network with other schools and agencies; generate teacher leadership and pupil leadership; provide opportunities for teacher enquiry and action research; allocate time for personal reflection and opportunities for teachers to talk together about teaching and learning; generate the collective capability, expertise and commitment of teachers to ensure that all teachers are involved. Engaging regularly in

continuing professional development is widely recognized as the tangible expression of the commitment to learn, and is essential if professionals at every level in the school are to remain up to date in their knowledge of the curriculum, be wise in their selection and use of a selection of pedagogical skills, be enthusiastic about their work and the students they teach, and be self-confident and clear about their purposes (Harris & Muijs, 2005).

Many country practices and evidence from different sources show that instructional leaders need specific training to respond to broadened roles and responsibilities. Strategies need to focus on developing and strengthening skills related to improving school outcomes and provide room for contextualization. Leadership development is broader than specific programs of activity or intervention. It requires a combination of formal and informal processes throughout all stages and contexts of leadership practice. This implies coherently supporting the school leadership career through the following stages (Pont et al., 2008).

2.4.6.2. Encourage initial leadership training: Whether initial training is voluntary or mandatory can depend on national governance structures. Governments can define national programs, collaborate with local level governments and develop incentives to ensure that school leaders participate. In countries where the position is not tenured, a trade-off must be found to make it worthwhile for principals to invest time in professional development. Efforts also need to be made to find the right candidates.

2.4.6.3. Organize induction programs: Induction programs are particularly valuable to prepare and shape initial school leadership practices, and they provide vital networks for principals to share concerns and explore challenges. These programs should provide a combination of theoretical and practical knowledge and self-study.

2.4.6.4. Ensure in-service training to cover need and context: In-service programs need to be seen in the context of prior learning opportunities for school leadership. Where there are no other initial requirements, basic in-service programs should encourage development of leadership skills. In-service training should be also offered periodically to principals and leadership teams so they can update their skills and keep up with new developments. Networks (virtual or real) also provide informal development for principals and leadership teams.

Educational leader examine the most appropriate training delivery methods with staff, monitor and evaluate impact of self training in the school. In this case, the staff professional confidence and competence increase, improve the teachers, and schools' ability to identify students need. The professional development program support newly qualified and recently appointed members of staff. Skilled leaders use career entry profile and use senior colleagues as mentors to assist in teachers' professional development. They also encourage staff to undertaken long term course in planning, leading and organizing for principals that prepare their further roles. So, the professional skill development enables the staff to gain broader experience.

2.5. Building Effective Relationship in Schools

In institutional setting like schools everything starts with relationships, whether those relationship are among ideas Marx (2006). Teachers, administrators, supervisions, students and parents need to come together to define their aspiration, design procedures for decision making, the mobilization of resources and the evaluation of learning outcomes. The role of instructional leader in team building and developing team cohesion is aimed at defining common goals. In school setting everyone wants to be safe, to be appreciated, to be accepted as part of the school community and be recognized as contributing to the school effectiveness.

2.6. Conflict Management Role of Instructional Leaders in School

According to Barge (1994) conflict is a social phenomenon that is heavily ingrained inhuman relation, expressed and sustained through communication and occurs when individuals or groups became dependent on one another to meet identified needs. The social context of the school is comprised of different groups, with different and sometimes opposing interests but interdependent on each other, the existence of conflict is inevitable.

Effective managers and school principals need to understand the nature of conflict and develop practical skill to manage it. Leaders who are skilled in the arts of resolving conflict are prepared to deescalate the rhetoric and posturing on both sides of the dispute

and substitute search for solutions that give each side of the opportunity to compromise without losing face. Such leaders go to the root of the communication breakdown, whether it is anger, fear, mistrust or differing assumption and definitions. They press each side to understand the way others perceive the problem, recognizing that how an adversary perceives the problem. Therefore, instructional leader generate alternative solutions to solve the problem in the school setting.

2.7. Overview of Instructional Leadership in Ethiopia

Throughout Africa, there is no formal requirement for principals to be trained managers. They are often appointed on the basis of a successful record as teachers with an implicit assumption that this provides a sufficient starting point for school leadership. In Kenya, for example, “deputy principals as well as good assistant teachers are appointed to the leadership without any leadership training. But good teaching abilities are not necessarily an indication that the person appointed will be a capable educational leader” (Kitavi & van der Westhuizen, 1997).

Principal ship in schools is one of the influential administrative positions in the success of school plans with respect to the historical back ground of principal ship, authorities give their own argument. As indicated in Knezevich, (in Ahmed, 2006) the origin of principal ship can be traced to 1515 to the time of Johann Sturm in USA. The position developed from classroom teacher with a few administrative duties to principal teacher and then to supervising principal.

The history of Ethiopian education system traces back its origin to the introduction of Christianity about fourth century A.D. However, the western type of education system was formally introduced into Ethiopia in 1908 with the opening of Menelik second school. In 1943 the first high school which was dominated by expatriates was opened. According to Ahmed at its early stage the history of principal ship in Ethiopia was dominated by foreign principals. In all government owned schools that were opened before and few years after the Italian occupation expatriates from France and Britain were assigned as school principals.

After the restoration of independence in 1942, education was given high priority which resulted in opening of schools in different parts of the country. However, there was not enough educated Ethiopians to teach and run schools, most of the teachers and principals in school were from foreign countries such as USA, Egypt and India (ICDR, 1999). According to MoE (2002) prior to 1962 expatriate principals were assigned in the elementary and secondary schools of different provinces of Ethiopia.

Gradually, the history had developed into a new phase where Ethiopians began to replace expatriates which started in 1964. According to Teshome (cited in Ahmed, 2006) this new phase of principalship started with supervising principals such leaders were responsible for the school and the education system of the community where the schools located.

From 1960's the Ethiopian schools principals were directly assigned in elementary school without competition among candidates. Only educational level and teaching experience were given highest priority for principalship. However, during the first few years of 1960's it was understood that those graduates of certificate in teaching were directly assigned in primary schools.

On the other hand, the promotion that were issued from 1973-1976 show that primary school principals were those who had at least worked for a limited time as a unit leader, department heads or teacher. It is also stated in the job description of the MoE issued in 1989 that primary school principals should have certificate in school administration and supervision including sufficient work experiences.

But in Ethiopia most principals are appointed by the government without enough training, experience and development in leadership. Primary school principals had been political appointed by major problems of primary schools in instructional leadership are: lack of professional training for principalship, lack of required qualification and commitment in making maximum use of environment resources and negative attitude

toward leadership. This shows that instructional leadership as professions has been given little attention.

To sum up, considering education as key elements for economic, social and technological development, many countries invest substantial amount of their national resources for the improvement of their education. Similarly the government of Ethiopia recognizing the role of education in developing the country economy, the ministry of education has placed great emphasis on professional development for school principals, vice principals, department heads, teachers as well as officers in charge of education at different levels.

In its education sector development program four (2010) the ministry of education stated that although the decentralization reforms have been implemented some years ago and important responsibilities have been transferred to the woreda offices and school functioning also needs further improvement in particular concerning school leadership. It was thus being fully aware of the importance of school in its blue print (MoE,2007) acknowledged that educational leadership are professional by their own with established theories and practices and indicated that those who assumed these roles should be equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills to exhibit proper professional ethics that are necessitated at school levels.

Instructional leadership play roles to improve students' learning outcomes, teachers' profession and produce well educated citizens at all levels. Finally the approaches of instruction and create an environment and situation which can lead them to practices effective instructional leadership role in their respective schools.

2.8. Challenges for Instructional Leadership Effectiveness

Limited understanding exists about how schools and school districts can establish the conditions, change processes, and external supports necessary for producing a culture of effective practice. According to Leith wood and Montgomery (1984) conducted a study whose focus was identifying the existence of obstacles outside the formal preparation program that inhibit the effectiveness of school leaders.

Many administrators are prevented by obstacles, real or perceived from performing tasks identified as informing effectiveness and efficiency. Being an effective instructional leader requires knowledge, skills, and attitudes that inform the successful operation of schools. The ability to identify and perform tasks directly associated with the educational needs of students correlates directly with effectiveness as instructional leaders.

Within the public school setting however, barriers and obstacles exist that inhibit the successful operation of schools. Several situational and environmental factors other than human, materials or financial resources, can affect the operation of instructional leadership practices of any school. For decades, schools have proved impervious to change at the instructional core, in large measure because of the overall complexity of the instructional process. Instructional leaders are often faced with a number of roadblocks: incompetence in educational leadership, lack of incentive for teachers, problems related with teachers promotions, lack of administrative skills and commitment of those assigned as school leaders, shortage of educational materials, or finance are among problems frequently cited as factors that hinder effective performance of teachers (MoE, 2004).

In addition, disconnected departmental subcultures; a resistance to school wide interventions, norms for teacher autonomy and teacher tracking; and a lack of training on and support for engaging disconnected adolescents who have significant learning gaps (McLaughlin & Talbert, 2007). Although the economic, political, social or technological variations, the following were cited as challenges to the effectiveness of instructional leadership practices: lack of skill and training, lack of cooperation from superiors and community, lack of time, lack of adequate resources, and lack of vision, will and courage.

2.8.1. Lack of skills and training;-As Sergiovanni (2001) stated that, technical, human and educational skills, abilities and knowledge are essential properties that instructional leaders have to possess. Instructional leaders without adequate skills and training in educational leadership and professional development of teachers can do little or no for the improvement of learning (West-Burnham, 1998).

2.8.2. Lack of cooperation from superiors and community;-Teachers' cooperation is essential for effective instructional leadership. The cooperation of teachers, students, and parents could be available in school climate where the leaders exercise democratic leadership (MoE, 2002).

2.8.3. Lack of time:- Principals have multiple roles they have to play. For instance information overload, paper work, too many reports, many non-academic demands and work overload consume much of the principals' time. Therefore only principals committed to instructional improvement can choose and use their time for the enhancement of the classroom instruction and teacher development (Harris and Muijs, 2003).

2.8.4. Lack of adequate resource:-Lack of adequate resources of all type and support from central offices discourages instructional leaders. Bureaucratic management that hampers timely assignment of human, financial and material resources required can be restricted the success of the schools and limits development of the teachers (Dimmock, 2000).

2.8.5. Lack of vision, will and courage: Nothing can affect instructional improvement more than lack of leaders' will. Instructional leaders have to spend more time on improving the teaching learning, initiating changes and encouraging others to achieve educational goals. However lack of vision, will and courage could hinder the effectiveness of leadership performance Sergiovanni (2001). Generally the barriers of instructional leadership hinder the leader's performance, sabotage principal's attempts and finally bring a serious problem on the quality of education.

CHAPTER THREE

THE RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This study was aimed to assess practice of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in government general secondary schools of Guji Zone in Oromia regional state of Ethiopia. This chapter specifically deals with the research design, method, source of data, population, sample, sample techniques, data gathering instruments, validity of instruments, reliability of instruments, procedures for data collections, method of data analysis and ethical considerations to attain the above purpose.

3.1. Design of the study

In this study, explanatory sequential mixed methods design was selected because it enables the researcher to conduct the study through both quantitative and qualitative approach. Quantitative approach is considered as main and appropriate because it uses the survey in collecting data from a wide area by selecting a representative of large population while the qualitative approach was employed , so as to obtain detailed and depth descriptions information that help as a supplementary to elaborate more the results of the initial quantitative.

Laughlin (2001) believes that for information that cannot be obtained through quantitative method can be effective in obtaining such information. Therefore, in this study, an explanatory mixed approach involving both quantitative and qualitative method was employed so as to collect extensive data and used to confirm findings from different data sources through triangulate data instruments and consequently to draw valid general conclusions. So, it advocated using an explanatory mixed approach even though more weight gave to quantitative approach. This research intends to apply explanatory mixed approach, which means both quantitative and qualitative method used to identify an accurate description of the practice of instructional leadership in supporting teachers .in teaching.

3.2. Research Methodology

This study used mixed method approach in what sort of relationship that would exist among different variables related to the topic under the study and it was also convenient to gather data from a relatively large scale of respondents at a particular time to arrive at better generalization of the existing situation. Through collecting and analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data. That means the researcher initially used as a major quantitative method through survey questionnaires and supported by qualitative data, that was the reason why the researcher also used interviews, FGD by senior teachers and document analysis to substantiate or supported the quantitative data. Therefore, the qualitative approach was employed so as to obtain detail descriptions of the phenomenon such as direct quotations and general ideas capturing peoples personal perspectives and experience of instructional leadership role practice through an in depth interview, FGD and document analysis. Thus, the method was preferred on the ground that practices of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in teaching are better perceived from the opinion survey of the teachers and instructional leaders school instructional leaders. According to Ezeani (1998, cited in Tadese, 2014) the purpose of descriptive survey is to collect detailed and factual information that describes an existing phenomenon.

3.3. Sources of Data

Data were collected by using two sources: primary and secondary. The primary sources of the study were key informants from the Zone including school cluster supervisors, Instructional Leaders (principals, vice principals, department heads, unit leader) and teachers of the government general secondary schools. Therefore, the major data source was obtained directly from these primary sources through questionnaire for both teachers and instructional leaders, an interview for school cluster supervisors and FGD for senior teachers to identify and insight practices of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in the government general secondary schools of Guji zone.

Secondary sources were other sources of the study. As a secondary source the data were collected from documents mainly focused on records and minutes, such as supervision

plan, teachers' portfolio, CPD plan and its report, annual plan of the school, monthly check lists of the supervisors, feedbacks given by the supervisors for teachers, brochures that stated the vision, mission and goals of the school and manuals was prepared for training purposes.

3.4. Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

The target populations of the study were general secondary school teachers, instructional leaders, and cluster supervisors. In this study, the researcher believed that these the target populations were the right sources of information on the issue under investigation. The population and sample respondents and schools are determined based on the 2019 G.C. recorded of Guji Zone Education Department. According to this recorded, there were 17 woredas, with total of 40 government general secondary schools.

From 17 woredas, for this study, only 6 Woredas namely Bore, Ana Sora, Adola Rede, Wadara, Negele, and Adola Woyu were selected by using stratified sampling techniques. They account 6(35.29%) of Woredas in the selected area. In the selected woredas, there were 14 government general secondary schools. Out of these government general secondary schools, 6(42.85%) of them were selected by using stratified sampling techniques. These general secondary schools include: Bore, Sora, Shakiso Boke, Wadera, Adola Woyu, and Negele. The selected government general secondary schools were consisted 159 teachers, 108 school leaders, and 6 cluster supervisors. Out of 159, only 102(64.15%) of the teachers, and out of 108, only 54(50%) of instructional leaders were selected by using simple random sampling techniques of the participants of the study, while 6(100 %) school cluster supervisors were selected by using comprehensive sampling techniques of the participants of the study. To sum up, probability sampling techniques for teachers, instructional leaders, woredas, and schools, while non-probability sampling techniques for school cluster supervisor were employed. To determine the sample size the researcher used Taro Yamane (1967) simplified formula.

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e^2)}$$

n =Sample size, **N** = Total population = **273** **e** = 0.05(degree of accuracy)

Table 1: Target Population and Sample Size of respondents

GSS	Teachers			Instructional leaders			Supervisors			Total		
	P	S	%	P	S	%	P	S	%	P	S	%
Bore	32	22	68.75	18	9	50	1	1	100	51	32	62.75
Sora	14	8	57.14	18	9	50	1	1	100	33	18	54.55
Adola Woyu	38	25	65.79	18	9	50	1	1	100	57	35	61.40
Shakiso Boke	19	12	63.16	18	9	50	1	1	100	38	22	57.89
Wadara	18	10	55.56	18	9	50	1	1	100	37	20	54.05
Negele	38	25	65.79	18	9	50	1	1	100	57	35	61.40
Total	159	102	64.15	108	54	50	6	6	100	273	162	59.34
ST	Simple Random Sampling			Simple Random Sampling			Comprehensive Sampling					
DGI	Questionnaires						Interviews					

Source: *Statistics 2011 E.C .Department of Guji Zone.*

key. P=population S= sample. %= Sample percent FGD=Focus Group Discussion GSS= General Secondary Schools ST= Sample Techniques DGI=Data Gathering Instrument

3.5. Data Collection Instruments

This study mainly employed questionnaires, interview, focus group discussion and document analysis.

3.5.1. Questionnaires:

This study used questionnaires to collect data from government general secondary school teachers and school leaders (head department, unit leader, main principals and vice principals). The close ended items were formulated in five point likert scale (Strongly disagree=1, Disagree=2, Undecided=3, Agree=4, and Strongly agree=5) for the items related to instructional leadership practice and instructional leadership support. On the other hand, the researcher used (Very high =5, High =4, Moderate=3, Low=2 and Very low=1), for the items related instructional leadership and challenges. The questionnaires

had two categories: the respondents' personal characteristics and items relevant to the issue under investigation. Likert Scale method of rating and the respondents are expected to express their degree of agreement on five point scale that is relevant to the issues.

Thus, questionnaire containing a total of only 58 close ended questionnaires were carefully selected and presented to the respondents of teachers and instructional leaders under category of four (4) subsequent sections background information. six (6) questions, practices of instructional leadership as a role of instructional leadership in school eight (8) questions, school instructional leadership provide professional support for teachers forty (40) questions and major challenges that affect the practice of instructional leadership four (4) questions. According to Husen (2016) used statistical division of five point likert scale, the researcher ranging from strongly agrees to strongly disagree used for the sake of analysis and interpretation as follow. Therefore, the mean values less than 1.80 as strongly disagree, 1.81-2.60 as disagree, 2.61-3.40 as undecided, 3.41-4.20 as agree and 4.21-5.00 as strongly agree implementation of the items. Similarly, the researcher used the mean score ranging from 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60=Disagree 2.61-3.40=Undecided, 3.41-4.20=Agree and 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree.

3.5.2. Interview

Interview is one of the data gathering instruments through communicating face-to-face. Thus structured interview was used to collect deep information on issue related to the role of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in their teaching. The interview questions were prepared in English Language and orally translated to Afan Oromo Language for more clarity of concept for the interviews. The interview was conducted with school cluster supervisor only.

3.5.3. Focus group discussion.

Focus group discussion used to produce deep understanding of the issue under study. The focus group discussion made with six (6) groups and four (4) members in each group with a total of twenty four (24) senior teachers who did not involve in responding the questionnaires. Thus, this instrument helped the researcher explore issues not raised in the interview and close ended questions. Besides it provided additional insight on the attitudes and perceptions of the issue under study which were not clearly raised by the other instruments.

3.5.4. Document analysis

Document analysis was also another tool to use or to collect data for this study as secondary source. The data were collected from documents like school based supervision and instructional leadership support in the general secondary schools, including school strategic plan, teachers portfolio, Continuous Professional Development plan and its report, annual plan of the school, work manual check lists of the supervisors, feedbacks given by the supervisors during classroom visits, brochures that state the vision, mission, goals of the schools, and manuals were prepared for training purposes.

3.6. Validity of the Instruments

To be sure of the face validity before actual data collection, senior colleagues were invited to provide their comment. The participants of the pilot test were also be first informed about the objectives and how to fill, evaluate and give feedback on the relevance of the contents, item length, clarity of items, and layout of the questionnaire. Based on their reflections, the instruments were improved before they were administered to the main participants of the study. As a result of the comment, two irrelevant items were removed; two lengthy items were shortened, and some unclear items were made clear.

Moreover, to verify the content validity of the instrument, the questionnaire with sufficient number (200 copies) of items addressing all objectives of the study was administered to large number of government of general secondary school teachers and school instructional leaders in Guji Zone and then, 156 copies were collected with high return rate of 100%. Triangulation of data gathering tools were executed by using semi structured interview, focus group discussion and document analysis. Information sources were also be multi-faceted by using variety of respondents of teachers and school instructional leaders (such as, principals, vice principals, school cluster supervisors, head departments, and unit leader). Finally, after the necessary improvements were made, the questionnaires were duplicated and distributed with necessary orientations by the researcher to be filled by respondents. Then interview, focus group discussion and document analysis were also carried out by the same time.

3.7. Reliability of the Instruments

To ensure its reliability before the final questionnaires were gathered, the researcher was administered and pilot testing was conducted in Shakiso general secondary school which was not included in the sample study, the data gathering questionnaire was pre tested by twenty five (25) teachers and fifteen (15) school leaders (department head, unit leader, principal and vice principal) and one supervisor of Shakiso general secondary school which were non sample to see the reliability of the items in terms of appropriateness and clarity.

After the questionnaires were filled and returned the reliability and validity of items were measured by using Cronbach's alpha method by the help of SPSS version 24. The researcher was used frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, grand mean, and independent t-test). The reliability coefficient of the questionnaire with cronbach alpha (α) = (0.989,0.967 and 0.964) for items related to practices as a role of instructional leadership in school, school instructional leadership provide professional support for teachers and major challenges that affect the practice of instructional leadership respectively. The results indicated that the reliability of the instruments were high since the results of 0.65 and above are reliable for attitude, option and perception question items (Yalew,2011).

3.8. Procedures for Data Collection

The study includes different procedure of data collection was used. First, different relevant literatures were reviewed. Second the researcher visited Zone and Woreda education office and informed the purpose of the study area by showing the letter of cooperation from Dilla University and asked the Zone to write a letter to woreda and next asked the Woreda to write a letter to the government general secondary schools in the Zone. Then, after obtained a permission letter from the administrative zonal education desk, the researcher communicated the all sampled school directors and vice directors in the zone and discussed with about the purpose and objective of the study area by showing the two letters from Dilla University and Woreda education office.

Then, after obtained a permission the actual study was conducted in government general secondary schools of the zone, the secondary school principals and supervisor of the sample schools were informed about the objective of the study and were requested to facilitate conditions for the data collection. The general purpose of the study was explained to the respondents before filling out the questionnaire and all respondents were informed to return the questionnaire on time.

Finally, the questionnaires were administered to the respondents and the data were gathered by the researcher. Then tabulated and counted the questionnaires response of the two groups. The researcher conducted the interview with the supervisor and focus group discussion with the selected senior teachers was conducted at their respective schools and at the end document analysis was observed by the researcher.

3.9. Method of Data Analysis

In this study, the data collected through the survey questionnaires and it was processed by Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), and analyze by employing different statistical tools. First, frequency distributions were used to obtain an accurate description of the respondents' and their schools background. Then, setting the alpha level of significance at five percent ($\alpha = .05$), the researcher used mean, standardization, grand mean and independent-samples t-test to analyze basic question. On the other hand, the qualitative data gathered from respondents through interviews, focus group discussion and document review were summarized by grouping respondent's ideas and qualitatively described using content analysis approach. Using this method enabled the researcher to organize the data, break them into manageable units, and then search and come up with themes.

3.10. Ethical Considerations

The researcher took the severity of the ethical considerations in mind. This study was done with highest importance place on ethics, confidentiality, and anonymity. In this study, confidentiality and anonymity of the respondents were emphasized to protect their privacy and the dignity (Cohen, 2007). Thus, on the cover page of the survey questionnaire, the researcher clearly indicated how he could take care of confidentiality

and anonymity of the participants and informed them that involvement in the study is voluntary and free of any intended risk; and that information would be kept anonymous.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter deals analysis and discussion of data obtained from teachers and school leaders. The study employed questionnaires for teachers and school leaders (department heads, unit leader, main principals, vice principals and school cluster supervisors) and interviews for supervisors. Besides, additional information was gathered through focus group discussion and document analysis. Thus, the quantitative and qualitative analysis of data was incorporated in to this chapter. The major quantitative part of analysis was supported by qualitative as complimentary analysis.

The study covered six government general secondary schools of Guji Zone namely; Bore, Sora, Adola Woyu, Shakiso Boke, Wadera and Negele government general secondary schools. A total of 52 questionnaires were prepared and distributed for 102 sample teachers and 54 school instructional leaders (principals, vice principals, unit leaders and department heads,) who have been purposefully selected as information sources. All the questionnaires (100%) that were distributed to the teachers and instructional leaders were filled and returned to the researcher. Beside this as a supplementary, the information gathered through six cluster supervisors interview, six focus group discussions of senior teachers and document analysis were used to triangulate the data obtained by questionnaires.

In analyzing the data of the study, different statistical techniques and procedures were used. Initially, the data collected through questionnaire were coded and inserted in to SPSS for analysis. Then the means for the two groups of respondents (teachers and instructional leaders) were identified and analysis was done by using the average means of the two groups' respondents. To determine the existence of the different role of instructional leadership practices in supporting teachers in teaching, and instructional leadership challenges in the government general secondary schools of the Zone, an average point of decision was set.

According to Husen (2016) used statistical division of five point likert scale, the researcher also used an average mean point of less than 1.80 is considered as strongly disagree, 1.81-2.60 as disagree, 2.61-3.20 as undecided, 3.21-4.20 as agree and 4.21-5.00 as strongly agree for the items related to instructional leadership practice in supporting teachers in teaching. On the other hand, the researcher used, 1.80 is considered as very low, 1.81-2.60 as low, 2.61-3.20 as moderate, 3.21-4.20 as high and 4.21-5.00 as very high for the items related to challenges that affect the role of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in teaching.

To examine the difference of the views of the two groups of respondents (teachers and instructional leaders) up on the instructional leadership practices in supporting teachers in teaching and challenges that affect the role of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in teaching and an independent sample t-test has been conducted. To this end, a test of significance has been carried out with eight (8) instructional leadership practices, forty (40) instructional leadership provide professional support for teachers and four (10) major challenges that affect the role of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in teaching items. Accordingly, if a calculated value is greater than 0.05 significant levels, there is no significance difference between the views of the two groups of respondents, while the calculated value is less than the 0.05 significant values, there is significant difference between the views of the two groups' of respondents.

4.1. Background of Respondents

Items involved in the questionnaires were classified in to two major categories. The first category dealt with general background information of the respondents, while the second part has treated specific issues of the study. Hence, this leads to use different approaches in treating or analyzing the data from the two categories questions. Therefore, frequency and percentages were used for the analysis of characteristics of respondents. On the other hand mean, standard deviation, and independent sample t-test were used for the analysis of specific items. Therefore, in the first part of the analysis, the background of the respondents in relation to their age, sex, education level, qualification, work experience and the current position they hold currently were tabulated and analyzed as indicated under Table 2. In the second part of the analysis the views of the two groups (teachers

and instructional leaders) respondents were analyzed and discussion was made based on means, grand means, average means and independent sample t-test.

Table 2. Background of the Respondents

No	Variables	CCR	Respondents					
			Teachers		Instructional leaders		Supervisors	
			F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Sex	Male	86	84.3	46	85.2	6	100
		Female	16	15.7	8	14.8	-	-
		Total	102	100	54	100	6	100
2	Age	20-25 years old	34	33.3	-	-	-	-
		26-30 years old	30	29.4	12	22.2	-	-
		31-35 years old	21	20.6	25	46.3	4	66.7
		36-40 years old	11	10.8	15	27.8	2	33.3
		41& above	6	5.9	2	3.7	-	-
		Total	102	100	54	100	6	100
3	Specialization	BA/BEd/BSc	95	93.1	40	74.1	6	100
		MA/MSc	7	6.9	14	25.9	-	-
		Total	102	100	54	100	6	100
4	Experience	Below 5 years	35	34.3	-	-	-	-
		6-10 years	31	30.4	9	16.7	-	-
		11-15 years	20	19.6	29	53.7	4	66.7
		16-20 years	10	9.8	14	25.9	2	33.3
		21 & above	6	5.9	2	3.7	-	-
		Total	102	100	54	100	6	100
5	Specialization	Subject Major	102	100	52	96.3	5	83.3
		EDPM	-	-	2	3.7	1	16.7
		Total	102	100	54	100	6	100
6	Position	Teacher	102	100	-	-	-	-
		Head depart.	-	-	42	77.8	-	-
		Unit leader	-	-	6	11.1	-	-
		Supervisor	-	-	-	-	6	100
		Principals	-	-	6	11.1	-	-
		Total	102	100	54	100	6	100

Source: Field survey.

Key: CCR= Categories of Characteristics of Respondents, F= Frequency number of the respondents, %= present of the respondents

As one can see the responses to item 1 of Table 2, Showed that 86(84.3%) of the teacher respondents, 46(85.2%) of instructional leaders (main principals, vice principals, unit

leaders and department heads) and all of the supervisors were males while the remaining 16(15.7%) of the teachers and 8 (14.8 %) of the instructional leaders were female respondents specially no involvement of female in the position supervision. According to this data, almost 85% of the respondents were males and only 15 % were females in all positions. This indicated that the females' participation, as compared to their male counter parts, was very low, both in the teaching and instructional leadership position in the sampled woreda government general secondary schools.

This was not a new finding; rather it has been reported by various researchers and organizations who have involved in educational affairs in the country. For instance, MoE (2005, cited in Adisu 2014) witnessed that participation of females in education had been low and this has resulted in lower rate of employment. This could be due to serious economic problem, unreasonable house load, school distance, early marriage, marriage by abduction and pregnancy. With regard to the age distribution of the respondents as indicated in Table 2 with item 2, 34(33.3%) of the teacher respondents, fall into the age ranges of 20 to 25 years old and 30(29.4%) and 12(22.2%) lie in to the age range of 26 to 30 years old of teachers and school instructional leaders respectively. 20(20.6%) ,25(46.5%) and 4(66.7%) of respondents fall in to the age ranges of 31 to 35 years old of teachers, school instructional leaders and cluster supervisors respectively. 11(10.8%), 15(27.8%) and 2(33.3) of respondents fall in to the age ranges of 36 to 40 years old of teachers, school instructional leaders and cluster supervisors respectively.

The remaining 6 (5.9%) and 2(3.7%) of respondents fall in to the age ranges of 41 and above of teachers and school instructional leaders respectively. To sum up, out of the total respondents, all of instructional leaders, cluster supervisors and the majority of teachers were 26 years old and above, whereas the remaining only 34(33%) of teachers were under the age ranges of 25 and below years old. Therefore, this data indicates that the majority of the respondents are matured enough to provide reliable information with regard to the issue under study.

In terms of level of education, as responses to item 3 of Table 2, showed that the majority of teachers and instructional leaders (main principals, vice principals, unit leaders and

department heads), 95(93.1%) and 40 (74.1%) were BA/BSC/BED degree holders respectively and also all of the supervisors were BA/BSC/BED degree holders; while the remaining 7(6.9%) of teachers and 14 (25.9%) of school leaders were M.A/MSc degree holders. These data imply that the majority of school leaders, cluster supervisors and teachers respondents were BA/BSc/BEd degree holders, while the minority of school leaders, cluster supervisors and teachers respondents were MA/MSC degree holders. They do not satisfy the standard set by the MoE (1996:8) which requires at least MA/MSC/MED degree for principals, supervisor and teachers of secondary schools.

As one can see the response to item 4 of Table 2, showed that 35(34.3%) of the teacher respondents had 1 up to 5 years of work experience, whereas 31(30.4%) and 9(16.7%) teacher and School instructional leaders respondents had 6 up to 10 years of work experience respectively. 20(19.6%), 29(53.7%) and 4(66.7%) teachers, school instructional leaders and cluster supervisors respondents had 11 up to 15 years of work experience. 10(9.8%), 14(25.9%) and 2(33.3%) teachers, school instructional leaders and cluster supervisors respondents had 16 to 20 years of work experience respectively. The remaining 6(5.9%) and 2(3.7%) teachers and school instructional leaders respondents had 21 and above years of work experience. This implies that relatively the majority of teachers was less experience than school instructional leaders and need more support from the school leaders.

As one can see the response to item 5 of Table 2, indicated that the teachers, the instructional leaders (main principals, vice Principals, unit leaders and department heads) and cluster supervisors were asked to indicate their areas of specialization. Accordingly, all of the teachers 102(100%) and the majority of the instructional leaders 52(96.3%) and cluster supervisors 5(83.3%) were academic subject major graduates, while the remaining 2(3.7%) and 1(16.7%) school instructional leaders and cluster supervisors were EdPM/pedagogical science graduate respectively. As these data show, the majority of the instructional leaders and supervisors in the government general secondary schools of Guji zone were subject area graduates. This might have its own negative implication on the overall success in the implementation of the roles of instructional leadership in supporting teachers' performance on teaching and student learning. As it can be seen

current position with item 6, Table 2, all of the sampled teachers of their current position were teacher. 42 (77.8%), 6(11.1%) and 6(11.1%) of respondents had current position of department heads, unit leaders, principals/vice principals respectively.

4.2. Data Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of the study

As the review of the related literature discussed in the foregoing chapters concluded that the role of instructional leadership practices in supporting teachers in teaching are mainly determined by the extent to which instructional leadership functions are implemented in the general secondary schools. Thus, the instructional functions including involving teachers when setting the school vision and mission, promoting implementation of the school curriculum and instructional program, supervising and evaluating instructional program, promoting professional skill development, building effective relations in school, promoting supportive roles of instruction, monitoring and directive roles, conflict management roles and challenges that affect the roles of instructional leadership were examined to see their implementation in supporting of teachers in the schools

A five point likert scales ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree were used. In order to determine the degree of implementation of each of the role of instructional leadership practice in supporting teachers in teaching in government general secondary schools, the following mean ranges were used as a cut point. According to Husen (2016) used statistical division of five point likert scale, the researcher also used an average mean point of less than 1.80 as strongly disagree, 1.81-2.60 as disagree, 2.61-3.40 as undecided, 3.41-4.20 as agree and 4.21-5.00 and strongly disagree as strongly agree level of implementation of the items one. In the process of data analysis, the scales strongly agree and agree indicate effective implementation of each item in the roles of instructional leadership, where as undecided presents neither positive nor negative agreement. On the other hand, the scales disagree indicate low implementation of the items in the sample schools.

4.2.1. Practices of Instructional Leadership as a Role of Instructional Leaders

Both groups of respondents of teachers and instructional leaders were asked to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement about practices of instructional leadership recognized as role of instructional leaders in school depending on the degree of

understanding of the following items in Table 3 of their schools. For this, eight items that describe practices of instructional leadership in school were presented to the group of teachers and instructional leaders and the result was analyzed under the following Table 3

Table-3. Practices of Instructional Leadership as a Role of Instructional Leaders

No	Items Description	Respondent's	Responses				Comparing means of Trs & I/ L by using t-test		
			N	M	STD	GM	T-value	DF	P-value
1	Engaging of teachers in setting the school vision and mission	Trs	102	4.22	1.030	4.19	.242	154	.809
		I/L	54	4.17	1.476				
2	Promoting the implementation of school Curriculum and Instruction	Trs	102	3.77	1.448	3.74	.218	154	.828
		I/L	54	3.72	1.379				
3	Supervising and evaluating Instructional program	Trs	102	4.04	1.279	4.03	.087	154	.931
		I/L	54	4.02	1.631				
4	Promoting teachers' Professional skill development	Trs	102	3.88	1.330	3.84	.385	154	.701
		I/L	54	3.80	1.323				
5	Building effective relationship in school	Trs	102	3.96	1.319	3.93	.229	154	.819
		I/L	54	3.91	1.496				
6	Promoting supportive roles of instructional program	Trs	102	3.66	1.506	3.64	.116	154	.908
		I/L	54	3.63	1.154				
7	Monitoring and directive instructional program	Trs	102	4.00	1.357	3.99	.077	154	.939
		I/L	54	3.98	1.572				
8	Ensure the sustainable way of Conflict Management	Trs	102	3.78	1.325	3.77	.111	154	.911
		I/L	54	3.76	1.359				
Average Mean Value		Trs	102	3.91		3.89			
		I/L	54	3.87					

Key: Trs=Teacher, I/L= Instructional Leader, N=number, M=Mean, STD=Standard deviation, GM=Grand Mean, Significant level = 0.05, Df= degree of freedom, Mean scores scale 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60=Disagree, 2.61-3.40=Undecided, 3.41-4.20=Agree and 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree.

As one can see the response to item 1 of Table 3 showed both groups of teachers and instructional leader respondents rated on agree scale as indicated mean value 4.22 and 4.17 respectively with grand mean value of 4.19. This shows that engaging of teachers in setting the school vision and mission is one of the practices of instructional leadership in school.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to engaging of teachers in setting the school vision and mission is one of the practices of instructional leadership in school. The computed p-value at alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$) was found to be 0.809, $p > 0.05$ or p-values is greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 2 of Table 3 showed both groups of teachers and instructional leader respondents rated on agree scale as indicated mean value 3.77 and 3.72 respectively with grand mean value of 3.74. This shows that promoting the implementation of school curriculum and instruction is one of the practices of instructional leadership in school.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to promoting the implementation of school curriculum and instruction is one of the practices instructional leadership in school. The computed p-value at alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$) was found to be 0.828, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 3 of Table 3 showed both groups of teachers and instructional leader respondents rated on agree scale as indicated mean value 3.88 and 3.80 respectively with grand mean value of 3.84. This shows that supervising and evaluating instructional program is one of the practices of instructional in school.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to supervising and evaluating instructional program is one of the practices of instructional leadership in school. The computed t-value at alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$) was found to be 0.701, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 4 of Table 3 showed both groups of teachers and instructional leader respondents rated on agree scale as indicated mean value 3.88 and

3.80 respectively with grand mean value of 3.84. This shows that promoting teachers' professional skill development is one of the practices of instructional leadership in school.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to promoting teachers' professional skill development is one of the practices instructional leadership. The computed p-value at alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$) was found to be 0.701, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 5 of Table 3 showed both groups of teachers and instructional leader respondents rated on agree scale as indicated mean value 3.96 and 3.91 respectively with grand mean value of 3.93. This shows that building effective relationship in school is one of the practices of instructional leadership in school.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to promoting teachers' building effective relationship in school is one of the practices instructional leadership in school. The computed p-value at alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$) was found to be 0.819, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 6 of Table 3 showed both groups of teachers and instructional leader respondents rated on agree scale as indicated mean value 3.66 and 3.63 respectively with grand mean value of 3.64. This shows that promoting supportive roles of instructional program is one of the practices of instructional leadership in school.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to promoting teachers' promoting supportive roles of instructional program is one of the practices instructional leadership in school. The computed p-value at alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$) was found to be 0.908, $p > 0.05$ or p-

values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 7 of Table 3 showed both groups of teachers and instructional leader respondents rated on agree scale as indicated mean value 4.00 and 3.98 respectively with grand mean value of 3.99. This shows that monitoring and directive instructional program is one of the practices of instructional leadership in school.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to monitoring and directive instructional program is one of the practices instructional leadership in school. The computed p-value at alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$) was found to be 0.939, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 8 of Table 3 showed both groups of teachers and instructional leader respondents rated on agree scale as indicated mean value 3.78 and 3.76 respectively with grand mean value of 3.77. This shows that ensure the sustainable way of conflict management is one of the practices of instructional leadership in school.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to ensure the sustainable way of conflict management is one of the roles instructional leadership in school. The computed p-value at alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$) was found to be 0.911, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

In relation to this, Murphy (1990) stated that mostly outstanding leadership has invariably emerged as a key characteristic of exceptional schools with successful and effective leadership are generally characterized by the way they setting vision and defining the school mission, managing curriculum and instruction, supervising and evaluating instruction, providing professional skill development, and creating conducive and healthy

school environment. Therefore, one can be conclude that all the items in the Table 3 above were accepted as a practice of instructional leadership in school.

Generally, as it can be seen from Table 3, the practices of instructional leadership in all of the items were found to be on agreed scale as indicated in the average mean value of 3.91 and 3.87 respectively with average grand mean value of 3.89 by teachers and instructional leaders groups of respondents. This indicated that all the items under the practices of instructional leadership in school were highly accepted as a practices instructional leadership by teachers and instructional leaders groups of respondents in the sampled general secondary schools of the zone.

4.2.2. School Instructional Leaders Provide Professional Support for Teachers

The effectiveness of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in teaching are mainly determined by the extent to which instructional leadership provide professional support for teachers in their respective schools. Therefore, the most important professional support of instructional leadership and their implementation in the study area like engaging of teachers in setting the school vision and school mission, promoting the implementation of school curriculum and instructional program, supervising and evaluating instructional program, promoting professional skill development, building effective relations in school, promoting supportive roles of instructional program, monitoring and directive role of instructional program and ensure the sustainable way of conflict management in supporting teachers in teaching.

4.2.2.1. Engaging of Teachers in Setting the School Vision and Mission

Concerning engaging of teachers in setting the School vision and mission, five items that describe the extent of implementation of the practice of instructional leaders were presented to the group of teachers and instructional leaders and analyzed under Table 4. Both groups of respondents were asked to rate from strongly agree to strongly disagree depending on the degree of implementation of the items in their schools.

Table 4. Engaging of Teachers in Setting the School Vision and Mission

No	Items Description Your Instructional Leaders..../As instructional Leaders....	Respondent's	Responses				Comparing means of Trs & I/L by using t-test		
			N	M	STD	GM	T- value	DF	P- value
1.	Well express or communicate the school vision help to improve teachers' instruction in class	Trs	102	3.51	1.467	3.49	.112	154	.911
		I/L	54	3.48	1.563				
2.	Develop missions that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school	Trs	102	2.13	1.096	2.12	.087	154	.931
		I/L	54	2.11	1.144				
3.	Participating teachers in setting school vision and mission in the school	Trs	102	2.13	1.264	2.11	.177	154	.860
		I/L	54	2.09	.976				
4.	Frame the school missions in the school help to strength the responsibilities of teachers in teaching	Trs	102	3.45	1.584	3.44	.025	154	.980
		I/L	54	3.44	1.513				
5.	Provide brochure that state the school vision and mission in the school	Trs	102	1.78	.929	1.77	.164	154	.867
		I/L	54	1.76	.867				
Average Mean Value		Trs	102	2.60		2.58			
		I/L	54	2.57					

Key: Trs=Teacher, I/L= Instructional School Leader, N=number, M=Mean, STD=Standard deviation, GM=Grand Mean, Significant level = 0.05, Df= degree of freedom, Mean scores scale 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60=Disagree, 2.61-3.40=Undecided, 3.41-4.20=Agree and 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree.

As one can see the response to item 1 of Table 4 showed both groups of teachers and instructional leader respondents rated on agree scale as indicated mean value 3.51 and 3.48 respectively with grand mean value of 3.49 This implies that both groups of respondents had almost similarly in high understanding of the importance of well express or communicate the school vision for teachers has significant contribution for the effectiveness of teachers in teaching in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders of well express or communicate the school vision for teachers have significant contribution for the effectiveness of teachers in teaching. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.911, $p > 0.05$ or p-values

are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 2 of Table 4 showed that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 2.13 and 2.11 respectively with combined mean value of 2.12. This show that the practice of instructional leadership in develop missions that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school were less effective implementation in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to the practice of instructional leadership practices to develop missions that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school. The computed p-value at alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$) was found to be 0.931, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one see the response to item 3 of Table 4 showed that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 2.13 and 1.09 respectively with combined mean value of 2.11. This shows that the practice of instructional leadership in participating teachers in setting school vision and mission in the school were less effective implementation in the sampled general secondary schools

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to the practice of instructional leadership in participating teachers in setting school vision and mission in the school by instructional leaders. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.860, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 4 of Table 4 showed both groups of teachers and instructional leader respondents rated on agree scale as indicated mean value 3.45 and 3.44 respectively with grand mean value of 3.44 This implies that both groups of

respondents had almost similarly in high understanding of the importance of frame the school missions in the school help to strength the responsibilities of teachers in teaching has significant contribution for the effectiveness of teaching in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders of frame the school missions in the school help to strength the responsibilities of teachers in teaching has significant contribution for the effectiveness of teaching. The computed p-value at alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$) was found to be 0.980, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 5 of Table 4 showed that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 1.78 and 1.76 respectively with combined mean value of 1.77. This shows that the practice of instructional leadership to provide brochure that state the school vision and mission in the school were less effective implementation in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to the practice of instructional leadership practices to provide brochure that state the school vision and mission in the school by instructional leaders. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.863, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

Generally, as it can be seen from Table 4, the practice of instructional leadership in engaging of teachers in setting the school vision and defining school's mission were found to be on disagree scale as indicated in the average mean value of 2.60 and 2.57 respectively with average grand mean value of 2.58 by groups of teachers and instructional leaders. This indicated that the practice of instructional leadership were low implementation in engaging teachers in setting the school vision and defining school's mission in the sampled secondary schools of the zone.

However, response to item 1 and 4 of Table 4 showed that both groups of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on agreed scale, i.e., both respondents of teachers and instructional leaders on the activity of well express or communicate the school vision help to improve teachers' teaching instruction in the class were felt under agreed scale and similarly both respondents of teachers and instructional leaders on the activity of frame the school missions in the school help to strength the responsibilities of teachers in teaching were felt under agreed scale. This indicated that both respondents have enough understanding about the importance of inclusiveness of teachers when setting school vision and defining school's mission have high contribution on the effectiveness of teachers' teaching instruction in the classroom, while not effectively implemented in the sampled general secondary school.

On the other hand, the data obtained from analysis shows that there is a variation between the mean values of the responses of the two groups of respondents. However, these do not have a meaning as long as a t-test is not made to see the implications of the mean differences between the two groups of respondents. Thus, to examine the implications of the mean difference found between the two groups' respondents, an independent sample t-test was conducted across the multiple roles indicated under the main instructional leadership listed down of inclusiveness of teachers when setting vision and defining school's mission. Accordingly, since all obtained p-values are greater than $\alpha = 0.05$ ($p > 0.05$), as a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders. So, the obtained responses were reliable.

As indicated in the methodology section, the researcher attempt to triangulate by interview, FGD by senior teachers and document analysis. According to the majority of interviewees elaborate about the roles of instructional leaders under inclusiveness of teachers when setting school vision and defining school mission in the sampled government general secondary schools were as better and effective implementation.

While the majority ideas of the focus group discussion of senior teachers explained and agreed about the roles of instructional leaders in inclusiveness of teachers when setting

school vision and defining school mission in the sampled government general secondary schools were not effective, because they explained as most of instructional leaders in sampled general secondary schools were not adopt the culture of inviting teachers in setting school vision and mission, even no clear communication of school vision and mission by instructional leaders, not able to create a suitable condition as easily understandable for teachers. Beside to this, from the document observation records similar with the ideas of FGD of senior teachers revealed as the majority of the sampled schools had no brochures that stated vision and mission of the schools in their office. From this data the researcher revealed that the practice of instructional leaders' engaging of teachers in setting school vision and defining school mission in the sampled government general secondary schools were low or ineffective implementation.

In general, the mean value show that instructional leaders of the sampled general secondary schools were found to be high in the understanding of well express or communicate the school vision help to improve teachers' instruction in class and frame the school missions in the school help to strength the responsibilities of teachers in teaching. However, in the remaining activities of instructional leadership, that is develop missions that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school, participating teachers in setting school vision and mission in the school and provide brochure that state the school vision and mission in the school were responded to as low implementation. Therefore, as indicated in the average mean value in Table 4 above, it can be concluded that the practice of instructional leadership activities in engaging of teachers in setting school vision and defining school's mission putting in to practice was not effectively implemented in the selected general secondary schools of Guji zone.

In connection to this, Day,et al.(2010) stated that successful instructional leaders have a very strong and clear vision and set of values for their school, which heavily influenced their actions and the actions of others and established a clear sense of directions and purpose for the school. In supporting of the idea Walker and Murphy (1989), Edmonds (1982) explained that after defining school goals, leaders are expected to build understanding of and commitment to those goals by communicating widely and systematically to teachers, students and parents. From this, the researcher conclude that

the practice of instructional leadership were inadequate implementation in clear communication of school vision & mission for teachers or the challenge had highly affected the task of teachers' teaching instruction in the sampled general secondary schools.

As a whole, one can be conclude that the practice of instructional leaders in engaging of teachers in setting school vision and defining school's missions were found to be ineffective in the sampled general secondary schools of Gujii zone, because of the poor performance of the three practices, i.e., develop missions that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school, participating teachers in setting school vision and mission in the school and provide brochure that state the school vision and mission in the school.

4.2.2.2. Promoting the Implementation of School Curriculum and Instruction

Promote the implementation of school curriculum and instruction is among the major functions of leaders who involved in to educational issues. It basically refers to the instructional leaders' activities of providing opportunity for staff to collaborate for the alignment of curriculum contents and achievement. It also refers to an instructional leader works with teachers to coordinate curriculum and provide the necessary assistance for teachers for instructional issues. In this regard, six questions were administered to gather the opinions of teachers and instructional leaders concerning the role of promoting the implementations school curriculum and instruction of their respective schools. The data collected through the five point linkert scale were interpreted as indicated in Table 5 below.

Table-5. Promoting the Implementation of School Curriculum and Instruction

No	Items Your Instructional Leaders..../As instructional Leaders....	Respondent's	Responses				Comparing means of Trs & I/L by using t-test		
			N	M	STD	GM	T- value	DF	P- value
1	Advice and encourage teachers regarding the good implementation of the curriculum in the school	Trs	102	2.35	1.191	2.35	.005	154	.996
		I/L	54	2.35	1.803				
2	Encourage and provide the necessary support to teachers is the means for curriculum improvement	Trs	102	3.83	1.574	3.81	.136	154	.892
		I/L	54	3.80	1.709				
3	Check and evaluate the school curriculum regularly at the school	Trs	102	2.45	1.166	2.45	-.058	154	.953
		I/L	54	2.46	1.313				
4	Coordinate teachers for curriculum implementation effectively at school	Trs	102	2.04	1.014	2.05	-.089	154	.955
		I/L	54	2.06	1.235				
5	Motivate teachers to implement appropriately the school curriculum at school	Trs	102	2.43	1.278	2.43	.025	154	.980
		I/L	54	2.43	1.395				
6	Hold regular meeting with teachers for the purpose of improving curriculum and instruction at school	Trs	102	2.00	1.227	2.01	-.091	154	.928
		I/L	54	2.02	1.173				
Average Mean Value		Trs	102	2.51		2.51			
		I/L	54	2.52					

Key: Trs=Teacher, I/L= Instructional Leader, N=number, M=Mean, STD=Standard deviation, GM=Grand Mean, Significant level = 0.05, Df= degree of freedom, Mean scores scale 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60=Disagree, 2.61-3.40=Undecided, 3.41-4.20=Agree and 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree.

As one can see the response to item 1 of Table 5 showed that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 2.35 and 3.35 respectively with combined mean value of 2.35. This shows that the practice of instructional leadership in advice and encourage teachers regarding the good implementation of the curriculum in the school was less implemented in supporting of teachers in teaching in the sampled general secondary schools

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to the practice of instructional

leadership in advice and encourage teachers regarding the good implementation of the curriculum in the school. The computed p-value at alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$) was found to be 0.996, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the responses of teachers and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 2 of Table 5 showed both groups of teachers and school leader respondents rated on agree scale as indicated mean value 3.83 and 3.80 respectively with grand mean value of 3.81 This implies that both groups of respondents had almost similarly in high understanding of the importance of the practice of instructional leadership in encourage and provide the necessary support to teachers is the means for curriculum improvement has significant contribution for the effectiveness of teaching in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders of the practice of instructional leadership in encourage and provide the necessary support to teachers is the means for curriculum improvement has significant contribution for the effectiveness of teaching. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.892, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 3 of Table 5 showed that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 2.45 and 2.46 respectively with combined mean value of 2.45. This shows that the practice of instructional leadership in check and evaluate the school curriculum regularly at the school by instructional leaders were less effective in supporting of teachers in the sampled general secondary schools

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to the practice of instructional leadership in check and evaluate the school curriculum regularly at the school by instructional leaders. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.953, $p > 0.05$) or

p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 4 of Table 5 showed that both group of teachers and school leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 2.04 and 2.06 respectively with combined mean value of 2.05. This shows that the practice of instructional leadership in coordinate teachers for curriculum implementation effectively at school by instructional leaders were less effective in supporting of teachers in teaching in the sampled general secondary schools

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regard to the practice of instructional leadership in coordinate teachers for curriculum implementation effectively at school by instructional leaders. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.955, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 5 of Table 5 showed that both group of teachers and school leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 2.43 and 2.43 respectively with combined mean value of 4.43. This shows that the practice of instructional leadership in motivate teachers to implement appropriately the school curriculum at school by instructional leaders were less effective in supporting of teachers in teaching in the sampled general secondary schools

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regard to the practice of instructional leadership in motivates teachers to implement appropriately the school curriculum at school by instructional leaders. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.980, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 6 of Table 5 showed that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 2.00 and

2.02 respectively with combined mean value of 2.01. This shows that the practice of instructional leadership in hold regular meeting with teachers for the purpose of improving curriculum and instruction at school by instructional leaders were less effective in supporting of teachers in teaching in the sampled general secondary schools

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to hold regular meeting with teachers for the purpose of improving curriculum and instruction at school by instructional leaders. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.928, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

Generally, as it can be seen in Table 5 both groups of respondents of teachers and instructional leaders rated the role of managing curriculum and instruction to be on disagreed scale as indicated in the average mean value 2.51 and 2.52 respectively with average grand mean value of 2.51. This implies that the practice of instructional leadership in promoting the implementation of school curriculum and instruction activities by instructional leaders were not effective implementation in supporting of teachers in teaching in the sampled general secondary schools.

Among the practice of instructional leaders under promoting the implementation of school curriculum and instruction, the five activities, i.e., advice and encourage teachers regarding the good implementation of the curriculum in the school, check and evaluate the school curriculum regularly at the school, coordinate teachers for curriculum implementation effectively at school, motivate teachers to implement appropriately the school curriculum at school and hold regular meeting with teachers for the purpose of improving curriculum and instruction at school both groups of respondents of teachers and instructional leaders were found to be under disagreed scale. This implies that the performance of promote the implementation of school curriculum and instruction by instructional leaders were not effective in supporting of teachers in teaching in the sampled general secondary schools.

However, only response to item 2 of Table 5 showed that both groups of respondents of teachers and school leaders rated on agreed scale. From this the researcher conclude that there is clear understanding about curriculum development activities practiced by instructional leaders in supporting of teachers' teaching process, but not effectively implemented in the sampled general secondary schools.

The responses of interviews of cluster supervisors and ideas of FGD of senior teachers indicated that the responsibility of promoting the implementation of school curriculum and instruction in supporting of teachers in teaching process by instructional leaders was ineffective in most of the sampled general secondary schools, because they couldn't obey their responsibility, commitment and initiation as they intended in their respective schools in the sampled schools.

Concerning to this, Hollinger (1985) stated that the instructional leaders' provide opportunity for staff collaboration on the alignment of curriculum with standards and achievement. In support of this idea, Hollinger Murphy (1985) explained that the roles of instructional leaders involves managing instructional program and working directly with teachers in the area related to curriculum and instruction. From this, it can be conclude that, the roles of instructional leadership activity of promote the implementation of school curriculum and instruction by instructional leaders was ineffective in supporting of teachers in teaching in the sampled general secondary schools of Guji zone.

Finally, an independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the role practice of instructional leadership in promoting the implementation of school curriculum and instructional program scores for both groups of teachers and instructional leaders. As a result they rated all the items in the roles as ineffective implementation in supporting teachers in teaching except item 2 as high understanding. In all item no statistically significant difference in group response between respondents of teachers and instructional leaders. All obtained p-values are greater than $\alpha = 0.05$ or $p > 0.05$ (see Table 5). So the obtained responses were reliable.

4.2.2.3. Supervising and Evaluating Instruction Program

As many literatures explain the major roles of supervisions are to examine the instructional process and assist or support teachers to be competent in their subject area and at the end achieve students learning progress. If instructional leaders are not attempt to manage and evaluate the day to day activities and cope up with current supervisory leadership demand, it would be difficult for them to provide the necessary support for teachers and obtained the required results.

Table-6. Supervising and Evaluating Instructional Program

No	Items Description Your Instructional Leaders..../As instructional Leaders....	Respondent's	Reponses				Comparing means of Trs & I/L by using t-test		
			N	M	STD	GM	T- value	DF	P- value
1	Make classroom visits for the purpose of supporting instructional process help teachers to improve teaching in the classroom	Trs	102	3.70	1.225	3.68	.140	154	.889
		I/L	54	3.67	1.303				
2	Regular and periodic visits way of teachers' teaching in the classroom at school	Trs	102	2.18	1.075	2.17	.050	154	.960
		I/L	54	2.17	1.314				
3	Give adequate time after class visit to discuss the problems and plan improvement together with teachers at school	Trs	102	1.93	1.007	1.93	.031	154	.976
		I/L	54	1.93	1.147				
4	Head departments are courage to visit classroom teaching at school	Trs	102	1.91	1.016	1.90	.133	154	.895
		I/L	54	1.89	1.040				
Average Mean Value		Trs	102	2.43		2.42			
	I/L	54	2.41						

Key: Trs=Teacher, I/L= Instructional Leader, N=number, M=Mean, STD=Standard deviation, GM=Grand Mean, Significant level = 0.05, Df= degree of freedom, Mean scores scale 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60=Disagree, 2.61-3.40=Undecided, 3.41-4.20=Agree and 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree.

As one can see the response to item 1 of Table 6 showed both groups of teachers and instructional leader respondents rated on agree scale as indicated mean value 3.70 and 3.67 respectively with grand mean value of 3.68. This implies that both groups of respondents had almost similarly in high understanding of the importance of make classroom visits for the purpose of supporting instructional process help teachers to

improve teaching in the classroom has significant contribution for the effectiveness of teaching in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders of make classroom visits for the purpose of supporting instructional process help teachers to improve teaching in the classroom has significant contribution for the effectiveness of teaching. The computed p-value at alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$) was found to be 0.889, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 2 of Table 6 showed that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 2.18 and 2.17 respectively with combined mean value of 2.17. This shows that the practice of instructional leadership in regular and periodic visits way of teachers' teaching in the classroom at school by instructional leaders were less effective in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled general secondary schools

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to regular and periodic visits way of teachers' teaching in the classroom at school by instructional leaders. The computed p-value at alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$) was found to be 0.960, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see response to item 3 of Table 6 showed that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 1.93 and 1.93 respectively with combined mean value of 1.93. This shows that the practices of give adequate time after class visit to discuss the problems and plan improvement together with teachers at school by instructional leaders were less effective implementation to provide professional support for teachers in the sampled general secondary schools

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to give adequate time after class visit to discuss the problems and plan improvement together with teachers at school by instructional leaders. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.976, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 4 of Table 6 showed that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 1.91 and 1.89 respectively with combined mean value of 1.90. This shows that the practice of instructional leadership in head departments are courage to visit classroom teaching at school were less effective in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled general secondary schools

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to head departments are courage to visit classroom teaching at school by instructional leaders. The computed p-value at alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$) was found to be 0.895, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

Generally, as it can be seen in Table 6 both groups of respondents of teachers and instructional leaders rated the role of supervising and evaluating instruction to be on disagreed scale as indicated in the average mean value 2.43 and 2.41 respectively with average grand mean value of 2.42. This implies that the practice of instructional leadership in supervising and evaluating instructional program activities by instructional leaders were low in supporting teachers in teaching in the sampled general secondary schools of the zone.

As indicated in Table 6 the activities under supervising and evaluating instruction by instructional leaders of items 2, 3 and 4 (regular and periodic visits way of teachers' teaching in the classroom at school, give adequate time after class visit to discuss the problems and plan improvement together with teachers at school and head departments

are courage to visit classroom teaching at school), with mean value of 2.18, 1.93 and 1.91 respectively found to be disagreed scale according to the teachers group respondents in the sampled general secondary schools of the zone.

Similarly, instructional leaders group respondents in the activities supervising and evaluating instruction by instructional leaders in the same Table 6 of item 2, 3 and 4 above (regular and periodic visits way of teachers' teaching in the classroom at school, give adequate time after class visit to discuss the problems and plan improvement together with teachers at school and head departments are courage to visit classroom teaching at school), with mean value of 2.17, 1.93 and 1.89 respectively found to be disagreed scale in their respective school.

When the researcher attempt to triangulate by six group of FGD of senior teachers and record of document observation, this idea can be confirmed with the output of six group of FGD of senior teachers and recorded document observations. They reported that instructional leaders in the schools they provided conduct ones or twice per years a class visit, no uniformly see all teachers and support them, they also indicated that the time taken to comment or give constructive feedback after class was very minimal and fragmented.

Concerning to this, Hollinger and Murphy (1985) stated that instructional leaders as evaluators he/she helps teachers to identify, analyze, and solve learning problems, provide timely and constructive feedback, assessing teachers to identify strengths and weakness to guide them on the path for improvement. From this, the researcher can be conclude that, the roles of instructional leadership activity in supervising and evaluating instruction by instructional leaders was ineffective in supporting teachers in teaching in the sampled general secondary schools of Guji zone. MoE (2007) suggested as instructional leaders are expected to play supervisory leadership role through examining the direction of the ongoing educational changes, teaching approach, continuous assessment, and task centered research and instructional material. Therefore, the researcher conclude that the practices of instructional leadership in supervising and

evaluating instruction was less implementation to provide professional support for teachers in the sampled school.

That means instructional leaders in the sampled general secondary schools are not effectively facilitating the working conditions for teachers and not courage to invest their efforts to bring teachers in to acceptable in teaching profession. Supervision has to give first attentions for teachers in guiding and initiating activities with the assumption of improving the capacities building, but not effectively implemented the role practice of instructional leadership in supervising and evaluating instruction by the instructional leaders of the sampled schools.

Finally, independent sample t-test was conducted to examine the difference in responses of two groups of respondents regarding to the roles of instructional leadership practice in supervising and evaluating instructional program. In all items no statistically significant difference in group response between respondents of teachers and instructional leaders. All obtained p-values are greater than $\alpha = 0.05$ or $p > 0.05$ (see Table 6). So, the obtained responses were reliable.

4.2.2.4. Promoting Teachers' Professional Skill Development

As a teacher professional skill development is one way of improving the teaching professional competence of teachers in a school and considered to be an important role of individual assumes an instructional leadership position. In the process of data analysis, the scales strongly agree and agree indicate effective implementation of each item in the roles of instructional leadership, where as undecided presents neither positive nor negative agreement. On the other hand, the scales disagree and strongly disagree indicate low implementation of the items in the sample schools. To assess the practice of instructional leaders how to perform professional support for teachers five items were administered and organized for both groups of teachers and school instructional leaders respondents by SPSS for more advanced statistical operation and decision making were presented in Table 7 below.

Table-7. Promoting Teachers' Professional Skill Development

No	Items Description Your Instructional Leaders..../As instructional Leaders....	Respondent's	Reponses				Comparing means of Trs & I/L by using t-test		
			N	M	STD	GM	T-value	DF	P-value
1	Facilitating teachers professional skill development is good for teachers' success in teaching at school	Trs	102	3.51	1.488	3.50	.039	154	.969
		I/L	54	3.50	1.476				
2	Identify the professional development needs of teachers at school	Trs	102	1.85	1.103	1.85	.006	154	.995
		I/L	54	1.85	1.071				
3	Encourage teachers to develop their professional skill through experience sharing at school	Trs	102	2.21	1.245	2.83	5.77	154	.000
		I/L	54	3.46	1.383				
4	Organize professional skill development opportunity for teachers at school	Trs	102	2.08	1.208	2.07	.021	154	.983
		I/L	54	2.07	1.315				
5	Create opportunities for professional discussions among teachers at school	Trs	102	2.14	1.379	2.12	.115	154	.909
		I/L	54	2.11	1.298				
Average Mean Value		Trs	102	2.35		2.47			
		I/L	54	2.59					

Key: Trs=Teacher, I/L= Instructional Leader, N=number, M=Mean, STD=Standard deviation, GM=Grand Mean, Significant level = 0.05, Df= degree of freedom, Mean scores scale 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60=Disagree, 2.61-3.40=Undecided, 3.41-4.20=Agree and 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree.

As one can see the response to item 1 of Table 7 showed that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on agree scale as indicated mean value 3.51 and 3.50 respectively with grand mean value of 3.50. This implies that facilitating teachers professional skill development is good for teachers' success in teaching at school were acceptable by two group respondents in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders with regard to facilitating teachers professional skill development is good for teachers' success in teaching at school by instructional leaders. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be .969, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are

greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 2 of Table 7 indicated that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 1.85 and 1.85 respectively with grand mean value of 1.85. This implies that the practice of instructional leadership in identify the professional development needs of teachers at school by instructional leaders were less effective in provide professional support for teachers.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders with regard to the practice of instructional leadership in identify the professional development needs of teachers at school by instructional leaders. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.995, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 3 of Table 7 showed that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 2.21 and 3.46 respectively with grand mean value of 2.83. This implies that teachers group of respondents rated on disagreed scale, but instructional leaders group of respondents rated on agreed scale and their grand mean value was found to be on undecided scale in the practices of encourage teachers to develop their professional skill through experience sharing at school by instructional leaders. In general, this indicated that both groups have assumed in different ideas and their grand mean value felt under undecided scale, so, it is difficult to decided whether the mentioned issue was implemented effectively in the school rather ineffective implementation in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders with regard to give feedback after visiting classroom teaching by school leaders. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be .000, $p < 0.05$ or p-values are less than 0.05. As a result, there is statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one see the response of item 4 of Table 7 indicated both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 2.08 and 2.07 respectively with grand mean value of 2.07. This implies that the practice of instructional leadership in organize professional skill development opportunity for teachers at school by instructional leaders were low in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to the practice of instructional leadership in organize professional skill development opportunity for teachers at school by instructional leaders. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.983, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 5 of Table 7 showed that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 2.14 and 2.11 respectively with combined mean value of 2.12. This implies that the practice of instructional leadership in create opportunities for professional discussions among teachers at school by instructional leaders were less effective provide professional support for teachers in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders with regarding to the practice of instructional leadership in create opportunities for professional discussions among teachers at school by instructional leaders. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be .909, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

Generally, as can be seen from Table 7 revealed that the activities under professional skill development roles of instructional leaders both groups of respondents of teachers and instructional leaders felt under disagreed level of performance as showed the average mean value of 2.35 and 2.59 respectively with average grand mean value of 2.47. This implies that the practices of instructional leadership in promoting professional skill

development program were ineffective provide professional support for teachers by instructional leaders in the sampled general secondary schools of Guji Zone .

Concerning to this, Harris and Muijs (2005) stated that working as part of a professional development community helps focus attention on shared purpose and the goals that lead to school improvement and dynamic change. From this, the researcher concludes that the practice of instructional leadership in promoting professional skill development were not enough in supporting of teachers in teaching instruction.

Finally, the result of independent t-test values for all items indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the means of the two groups as obtained p-value which range from .909 to .995 were greater than 0.05 except item 3 which was statistically significant different between the means of the two groups as obtained p-value which was less than 0.05 or $p < 0.05$ (see Table 7). So, this implies the consistency of responses between the groups of teachers and instructional leaders.

4.2.2.5. Building Effective Relations in School

Actually, in the school everything began with relationship among teachers, administrators, cluster supervisors, students, communities and parents for decision making, allocation of resources and evaluation of learning outcomes. In the process of data analysis, the scales strongly agree and agree indicate effective implementation of each item in the roles of instructional leadership, where as undecided presents neither positive nor negative agreement. On the other hand, the scales disagree and strongly disagree indicate low implementation of the items in the sample schools. To assess the practice of instructional leaders six items were administered and organized for both groups of respondents of teacher and instructional leaders by spss for more advanced statistical operation and decision making were presented in Table 8 below.

Table 8. Building Effective Relationship in School

No	Items Description Your Instructional Leaders..../As instructional Leaders....	Respondent's	Responses				Comparing means of Trs & I/L by using t-test		
			N	M	STD	GM	T-value	DF	P-value
1	Maintain good relationship between school leaders and teachers has positive impact on teachers' work.	Trs	102	3.54	1.487	3.53	.085	154	.932
		I/L	54	3.52	1.356				
2	Encourage teachers to share on their academic ideas and support each other has significant contribution for the effectiveness of teaching	Trs	102	3.44	1.571	3.43	.055	154	.956
		I/L	54	3.43	1.787				
3	Listen to and accept teachers suggestions is very important to solve the teaching problems of teachers	Trs	102	3.44	1.564	3.42	.124	154	.902
		I/L	54	3.41	1.721				
4	Encourage collaborative work cultures among teachers at school	Trs	102	1.62	.879	1.59	.316	154	.752
		I/L	54	1.57	.690				
5	Democratically open and collaborative communication with teachers at school	Trs	102	1.82	1.112	1.81	.045	154	.964
		I/L	54	1.81	1.214				
6	Encourage teachers to help and support each other in teaching at school	Trs	102	1.74	.843	1.72	.195	154	.846
		I/L	54	1.70	1.160				
Average Mean Value		Trs	102	2.60		2.58			
		I/L	54	2.57					

Key: Trs=Teacher, I/L= Instructional Leader, N=number, M=Mean, STD=Standard deviation, GM=Grand Mean, Significant level = 0.05, Df= degree of freedom, Mean scores scale 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60=Disagree, 2.61-3.40=Undecided, 3.41-4.20=Agree and 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree.

As one can see the response to item 1 of Table 8 showed that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on agree scale as indicated mean value 3.54 and 3.52 respectively with grand mean value of 3.53. This implies that both groups of respondents had almost similarly in high understanding of the importance of maintain good relationship between school leaders and teachers has positive impact on teachers in teaching in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to maintain good relationship between school leaders and teachers has positive impact on teachers. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.932, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 2 of Table 8 indicated both groups of teachers and instructional leader respondents rated on agree scale as indicated mean value 3.44 and 3.43 respectively with grand mean value of 3.43. This implies that both groups of respondents had almost similarly in high understanding of the importance encourage teachers to share on their academic ideas and support each other has significant contribution for the effectiveness of teaching in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to encourage teachers to share on their academic ideas and support each other has significant contribution for the effectiveness of teaching. The computed p-value at alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$) was found to be 0.956, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

In relation to this, Halpin (1966, cited in Adisu 2014) indicated that professional supportive role of school instructional leaders has to be done with how the school leader relates and respond to staff needs and this contributes to caring environment in which every body cares for one another and invariable foster excellent teaching learning process.

As one can see the response to item 3 of Table 8 showed that both groups of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on agree scale as indicated mean value 3.44 and 3.41 respectively with grand mean value of 3.42. This shows that both groups of respondents had almost similarly in high understanding of the importance of listen to and

accept teachers' suggestions is very important to solve the teaching problems of teachers in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to advice teachers on implementation of the curriculum. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.902, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see response to item 4 of Table 8 reflected that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on strongly disagree scale as indicated mean value 1.62 and 1.57 respectively with grand mean value of 1.59. This implies that the practices of instructional leadership in encourage collaborative work cultures among teachers at school by instructional leaders were low implementation in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders with regard to encourage collaborative work cultures among teachers at school by instructional leaders. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.752, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see response to item 5 of Table 8 showed that both group of teachers and school leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 1.82 and 1.81 respectively with combined mean value of 1.81. This shows that the practices of instructional leadership in open and collaborative communication between instructional leaders and teachers at school by school leaders were less effective in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled general secondary schools

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to the role practices of instructional

leadership in open and collaborative communication between instructional leaders and teachers at school by instructional leaders. The computed p-value at alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$) was found to be 0.964, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 6 of Table 8 reflected that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on strongly disagree scale as indicated mean value 1.74 and 1.70 respectively with grand mean value of 1.72. This implies that the practices of instructional leadership in encourage teachers to help and supports each other in teaching at school by instructional leaders were low implementation in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to the role practices of instructional leadership in encourage teachers to help and support each other in teaching at school by instructional leaders. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.846, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

Generally, as it can be observed from Table 8 above both groups of teachers and instructional leaders respondent were rated the roles of instructional leaders under building effective relations among teachers on disagreed level of implementations as indicated average mean value 2.60 and 2.57 respectively with grand mean of 2.58 in the sampled general secondary schools of Guji Zone. This showed that the practices of instructional leadership in building effective relationship among teachers were low implementation in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled general secondary schools.

Regarding items 1, 2, and 3 of Table 8 analysis, the mean value of both teachers and instructional leaders respondents (maintain good relationship between school leaders and teachers has positive impact on teachers' work, encourage teachers to share on their academic ideas and support each other has significant contribution for the effectiveness

of teaching and listen to and accept teachers suggestions is very important to solve the teaching problems of teachers) were rated in high level of understanding with grand mean value of 3.53, 3.43 and 3.42 respectively, but not implementation.

while items 4, 5, and 6 of Table 8 analysis, the mean value of both teachers and instructional leaders respondents showed that (encourage collaborative work cultures among teachers at school, open and collaborative communication between school leaders and teachers at school and encourage teachers to help and support each other in teaching at school) were rated low implementation with grand mean value of 1.59, 1.81 and 1.72 respectively. Concerning to this, Marx (2006) explained that instructional leaders establish and maintain open and productive relations among the school community by working with teachers, students, parents and the community at large and need to be develop and maintain positive relationship with all. Accordingly, as a whole the roles of instructional leaders with regard to building effective relationship in the sampled schools were low level of implementation. From this, the researcher conclude that the practice of instructional leaders in building of effective relationship among teachers, even between teachers and instructional leaders were not successful in line of supporting teachers' teaching instruction in the sampled general secondary schools of Guji Zone.

Finally, the result of independent t-test values for all items indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the means of the two groups as obtained p-value which range from .752 to .964 were greater than 0.05 (see Table 8). So, this implies the consistency of responses between the groups of teachers and instructional leaders.

4.2.2.6. Promoting Supportive Role of Instructional Program

This practice is to be done with how the instructional leaders recognize, relates, and respond specifically teachers and generally staff needs and this contributes to caring environment in which every body cares for one another and invariable *foster* excellent teaching learning process. In the process of data analysis, the scales strongly agree and agree indicate effective implementation of each item in the roles of instructional leadership, where as undecided presents neither positive nor negative agreement. On the other hand, the scales disagree and strongly disagree indicate low implementation of the items in the sample schools. To assess the supportive roles of instructional leaders, six

items were administered and organized for both groups of respondents by SPSS for more advanced statistical operation. In the process of data analysis, the scales strongly agree and agree indicate effective implementation of each item in the roles of instructional leadership, whereas undecided presents neither positive nor negative agreement. On the other hand, the scales disagree and strongly disagree indicate low implementation of the items in the sample schools decision making were presented in Table 9 below.

Table 9. Promoting Supportive Roles of Instructional Program

No	Items Description Your Instructional Leaders..../As instructional Leaders....	Respondent's	Responses				Comparing means of Trs & I/ L by using t-test		
			N	M	STD	GM	T- value	DF	P- value
1	Give recognition and encourage teachers based on their good work activities have positive contribution for effective classroom teaching	Trs	102	3.48	1.553	3.47	.064	154	.949
		I/L	54	3.46	1.767				
2	Provide faire selection of teachers for reward on their good working activities at school	Trs	102	2.47	1.546	2.46	.029	154	.977
		I/L	54	2.46	1.599				
3	Regular and periodic teachers' classroom teaching observation at school	Trs	102	2.39	1.470	2.39	.014	154	.989
		I/L	54	2.39	1.123				
4	Give constructive feedback after classroom observation in time for teachers at school	Trs	102	2.52	1.540	2.51	.081	154	.935
		I/L	54	2.50	1.209				
5	Give training for teachers on teaching skills at school	Trs	102	2.02	1.312	2.01	.096	154	.929
		I/L	54	2.00	1.009				
6	support on weekly and annual lesson plan preparation at school	Trs	102	1.86	1.259	1.84	.141	154	.887
		I/L	54	1.83	1.209				
Average Mean Value		Trs	102	2.45		2.44			
		I/L	54	2.44					

Key: Trs=Teacher, I/L= Instructional Leader, N=number, M=Mean, STD=Standard deviation, GM=Grand Mean, Significant level = 0.05, Df= degree of freedom, Mean scores scale 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60=Disagree, 2.61-3.40=Undecided, 3.41-4.20=Agree and 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree.

As one can see the response to item 1 of Table 9 indicated both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on agree scale as indicated mean value 3.48 and

3.46 respectively with grand mean value of 3.47. This implies that both groups of respondents had almost similarly in high understanding of the importance to give recognition and encourage teachers based on their good work activities have positive contribution for effective classroom teaching in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to give recognition and encourage teachers based on their good work activities have positive contribution for effective classroom teaching. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.949, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 2 of Table 9 showed that both group of teachers and school leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 2.47 and 2.46 respectively with grand mean value of 2.46. This implies that the practice of instructional leadership in provide faire selection of teachers for reward on their good working activities at school by instruction leaders were low implementation provide professional support for teachers in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to the practice of instructional leadership in provide faire selection of teachers for reward on their good working activities at school by instructional leaders. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.977, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 3 of Table 9 showed that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 2.39 and 2.39 respectively with combined mean value of 2.39. This implies that the practice of instructional leadership in regular and periodic teachers' classroom teaching observation at school by instructional leaders were low implementation in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to the practice of instructional leadership in regular and periodic teachers' classroom teaching observation at school by instructional leaders. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.989, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 4 of Table 9 reflected that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 2.52 and 2.50 respectively with combined mean value of 2.51. This implies that the practice of instructional leadership in give constructive feedback after classroom observation in time for teachers at school by instructional leaders were low implementation in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to give constructive feedback after classroom observation in time for teachers at school by instructional leaders. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.935, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see response to item 5 of Table 9 showed both group of teachers and school leader respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 2.02 and 2.00 respectively with combined mean value of 2.01. This implies that the practice of instructional leadership in give training for teachers on teaching skills at school by instructional leaders were low implementation in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to give training for teachers on teaching skills at school by instructional leaders. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.929, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no

statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see response to item 6 of Table 9 showed both group of teachers and instructional leader respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 1.86 and 1.83 respectively with combined mean value of 1.84. This implies that the practice of instructional leadership in support on weekly and annual lesson plan preparation at school by instructional leaders were low implementation in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to the role of instructional leadership practice in support on weekly and annual lesson plan preparation at school by instructional leaders. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.887, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

Generally, as it can be observed from Table 9 above both teachers and instructional leaders group of respondents were rated the practice of instructional leaders under supportive roles of teaching instruction on disagreed level of implementations as indicated average mean value 2.45 and 2.44 respectively with grand mean of 2.44 in the sampled general secondary schools of the zone. This implies that the practice of instructional leadership in promoting supportive roles of instructional program were low implementation in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled general secondary schools.

As can be seen in the above Table 9, item number 2 up to 6 both groups of respondents almost rated similar, then, the mean scores of teachers were ranges from 1.86-2.47 and that of instructional leaders ranges from 1.83-2.46 respectively and the average mean scores of the two groups of respondents felt under disagree level of implementation in the sampled general secondary schools. This implies that low implementation of instructional leaders' activities in line of supporting teachers in teaching instruction in the sampled schools, except item number 1 of both teachers and instructional leaders respondents

mean score 3.47 and 3.46 respectively with grand mean value of 3.46 which found to be similarly high level understanding but not implementation.

In relation to this, Halpin (1966) indicated that supportive role of instructional leader has to be done with how the school leader relates and respond to staff needs and this contributes to caring environment in which every body cares for one another and invariable foster excellent teaching learning process. From this, it can be concluded that the supportive role of instructional leaders was rated as low implementation in the sampled general secondary schools of Guji Zone.

Finally, the result of independent t-test values for all items indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the means of the two groups as obtained p-value which range from .887 to .989 were greater than 0.05 (see Table 9). So, this implies the consistency of responses between the groups of teachers and instructional leaders.

4.2.2.7. Monitoring and Directive Instructional Program

Monitoring the instructional activities or programs refers to instructional leader's test result goals, evaluating instructional activities and measuring progress towards school goals. The ultimate goal of monitoring instructional program is to ensure that all students successfully attend proficiency in their learning. In relation to monitoring the instructional program, Murphy (1985, cited in Adisu, 2014) explained that good instructional leaders need to use assessment results that help teachers, students and parents to understand where and why improvement is needed. This continuous inspection of the instructional program enable teacher to effectively meet students needs through constant revision. A directive role of instructional leader also very important for effective teacher's teaching in the classroom. Instructional leader who emphasizes directive very strongly influences or support how the teachers fulfill their responsibility and it will ultimately improve teaching learning process in the school.

To assess monitoring and directive roles of instructional leaders' four items were prepared, organized and presented for both group of respondents by spss for more advanced statistical operation and decision making were presented in Table 10 below.

Table-10. Monitoring and Directive Instructional Program

No	Items Description Your Instructional Leaders..../As instructional Leaders....	Respondent's	Responses				Comparing means of Trs & I/L by using t-test		
			N	M	STD	GM	T- value	DF	P- value
1	Closely checks teacher's activities has positive contribution for the effectiveness of teachers in teaching	Trs	102	3.62	1.542	3.60	.097	154	.922
		I/L	54	3.59	1.499				
2	Monitor everything the teachers do at school	Trs	102	2.16	1.333	2.15	.039	154	.969
		I/L	54	2.15	1.280				
3	Effective monitoring of teachers' activities at school	Trs	102	2.58	1.346	2.57	.019	154	.985
		I/L	54	2.57	1.449				
4	Meet individually with teachers to discuss students academic progress at school	Trs	102	1.98	1.364	1.95	.231	154	.817
		I/L	54	1.93	1.465				
Average Mean Value		Trs	102	2.58		2.57			
		I/L	54	2.56					

Key: Trs=Teacher, I/L= Instructional Leader, N=number, M=Mean, STD=Standard deviation, GM=Grand Mean, Significant level = 0.05, Df= degree of freedom, Mean scores scale 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60=Disagree, 2.61-3.40=Undecided, 3.41-4.20=Agree and 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree.

As one can see the response to item 1 of Table 10 showed that both groups of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on agree scale as indicated mean value 3.62 and 3.59 respectively with grand mean value of 3.60. This shows that both groups of respondents had almost similarly in high understanding of the importance of closely checks teacher's activities has positive contribution for the effectiveness of teachers in teaching in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding closely checks teacher's activities has positive contribution for the effectiveness of teachers in teaching. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.922, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a

result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 2 of Table 10 reflected that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 2.16 and 2.15 respectively with combined mean value of 2.15. This implies that the practice of instructional leadership in monitor everything the teachers do at school by school leaders were low implementation in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders with regard to monitor everything the teachers do at school by school leaders. The computed t-value at alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$) was found to be 0.969, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see response to item 3 of Table 10 showed that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 2.58 and 2.57 respectively with combined mean value of 2.57. This shows that the practice of instructional leadership in effective monitoring of teachers' activities at school by instructional leaders were low implementation in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to effective monitoring of teachers' activities at school by instruction leaders. The computed p-value at alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$) was found to be 0.985, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 4 of Table 10 reflected that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 1.98 and 1.93 respectively with grand mean value of 1.95. This implies that the practice of

instructional leadership in meet individually with teachers to discuss students' academic progress at school by instructional leaders were low implementation in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to the role of instructional leadership practice in meet individually with teachers to discuss students' academic progress at school by school leaders. The computed p-value at alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$) was found to be 0.817, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

Generally, as it can be observed from Table 10 above both groups of teachers and instructional leaders' respondents were rated the practice of instructional leaders under monitoring and directive instructional program in supporting of teachers' teaching instruction found to be on disagreed level of implementations as indicated average mean value 2.58 and 2.56 respectively with grand mean of 2.57 in the sampled general secondary schools of Guji Zone. This implies that the practice of instructional leadership in monitoring and directive instructional program were low implementation in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled general secondary schools.

In connection to this, Weber (1996) stated that assessing the instructional program is essential for improvement of instructional program. In supporting, Halpin (1966) explain that the school leader who emphasizes directive very strongly believes that, people work best under tension and pressure. This type of principal behavior influences how the staff will discharge their responsibilities it will ultimately affect the school. From this, the researcher can be conclude that the practice of instructional leader were low implementation in monitoring and directive of teachers' teaching instruction in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled general secondary schools.

As can be seen in the above Table 10, item number 2 up to 4 both groups of respondents almost rated similar, then, the mean scores of teachers were ranges from 1.98-2.58 and that of instructional leaders ranges from 1.93-2.56 respectively and the average mean

scores of the two groups of respondents felt under disagree level of implementation in the sampled general secondary schools. This implies that low implementation of instructional leaders' activities of monitoring and directive in line of supporting teachers' teaching instruction in the sampled schools, except item number 1 of both teachers and instructional leaders respondents mean score 3.62 and 3.59 respectively with grand mean value of 3.60 which found to be similarly high level understanding but not implementation.

Finally, the result of independent t-test values for all items indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the means of the two groups as obtained p-value which range from .817 to .985 were greater than 0.05 (see Table 10). So, this implies the consistency of responses between the groups of teachers and instructional leaders.

4.2.2.8. Ensure the Sustainable Way of Conflict Management

Actually, the practice of effective instructional leadership able to minimize high conflict at all levels, attain and maintain a moderate amount of conflict and use the appropriate conflict management strategy of identifying the nature and cause of the conflict and mediate of the right problem. To assess the practice of the conflict management role of instructional leaders' four items that express the functions were administered, screened and organized for both groups of teachers and instructional leaders respondents by spss for more advanced statistical operation and decision making were presented in Table 11 below.

Table-11. Ensure the Sustainable Way of Conflict Management

No	Items Description Your Instructional Leaders..../As Instructional Leaders....	Respondent's					Comparing means of Trs & I/L by using t-test		
			N	M	STD	GM	T-value	DF	P-value
1	Use problem framing and solving skill effectively at school is help teachers in their effective teaching	Trs	102	3.43	1.473	3.43	.021	154	.983
		I/L	54	3.43	1.573				
2	Easily resolve when problems face up teachers in a time at school	Trs	102	1.75	.979	1.74	.085	154	.932
		I/L	54	1.74	.994				
3	Provide a safe and healthy environment is very important for teachers effectiveness in teaching	Trs	102	3.46	1.669	3.44	.129	154	.897
		I/L	54	3.43	1.474				
4	Teachers satisfy way of safe and healthy school environment at school	Trs	102	1.71	1.011	1.69	.269	154	.788
		I/L	54	1.67	1.476				
Average Mean Value		Trs	102	2.58		2.57			
		I/L	54	2.56					

Key: Trs=Teacher, I/L= Instructional Leader, N=number, M=Mean, STD=Standard deviation, GM=Grand Mean, Significant level = 0.05, Df= degree of freedom, Mean scores scale 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60=Disagree, 2.61-3.40=Undecided, 3.41-4.20=Agree and 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree.

As one can see the response to item 1 of Table 11 showed that both groups of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on agree scale as indicated mean value 3.43 and 3.43 respectively with grand mean value of 3.43. This shows that both groups of respondents had almost similarly in high understanding of the importance of use problem framing and solving skill effectively at school is help teachers in their effective teaching in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to use problem framing and solving skill effectively at school is help teachers in their effective teaching. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.983, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 2 of Table 11 reflected that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 1.75 and 1.74 respectively with combined mean value of 1.74. This implies that the practice of instructional leadership practice in easily resolve when problems face up teachers in a time at school by instructional leaders were low implementation in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to the role of instructional leadership practice in easily resolve when problems face up teachers in a time at school by instructional leaders. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.932, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 3 of Table 11 showed that both groups of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on agree scale as indicated mean value 3.46 and 3.43 respectively with grand mean value of 3.44. This shows that both groups of respondents had almost similarly in high understanding of the importance of Provide a safe and healthy environment is very important for teachers effectiveness in teaching in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to provide a safe and healthy environment is very important for teachers' effectiveness in teaching. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.897, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

As one can see the response to item 4 of Table 11 reflected that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on disagree scale as indicated mean value 1.71 and 1.67 respectively with grand mean value of 1.69. This implies that the practice of instructional leadership in teachers satisfy way of safe and healthy school environment at

school by instructional leaders were less effective in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled general secondary schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to the practice of instructional leadership in teachers satisfy way of safe and healthy school environment at school by instructional leaders. The computed p-value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was found to be 0.788, $p > 0.05$ or p-values are greater than 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in group response between the respondents of teacher and instructional leaders.

Generally, as it can be observed from Table 11 above both groups of teachers and instructional leaders' respondents were rated the roles of instructional leadership under way of conflict management of instructional leadership in supporting of teachers in teaching instruction found to be on disagreed level of implementations as indicated average mean value 2.58 and 2.56 respectively with grand mean of 2.57 in the sampled general secondary schools of Guji Zone. This implied that the practice of instructional leadership in way of conflict management of instructional leadership effective in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled general secondary schools.

Regarding items 1 and 3 of Table 11 analysis, the mean value of both teachers and instructional leaders respondents (Use problem framing and solving skill effectively at school is help teachers in their effective teaching and Provide a safe and healthy environment is very important for teachers effectiveness in teaching) were rated in high level of understanding with grand mean value of 3.43 and 3.44 respectively, but not implementation, while items 2 and 4 of Table 11 analysis, the mean value of both teachers and instructional leaders respondents showed that (easily resolve when problems face up teachers in a time at school and teachers satisfy way of safe and healthy school environment at school) were rated strongly disagree level of implementation with grand mean value of 1.74 and 1.69 respectively. This indicated that the practice of instructional leaders in conflict management among teachers were low implementation in provide professional support for teachers in sampled school of the zone.

In addition to this most of FGD of senior teachers in the sampled schools elaborate and discuss about the roles of instructional leaders way of conflict management as poor, not following scientific way of problem solving in a timely manner.

In relation to this, Barge (1994) stated that a wise leader must have ethically to do so should be open to new information and willing to change his or her mind as well as other mind. Effective school leaders need to understand the nature of the conflict and develop practical skill to manage it. From this, it is possible to conclude that the practice of managing conflict was highly affected the task of teachers in the sampled general secondary school.

As a whole, one can be conclude that the practice of instructional leaders in conflict management were found to be low implementation in the sampled general secondary schools of Gujii zone, because of the poor performance of the two practice, i.e., easily resolve when problems face up teachers in a time at school and teachers satisfy way of safe and healthy school environment at school.

Finally, the result of independent t-test values for all items indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the means of the two groups as obtained p-value which range from .788 to .983 were greater than 0.05 (see Table 11). So, this implies the consistency of responses between the groups of teachers and instructional leaders.

4.2.3 . Major Challenges that Affect Practices of Instructional Leadership

The scope of instructional leadership barriers in supporting teachers in teaching can be listed based on the context to which each sampled general secondary schools are exposed. However, with the exceptions of some particularities, most of the challenges that affect practices of instructional leaders in supporting teachers in teaching instruction in the zone are common to every school. The extent to which these challenges affect each school performance based on the instructional leaders ability, commitment and initiation of controlling different situations.

Therefore, the study dealt with some of the major challenges in which seriously affect the effective performance of the role of instructional leadership. So in this regard, the two

groups of respondents were asked to indicate their views on instructional leadership major challenges to perform professional support for teacher. A five point scale that ranges from very high to very low was employed to collect data through the close ended questionnaires shown. In the scale very high and high represents the extent of inadequacy of each item. On the other hand, very low and low represents adequacy of each item. To assess the practice of the challenges role of instructional leaders' four items that express the challenges were administered, screened and organized for both groups of teachers and instructional leaders respondents by SPSS for more advanced statistical operation and decision making were presented in Table 12 below.

Table12. Major Challenges that Affect Practices of Instructional Leadership

No	Items Description Your Instructional Leaders..../As instructional Leaders....	Respondent's	Responses				Comparing means of Trs & I/L by using t-test		
			N	M	STD	GM	T-value	DF	P-value
1	Overburdened of instructional principals with administrative task	Trs	102	4.16	1.115	4.14	.136	154	.892
		I/L	54	4.13	1.332				
2	Lack of adequate resource in the school	Trs	102	4.19	1.167	4.18	.103	154	.918
		I/L	54	4.17	1.060				
3	Lack of cooperation with teachers and community at school	Trs	102	3.84	1.461	3.82	.198	154	.843
		I/L	54	3.80	1.294				
4	Lack of adequate training towards leadership	Trs	102	4.10	.095	4.08	.218	154	.827
		I/L	54	4.06	1.265				
Average Mean Value		Trs	102	4.07		4.05			
		I/L	54	4.04					

Key: Trs=Teacher, I/L= Instructional l Leader, N= number, M=Mean, STD=Standard deviation, GM= Grand Mean, Significant level =0.05, Df= degree of freedom, Mean scores 1.00-1.80=Very Low, 1.81-2.60=Low, 2.61-3.40=Moderate, 3.41-4.20=High and 4.21-5.00=Very High.

As one can see the response to item 1 of Table 12 indicated that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on high scale as indicated mean value 4.16 and 4.13 respectively with grand mean value of 4.14. This implies that overburdened of instructional principals with administrative tasks were the challenge that highly affect the practice of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in teaching in the sampled general secondary schools. Similarly, the qualitative result obtained through six schools

of FGD of senior teachers revealed by support this idea, the practice instructional leaders were not adequate due to overburdened of instructional principals with administrative tasks. They reported as principals have over load most of their time by non-academic routine day to day activities. In relation to this, Harris and Muijs (2003) stated that only principals committed to instructional improvement can choose and use their time for the enhancement of the classroom instruction and teacher development.

As one can see the response to item 2 of Table 12 showed that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on high scale as indicated mean value 4.19 and 4.17 respectively with grand mean value of 4.18. This implies that the weakness of the practice of instructional leadership in providing the necessary instructional resource of instructional leaders were the challenge that highly affect the practice of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in teaching in the sampled general secondary schools.

Similarly, the qualitative result obtained through both interview questions from six schools cluster supervisors and six schools FGD of senior teachers support this idea, they indicated shortage of basic instructional material resources like duster, paper, pen, and teacher's guide were mostly the major challenges that instructional leaders encountered in playing their instructional leadership practice in supporting teachers in teaching instruction. Therefore, from this finding, the researcher conclude that inadequate instructional resource material in the schools were high challenge to affect the practice of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in teaching instruction in the sampled schools. In relation to this, Dimmock (2000) explained that bureaucratic management that hampers timely assignment human, financial and material resources required can be restricted the success of the schools and limits development of the teachers. From this, the researcher conclude that the role of instructional leaders were inadequate implementation in of providing adequate resource in the school or the challenge had highly affected the task of teachers' teaching instruction in the sampled general secondary schools.

As one can see the response to item 3 of Table 12 indicated that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on high scale as indicated mean value 3.84

and 3.80 respectively with grand mean value of 3.82. This implies that the weakness of cooperation with teachers and school community of instructional leaders were the challenge that highly affect in supporting teachers in teaching in the sampled general secondary schools.

Contrary to the quantitative data analysis, the qualitative result obtained from six schools cluster supervisor interview revealed that the instructional leadership practice to make good cooperation with teachers and community. They explained as there was strong team work culture between teachers and school leaders, among teachers, and between teachers and students. Accordingly, the roles of instructional leaders' activities in cooperation with teachers and community at school were not high challenge in supporting teachers in teaching instruction. However, the quantitative analysis result would be the main finding, because it was based on large numbers of respondents and the data were gathered through organized questionnaire. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the cooperation with teachers and instructional leaders were inadequate in the sampled general secondary schools

In connection to this, MoE (2002) stated that cooperation of teachers, students, and parents could be available in school climate where the leaders exercise democratic leadership. From this, one can be conclude that the roles of instructional leaders in cooperation with teachers and community not adequate in supporting teachers in teaching instruction in the sampled schools. As one can see the response to item 4 of Table 12 indicated that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents rated on high scale as indicated mean value 4.10 and 4.06 respectively with grand mean value of 4.08.

This implies that inadequate training of educational leadership of instructional leaders were the challenge that highly affects the instructional leadership practice in supporting of teachers in teaching instruction in the sampled general secondary schools. Similarly, the qualitative data obtained from the result of interview made to six schools cluster supervisors revealed as supporting the ideas of both teachers and instructional leaders responses. According to them, they explained that most of the school principals and cluster supervisors were subject area graduated and they had no adequate skill and

knowledge in the area of leadership aspects. They stressed the problem is attached to turnover of the qualified instructional leaders from year to year and shift to other sector office.

In relation to this, West-Burnham (1998) explained as instructional leaders without adequate skills and training in educational leadership and professional development of teachers can do little or no for the improvement of learning. Therefore, from this, the researcher can be conclude that the training of educational leadership of instructional leaders were inadequate in supporting teachers in teaching in the sampled schools.

Generally, as it can be seen from Table 12 revealed that both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents were rated the aver all items that affect the practice of instructional leadership in line of supporting teachers in teaching instruction found to be on high scale as indicated average mean value 4.07 and 4.04 respectively with grand mean value of 4.05. This implies that the challenges were highly affect the practice role of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in teaching in the sampled general secondary schools.

Finally, an independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between teachers and instructional leaders regarding to the overall challenges that affect the roles of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in teaching. As result, the items in the dimension were rated as high by both teachers and instructional leaders with no statistically significant difference in their judgments. All obtained p-value which range from 0.828 to 0.918 were greater than 0.05 (see Table 12). So, this implies that the consistency of responses between the groups of teachers and instructional leaders.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter deals with the summary, the conclusion and recommendations drawn on the basis of major findings that the researcher suggests and assumes operational regarding the role of instructional leadership practice in supporting teachers in teaching instruction in government general secondary schools of Guji Zone in Oromia Regional State of Ethiopia.

5.1. Summary

The main purpose of the study was to assess the role of instructional leadership practice in supporting teachers in teaching instruction in government general secondary schools of Gujia Zone in Oromia Regional State of Ethiopia

Finally; efforts were made to come up with suggestions and forwarded recommendations. In order to achieve the objective of the study, the following basic questions were stated and answered.

1. What are the practices of instructional leadership in supporting teachers teaching in government general secondary schools of Guji Zone?
2. To what extent do school instructional leaders provide professional support for teachers in government general secondary schools of Guji Zone?
3. What are the major challenges that affecting the practices of instructional leadership in the government general secondary schools of Guji Zone?

A survey study with quantitative research approach was employed in this study. The related literature were reviewed and documented. In order to get answers for the above basic questions, the study was carried out in six government general secondary schools that were selected by comprehensive sampling techniques to the study. There were total of 273 populations of school leaderships and teachers in the selected schools. The study incorporated a total of 162 respondents. 5 school cluster supervisors, 102 teachers and 54

instructional leaders of Guji Zone were incorporated in the study. For quantitative, only the two groups of respondents (instructional leaders and teachers) were engaged to response the questionnaire, while qualitative data, six schools cluster supervisors were interviewed; six focus group discussions of senior teachers and six schools document analysis of government general secondary schools were employed,

One set of questionnaire used for data collection in the study. All the questionnaires that were distributed to the teachers and instructional leaders were completed and returned to the researcher. In addition, to supplement the information gathered through questionnaire, the six focus group discussion, six document analysis and six schools supervisors' interviews were undertaken as supplementary as planned.

Finally, the data were carefully collected, coded, and presented for analysis. In the study, different data analysis tools including frequency, mean values, grand mean, average mean values, and an independent sample t-test for comparing means were used. According to the result of data analysis, the following major findings were identified as follow.

5.1.1. Background of the respondents

- The result of data analysis showed that interims of sex 85% of the respondents was males and only 15 % were females in all positions. While 85.2% of male and only 14.8% female respondents in school leadership position. Interims of service all (100%) of school leaders respondents had six and more than service years, while teachers respondents had 65.7%. This showed that school leaders were enough matured than teachers, interims of level of education of the result of data analysis showed that (74.1%) of school leaders respondents were BA/BSc/BEEd degree holders while only (25.9%) of respondents were MA/MSc degree holders, interims of area of specialization the finding indicated that (96.3%) of school leaders respondents were subject major graduate while only (3.7%) of school leaders respondents were EDPM graduate. Again the (83.3%) of schools cluster supervisors were Subject major graduate but only (16.7%) of schools cluster supervisors were EDPM graduate in the sampled general secondary schools of Guji Zone

5.1.2. Finding in relation to what are practices of instructional leaders as a role of instructional leaders in school in government general secondary schools of Guji Zone?

- The result of the analyzed data obtained from both group teachers and instructional leaders showed that the practices of instructional leadership as a role of instructional leaders in school were including engaging of teachers in setting the school vision and school mission, promoting the implementation of school curriculum and instructional program, supervising and evaluating instructional program, promoting professional skill development, building effective relations in school, promoting supportive roles of instructional program, monitoring and directive, and ensure a sustainable conflict management. The practices of instructional leadership recognize in school were found to be on agreed scale as indicated in the average mean value of 3.91 and 3.87 respectively with average grand mean value of 3.89 by teachers and instructional leaders groups of respondents. The result indicated that the practices of instructional leadership as a role of instructional leaders were highly recognized in school by group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents in the sampled general secondary schools of the zone.

5.1.3. Finding in relation to what extents do school instructional leaders provide professional support for teachers in government general secondary schools of Guji Zone?

- The result of the compiled data obtained from both group teachers and instructional leaders showed that the practice of instructional leadership in case of engaging of teachers in setting school vision and mission were not effective in provide professional support for teachers. The practice of instructional leadership in engaging of teachers in setting school vision and school mission were found to be on disagreed scale as indicated in the average mean value of 2.60 and 2.57 respectively with average grand mean value of 2.58. This result indicated that the practice of instructional leadership did not play adequately in participating teachers in setting school vision and mission. Similarly, the qualitative result

obtained from FGD and document analysis support this ideas in that instructional leaders were not able to develop mission that are easily understood and used by teachers and they were not provide brochures that state the school vision and mission in the school

- The compiled data obtained from both groups of teachers and instructional leaders respondents showed that the practice of instructional leadership were ineffective implementation in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled schools and found to be on disagreed scale in promoting the implementation of school curriculum and instructional program as indicated average mean value of 2.51 and 2.52 respectively with average grand mean value of 2.51. This result indicated that the practice of instructional leadership did not played adequately in advice and encourage teachers regarding the good implementation of the school curriculum, check and evaluating the school curriculum regularly, coordinate teachers for curriculum implementation effectively, motivation of teachers, hold regular meeting. Similarly the qualitative finding was also obtained through FGD and interview analysis.
- The analyzed data obtained from both groups of teachers and instructional leaders respondents showed that the practice of instructional leadership were low implementation in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled schools, in supervising and evaluating instruction program as indicated average mean value of 2.43 and 2.1 respectively with average grand mean value of 2.42. This result indicated that the role of instructional leadership did not played in regular and periodic visits way of teachers teaching classroom give adequate time after classroom visit, to discuss time for problem solving, head department not courage to classroom in line of supporting teachers in teaching in the sampled school.
- The result of the compiled data obtained from both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents showed that the practice of instructional leadership were ineffective implementation in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled schools, in promoting professional skill development as indicated average mean value of 2.35 and 2.59 respectively with average grand

mean value of 2.47. This result indicated that the practice of instructional leadership did not played in identifying the professional development needs of teachers encourage teachers to develop their professional skill through experience sharing, organize the professional skill development opportunity for teachers, create opportunities for professional discussion among teachers. Workshops, experience sharing program, in-service training, induction program for novice teachers, pedagogical skill improvement training and supporting innovation creativity tried by teachers in relation to supporting teachers in teaching. Similarly qualitative research finding was also obtained through interview and FGD.

- The result of compiled data obtained from both groups of teachers and instructional leaders respondents showed that the practice of instructional leadership were low implementation in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled schools, in building effective relationship among teachers as indicted average mean value of 2.60 and 2.57 respectively with average grand mean value of 2.58. This result indicated that the practice of instructional leadership did not played encourage collaborative work culture among teachers, open and collaborative communication between teachers and instructional leaders, encourage teachers towards cooperative work and support each others.
- The results of analyzed data obtained from both groups of teachers and instructional leaders respondents revealed that the practice of instructional leadership were low implementation in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled schools, in supportive practice of instructional program as indicated average mean value of 2.45 and 2.44 respectively with average grand mean value of 2.44. This result indicated that the practice of instructional leadership did not played in provide fair selection of teachers for reward on their good working activities, regular and periodic teachers' classroom observation, give constructive feedback after classroom observation in time for teachers, give training for teachers on teaching skills and support on weekly and annual lesson plan preparation.
- The result of the compiled data obtained from both groups of teachers of and instructional leadership practice were less effective in provide professional

support for teachers in the sampled schools, in monitoring and directive practice of instructional program as indicated average mean value of 2.58 and 2.56 respectively with average grand mean value of 2.57. This result indicated the practice of instructional leadership did not played in closely checks teachers' activities and meet individually with teachers to discuss students' academic progress.

- The result of the analyzed data obtained from both group of teachers and instructional leaders respondents conclude that the practice of instructional leadership were low implementation in provide professional support for teachers in the sampled schools, in conflict management as indicated average mean value of 2.58 and 2.56 respectively with average grand mean value of 2.57. This result indicated the practice of instructional leadership did not played in easily resolve when problems face up teachers in a time, provide safe and healthy environment, use problem framing and solve skill effectively, teachers satisfy way of save and healthy environment. Similarly qualitative research finding was also obtained through FGD.

5.1.4. Finding in relation to what are the major challenges that affecting the practices of instructional leadership in the government general secondary schools of Guji Zone?

- The result of the compiled data obtained from both groups of teachers and instructional leaders respondents showed that the practice of instructional leadership were highly affected due to lack of adequate instructional resource, lack of cooperation with teachers and school community and lack of adequate training towards leadership as indicated average mean value of 4.07 and 4.04 respectively with average grand mean value of 4.05. Therefore, both the qualitative and quantitative result showed that instructional leaders faced various problems due to lack of adequate instructional resource, lack of cooperation with teachers and school community and lack of adequate training towards leadership profession.

5.2. Conclusions

Based on the basic research questions, findings of the study and the summary, the following conclusions were drawn. Therefore, the following conclusions have been drawn from the results of analysis related to the basic question of the study:

- School principals did not properly play the practices of principal functions in the school in relation to developing the school plan and objective clearly, in preparing plans towards the achievement of expected goals, and in capable of encouraging the staff towards the achievement of goals according to promoting the implementation of school curriculum and instructional program, supervising and evaluating instructional program, promoting professional skill development, building effective relations in school, promoting supportive roles of instructional program, monitoring and directive, ensure a sustainable conflict management in supporting teachers in teaching.
- Most of school instructional principals and cluster supervisors were not professionally qualified in educational leadership aspects rather subject major graduate that is why they failed to play their practice in providing the required service in supporting teachers in teaching in their respected schools as they expected.
- The practice of instructional leadership were ineffective in supporting teachers in teaching instruction due to overburdened of instructional principals with administrative task, inadequate providing the necessary instructional material, absence of cooperation between teachers and instructional principals, lack of adequate training towards instructional leadership professions.
- Finally, the researcher strongly believes that if the practice of instructional leadership properly planned and implemented in provide professional support for teachers will improve so as to bring change on the part of the learners' learning and achievement.

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study the researcher recommended the following points.

1. It is good if instructional leaders and supervisors have adequate training in educational leadership field of specialization because to be an effective instructional leader have to the skill of planning, communicating, promoting , facilitating, and guiding instructional program in supporting of teachers in teaching. However, the result of this study revealed that most of instructional principals and school cluster supervisors have inadequate training towards leadership in the sampled school, because they were subject graduate. To overcome these problems, it would be wise if Woreda Education and Zone education Offices linked together to provide a capacity building towards leadership training aspects for instructional principals and school cluster supervisors through workshop; short term training and seminar for short term plan and for long term plan facilitate a conditions in which individuals get trained instructional leadership to empower the practice of instructional leadership in the sampled school.
2. Instructional leaders need to promote the implementation of school curriculum and instructional program in supporting of teachers. However, the result of this study showed that the practice of instructional leadership was ineffective implementation in promoting the implementation of school curriculum and instructional program. To realize the effective implementation of school curriculum and instructional program at school, instructional leaders need to provide professional support for teachers in advice, encourage, motivate, and coordinate teachers closely for the effective implementations of school curriculum and instructional program at school.
3. One of the successful implementation of instructional leadership practice is the involvement of all stakeholders in formulation of school vision and mission. However, the result of this study revealed that instructional leadership practice did not played their roles adequately in involving teachers in setting school vision and

mission. School vision and mission guide the daily activity of the school. Therefore, to achieve the successful implementation of instructional leadership practice in provide professional support for teachers, it would be wise if instructional principals engage teachers in formulation of school vision and mission and communicate to them and frequently evaluate their daily activities against what is stimulated in the mission statement. This approach could help teachers to internalize the school aims and practice effectively their instructional activities in the classroom.

4. Working on teachers' professional skill development program ensures the effective implementation of school objective and enhance educational quality. The result of the research finding revealed that the role of instructional leadership practice in promoting teachers professional skill development program in the school was low implementation. One of the instructional principal practices is to plan and lead actively the process professional development program. In order to achieve the effective implementation of instructional leadership practice in teachers' professional skill development program, it is good if instructional leaders provide professional support for teachers and give pay attention to promoting teachers' professional skill development program through identifying training needs for teachers, facilitating and encourage teachers to develop their profession, creating opportunities for professional discussion among teachers and organize professional development training program in their respective school and enhance teachers capacity through workshop, short term training, and seminars.
5. One of the roles of instructional leadership is to build effective relationship in the schools. However, the result of the finding of the study revealed that the practice of instructional leadership in building effective relations in school was ineffective implementations provide professional support for teachers. Cooperatively work together makes the complex work easier. Therefore, to ensure the effective implementation of instructional leadership practice in building effective relationship, it would be wise if instructional leaders give pay attention to build effective relationship in their respective school through encourage collaborative work among teachers, democratically open communication with teachers,

encourage teachers to share ideas with each others, listen to closely and accept teachers' suggestion.

6. Scientific ways of conflict resolution is high contribution to ensure a sustainable safe and healthy environment. However, the result of the research finding revealed that the role of instructional leadership practice in ensure a sustainable ways of conflict management was low effective implementation. Therefore, to realize the effective implementation of instructional leadership practice in ensure a sustainable ways of conflict management, it is good if instructional principals give pay attention to ensure a sustainable ways of conflict management in their respective school through resolve when problem face up teachers in scientific way and in timely manner.
7. It is good if each of the department head provides professional support for teachers on weekly and annual lesson plan preparation for teachers and monitoring continuously once a week in a working day and checked by principals. This helps the teachers to improve their classroom teaching.
8. It would be wise if Instructional leaders visit classroom teaching in regular and periodic as it intended. This is the important things for teachers to give constructive feedback within a time. It also helps to provide professional support for all teachers.

REFERENCE

- Ahmed (2006) *A comparative study of managerial effectiveness between government and private high school of Addis Ababa*. AAU: Unpublished MA thesis
- Alemayehu Tesema (2011) *Educational Leadership Problem of Government Secondary Principals in East Shewa Zone of Oromia Regional State*. MA Thesis. Addis Ababa University (Unpublished)
- Ash, R.C. & Persall, J.M. (2000) *The principal as chief learning officer: developing Teachers' leaders*, NASSP Bulletin, 84(616): 15–22.
- Barge, J.K. (1994) *Leadership: Communication Skills for Organizations and Groups*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Barth, R. (1999) *The Teacher Leader Providence, RI: The Rhode Island Foundation*.
- Beare, H., Caldwell, B., & Millikan, R. (1989) *Creating an Excellent School*. London: Routledge
- Bekuretsion Hailesilassie Abreha (2014) *The Principal's Instructional Role: a Case of Four Secondary Schools in Southern Nations, Nationalities and People's Region, Ethiopia*. University of South Africa
- Bennett (2003). *Distributed Leadership Nottingham: National College of School Leadership*.
- Blase, J. and Anderson, G. (1995). *The Micro-Politics of Educational Leadership: From Control to Empowerment*. London: Cassel
- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (1998) *Effective instructional leadership: Teachers perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools*. Journal of Educational Administration, 38 (2), 130-136.
- Blase, J. J. and Blase, J. A. 2000. *Bringing out the best in teachers: What effective principals do*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Bennis, W. and Nanus, B. (1985) *Leaders*, New York, Harper and Row.
- Best, J.W., and Khan, J.W. (2003) *Research in Education. (7th ed.)*. New Delhi :Prentice Hall of India Pvt.Ltd.
- Boles, K. & Troen, V. (1994) *Teacher leadership in a Professional Development School*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

- Bush, T. (2007) *Theories of Educational Leadership and Management (3rd ed)*. London: Sage Publications.
- Chell, J. (1991) *Introducing principals to the role of instructional leadership*. SSTA Resource Center, No.95-14.
- Chris, P. J. (1992) *Purposeful structuring creating a culture for learning and achievement in elementary schools*. Washington DC: Palmer press.
- Clayton, H. (1994) *Creating an Effective Vision for a Primary School*. in Davies Band Ellison (Eds.) *Managing the Effective Primary Primary School*. N.p. Longman Group Limited, pp.34-44
- Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (2002) *Research methods in education*. New York: Routledge
- Creswell, J. (2003) *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed Methods approaches (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Creswell, J. W. (2003) *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Davis (1986) *A Recipe for the Development of an Effective Teaching Clinic*. Paper Presented at the annual conference of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, San Francisco, CA, March 1, 1986. ED 275 028.
- Day C. (2010) *Seven Strong claims about effective school leadership*. Nottingham: National College for Leadership of Schools and Children's Services
- Du Four, R. & Berkey, T. (1995) *The principal as staff developer*. Journal of staff development, 16(4): 2-6.
- Dimmock, C. (1993) *School Based Management and School Effectiveness*. Great Britain: Machays of Chathan PLC, Chatham, Kent
- Dimmock, Clive. (2000) *Designing the Learning Centred Schools*. London: Falmer
- Ezeani, S. (1998) *A Research Method: A realistic Approach*. Ebbadan Nigeria, Elohim Publishers.
- Fenstermacher, G., & Richardson, V. (2005) *On making determinations of quality in teaching*. Teachers College Record, 107, 186–213.
- Fullan, M. (1991) *The New Meaning of Education Change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Fullan, M. (2010) *Motion leadership: The skinny on becoming change savvy*. Thousand Oaks,CA: Corwin
- Gherkin, N. (1991) *Developing Teachers' Leadership Skills*. ERIC Digest ED330691
- Glickman, C. (2004) *Supervision and Instructional Leadership: development approach*. Boston: Person University Press.
- Goddard, R.D and Miller, R.J. (2010) *The Conceptualization, Measurement and Effects of School Leadership: Instruction to the Special Issue*. The Elementary School Journal, 111,211-225.
- Hallinger, P., & Walker, A.(2014) *Exploring whole school vs. subject department improvement in Hong Kong secondary schools*. School improvement and school effectiveness. Retrieved from <http://www.philliphallinger.com>. on 1st April 2015
- Harris, A. (2002) *School Improvement: What's in It for Schools?* London: Rout ledge Flamer Press
- Harris, A. (2003) *Effective Leadership for School Improvement*. New York: Rutledge Flamer Retrived September,10/2011, from (<http://www.acs.ucalqary.cal-jeill>).
- Harris (2005) *Effective Leadership for School Improvement*. Newyork: Rout ledge famler
- Harris, A. & Muijs, D. (2005) *Improving Schools through Teacher Leadership*: Open University press McGraw-Hill Education, London.
- Hollinger. and F. Murphy (1987) *Assessing and developing principal leadership*. Englewood Cliffs NG: Prentice Hall
- Hollinger, P. and Murphy, J. (1989) *Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals*. The Elementary School, Journal, 86(2).
- Hopkins.D. (2001) *Instructional Leadership and School Improvement*: in Harris (eds) *Effective Leadership for School Improvement*. Rutledge Flamer
- Hoy, W., & Miskel, C. (2008) *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Jita, L. C. (2010) *Instructional leadership for the improvement of science and mathematics in South Africa*. Procodia–Social and Behavioral Sciences, (9)2, 851–854. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.12.247
- Kemal Abdurahim Ahmed (2016) *Instructional Leadership Practices in Secondary Schools of Assosa Zone, Ethiopia*: Assosa University

- Katzenmeyer, M. & Moller, G. (2001) *Awakening the Sleeping Giant: Helping Teachers to Develop as Leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- King, D. S. (2002) *The Changing Shape of Leadership: Educational Leadership*. USA: Harper Collins College Publisher. Material presented for training of trainers workshop. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Ministry of Education.
- Kruger, A. G. (2002) *School management international and external environment, Study Guide*. UNISA, Pretoria
- Larson-Knight, B. (2000) *Leadership, culture, and organizational learning: in Understanding the Schools as Intelligent System*. Stanford, CT: JAI Press.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999) *Changing leadership for changing times*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2006) Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17 (2), 201-227.
- Locke, A. Edwin and Latham (1990) *The Essence of Leadership*. New York: Macmillan
- Lwaitama, A. L., & Galabawa, J. C. J. (2008) *Community secondary schools: How long is their journey to quality education*. Paper presented as a contribution to the ongoing national education debate, 21st October 2008. Dares Salaam: Tanzania Education Network (TEN).
- Marcher, R.L. & Hyle, A.E. (1996) *Collaborative Power: A Grounded Theory of Administrative Instructional Leadership in Elementary School*, *Journal of Education Administration*. 34(3) 15-30.
- Marks, M. Helen, Susan M. Printy (2003) *Principal leadership and school performance: an international and instructional leadership*. *Educational Leadership Quarterly*. Vol. 39, No 3, 370-397.
- Marx, Gray. (2006) *Future-Focused leadership. Preparing Schools, Students and Communities for Tomorrow's Realities Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development*.
- Mc Ewan, E.K. (1998) *Seven steps to effective instructional leadership*. California: Corwin press.
- Mc Ewan, K. (2003) *Seven Steps in Effective Instructional Leadership*. USA: Crown Press, Inc.
- McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. E. (2001) *Professional communities and the work of high school teaching*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- MoE (2002) *Responsibility and practices of school principal*: Unpublished Material
- MoE, (2006) *Educational Statistics Annual Abstract 2005/6*: Addis Ababa
- MOE. (2011) *ESDP IV, Education Sector Development Plan*: Ethiopia: Addis Ababa press.
- MOE. (1994) *Education and Training Policy*: Addis Ababa: PLC Press.
- MoE.(2013) *Education Sector Development Program Annual Report*: Addis Ababa, Ministry of Education.
- Murphy, J. (1990) *Principal Instructional Leadership: Advances in Educational Administration, ICB: Changing Perspectives on the School*, 163-200.AA:USAID.Pamela
- Murphy, J. (2002) *The Educational Leadership Challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21stc*. Chicago: National society for the study of education.
- Olive, F. Peter and G. E. Pawlas (1997) *Supervision for today schools*: New York: Longman Inc.
- Orji, K.E & Job, M. (2013) *The role of education in national development: Nigerian experience*. European Scientific Journal, 9, (28), 1-9.
- Peter, S. M. (1990) *The Leader's New Work: Building Learning Organizations*. Sloan Management Review.
- Pont,B., Nusche, D. & Moorman, H. (2008) *Improving School Leadership Volume 1: Policy and Practice*, Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).
- Purkey, S.C. & Smith, M.S. (1985) *School reform: The district policy implications of the effective schools literature*. The Elementary School Journal, 85(3), 341-89.
- Pustejovsky, J., Spillane, J.P., Heaton, R.M., & Lewis, W. J. (2009) *Understanding teacher leadership in middle school mathematics: A collaborative research effort*. Journal of Mathematics and Science: Collaborative Explorations, (11)2, 19–40.
- Sergionanni, J.T. (2001) *Leadership: What is in for School?* London: rout ledge Falmer
- Seyoum Tefera & Ayalew Shibeshi (1989) *Fundamentals of Educational Research: For Students and Beginning Reseaechers*. Addis Ababa University: Addis Ababa printing press.
- Seyoum Tefera and Ayalew Shibeshi (1989) *Fundamentals of educational research*: AA: AAU Printing Press\

- Silvestre Masuku (2011). *The Instructional Leadership Role of The High School Head in Creating a Culture of Teaching and Learning In ZIMBABWE*
- Smith.(2003) *Leadership Instructional educational*, London; SAGE Publications.
- Tadesse Atnafu(2014) *Instructional Leadership Practices and Challenges in Government Primary Schools of Woreda Five in Arada Sub City*. Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- Tesfaye Nigussie, (2010) *The Role of Instructional leadership in Building Organizational Climate of Secondary School*. (AAU, Unpublished MA Thesis)
- TGE. (1994) *Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia: Educational Training Policy*, Addis Ababa: St. Printing press.
- Townsend, T. (1997) *What Makes School Effective? A Comparison between Schools Communities in Australia and the USA: School Effectiveness and School Improvement* 8(3), 311-326.
- Weber, J. (1996) *Leading the Instructional Program: School leadership*. Clearing house of Educational Management, Eugene, Oregon
- Wasley, P.A. (1991) *From Quarterback to Coach, From Actor to Director*, *Educational Leadership*, 48(8), 35-40.
- Waters, J.T., Marzano, R.J. & McNulty, B.(2004) *Leadership that Sparks Learning* *Educational Leadership*, 61 (7), 48-51.
- Weber, W.A. (1996) *Classroom management in classroom teaching skills*
- Whitaker, B. (1997) *Instructional leadership and principal Visibility*, *The clearing house*
- World Bank, (2010) *Recruiting, Retaining, and Retraining Secondary School Teachers and Principals in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Washington DC: The World Bank..
- Yamane, Taro (1967) *Statistics, an Introductory Analysis*, 2nd Ed., New York: Harper and Row

APPENDICES

Appendix-A

Dilla University

Institute of Education and Behavioural Science

Department of Educational Planning and Management

A questionnaire to be filled by Teachers and instructional leaders (principals, vice principals, department heads and unit leaders)

The main purpose of this questionnaire is to gather data on practices of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in teaching. You are, therefore kindly requested to fill the questionnaires in order to give necessary information on the issue related to the study. The success of this study depends on your honest and genuine responses. The information that will be obtained from the responses to these questionnaires will be used only for the purpose of the study. All the information will be kept confidential and will be used only for the academic purpose.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Instruction I

1. No need of writing your name.
2. Kindly complete the questionnaire as much as possible.
3. Mark (X) in the appropriate box you agree.

I. Personal Information

1. Name of the school Woreda /city.....
2. Sex: Male Female
3. Age: 20-25 26-30 31-35 36-40 41 and above
4. Level of educational or qualification:
Diploma B.A/ BEd/ BSc degree M.A/MSc degree
5. Area of specialization or field of study:
Subject Major EDPM/ Pedagogical Science Other specify...
6. Current position:
Teacher Head department Unit leaders Principals
Vice principals
7. Service year:
Below 5 years 6-10 years 11- 15years 16-20years
21 & above

Instruction -2

Below are Tables that consist of questions show practices of instructional leadership of your school. Please indicate the extent to which each statement represents your school by putting tick mark (X) in one of the boxes against each item. Every response has to be based on your school context. The numbers shows: 5=strongly Agree (SA) 4=Agree (A) 3=Undecided (UD) 2=Disagree (DA) 1=strongly Disagree (SD) or for challenges 5=very high (VH) 4=high (H) 3=moderate (M) 2=low (L) 1=very low (VL).

No	Items Description	Response				
		SA	A	UD	DA	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
Your Instructional Leaders.../as Instructional Leaders...						
1. Recognized the practice of Instructional Leadership as a Role of Instructional Leaders in School						
1.1	The involvement of teachers in setting the school vision and mission					
1.2	Promoting the implementation of school Curriculum and Instruction					
1.3	Supervising and Evaluating Instructional program					
1.4	Promoting teachers' Professional skill development					
1.5	Building effective relationship in school					
1.6	Promoting supportive roles of instructional program					
1.7	Monitoring and directive instructional program					
1.8	Ensure the sustainable way of Conflict Management					
2. School Instructional Leaders Provide Professional Support for Teachers						
Your Instructional Leader.../as Instructional Leader...						
2.1. Engaging of teachers in setting school vision and mission						
2.1.1	Well express or communicate the school vision help to improve teachers' instruction in class					
2.1.2	Develop missions that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school					
2.1.3	Participating teachers in setting school vision and mission in the school					
2.1.4	Frame the school missions in the school help to strength the responsibilities of teachers in teaching					
2.1.5	Provide brochure that state the school vision and mission in the school					
2.2. Managing curriculum and instruction roles						
2.2.1	Advice and encourage teachers regarding the challenges they faced in relation to the good implementation of the curriculum in the school					

2.2.2	Encourage and provide the necessary support to teachers is the means for curriculum improvement					
2.2.3	Check and evaluate the school curriculum regularly at the school					
2.2.4	Coordinate teachers for curriculum implementation effectively at school					
2.2.5	Motivate teachers to implement appropriately the school curriculum at school					
2.2.6	Hold regular meeting with teachers for the purpose of improving curriculum and instruction at school					
2.3. Supervising and Evaluating Instruction roles						
2.3.1	Make classroom visits for the purpose of supporting instructional process help teachers to improve teaching in the classroom					
2.3.2	Regular and periodic visits way of teachers' teaching in the classroom at school					
2.3.3	Give adequate time after class visit to discuss the problems and plan improvement together with teachers at school					
2.3.4	Head departments are courage to visit classroom teaching at school					
2.4. Professional skill development roles						
2.4.1	Facilitating teachers professional skill development is good for teachers' success in teaching at school					
2.4.2	Identify the professional development needs of teachers at school					
2.4.3	Encourage teachers to develop their professional skill through experience sharing at school					
2.4.4	Organize professional skill development opportunity for teachers at school					
2.4.5	Create opportunities for professional discussions among teachers at school					
2.5. Building Effective Relationship roles						
2.5.1	Maintain good relationship between school leaders and teachers has positive impact on teachers' work.					
2.5.2	Encourage teachers to share on their academic ideas and support each other has significant contribution for the effectiveness of teaching					
2.5.3	Listen to and accept teachers suggestions is very important to solve the teaching problems of teacher					
2.5.4	Encourage collaborative work cultures among teachers at school					
2.5.5	Democratically open and collaborative communication with teachers at school					

2.5.6	Encourage teachers to help and support each other in teaching at school					
2.6.Supportive Roles of Instructional Leadership						
2.6.1	Give recognition and encourage teachers based on their good work activities have positive contribution for effective classroom teaching					
2.6.2	Provide faire selection of teachers for reward on their good working activities at school					
2.6.3	Regular and periodic teachers' classroom teaching observation at school					
2.6.4	Give constructive feedback after classroom observation in time for teachers at school					
2.6.5	Give training for teachers on teaching skills at school					
2.6.6	support on weekly and annual lesson plan preparation at school					
2.7.Monitoring and Directive Roles						
2.7.1	Closely checks teacher's activities has positive contribution for the effectiveness of teachers in teaching					
2.7.2	Monitor everything the teachers do at school					
2.7.3	Effective monitoring of teachers' activities at school					
2.7.4	Meet individually with teachers to discuss students academic progress at school					
2.8.Conflict Management Roles						
2.8.1	Use problem framing and solving skill effectively at school is help teachers in their effective teaching					
2.8.2	Easily resolve when problems face up teachers in a time at school					
2.8.3	Provide a safe and healthy environment is very important for teachers effectiveness in teaching					
2.8.4	Teachers satisfy way of safe and healthy school environment at school					
3.Challenges that affect the practices of instructional leadership		VH	H	M	L	VL
		5	4	3	2	1
Your Instructional Leader.../as Instructional Leader....						
3.1	Overburdened of instructional principals with administrative task					
3.2	Lack of providing the necessary adequate resource in the school					
3.3	Lack of cooperation with teachers and community at school					
3.4	Lack of adequate training towards leadership					

Appendix-B

Dilla University

Institute of Education and Behavioural Science

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Interview Guide for Supervisors

The main purpose of this interview is to collect relevant data regarding practices of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in teaching in government general secondary schools of Guji Zone. The data will be used for research purpose only. Therefore, your sincerity in responding to the questions is of great importance, and your responses to the interview would be kept confidential.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation!

Part I: General Information and Personal Data

1. Interviewee..... School Woreda /city.....
2. Venue/place of meeting.....Date.....
3. Starting time.....Ending time.....Duration.....
4. Sex _____
5. Age _____
6. Level of education or Qualification _____
7. Area of specialization or field of study ____A. Subject area/major
B.EDPM/Pedagogical Science C. other specify_____
8. Experience: as a teacher _____
9. As a supervisors_____

Part II: Give your response to the questions in short, and be precise

1. Would you mention the practice of instructional leadership in your schools?
2. Can you elaborate how often do you provide professional support for teachers in your school?
3. What are the major challenges that affect the practice of instructional leadership in your school?

Appendix-C

Dilla University

Institute of Education and Behavioural Science

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Focus Group Discussion Guide for Senior Teachers

The purpose of this discussion is to investigate issues related to practices of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in government general secondary school of Guji Zone. The information will be obtained from you can help to suggest the contribution of the practices of instructional leadership and instructional leaders provide professional support for teachers in your secondary schools.

So, you are kindly requested to participate actively in the discussion. For the following items fill in the spaces provided and/or give brief description of your opinions for the open ended question.

Part I: General Information and Personal Data

1. Focus Group forSchoolWoreda /Ad.town.....
2. Venue/place of meeting.....Date.....
3. Starting time.....Ending time.....Duration.....
4. Sex: Male Female
5. Age 30-35 36-40 41-25 26-30 31-35 36 and above
6. Service years: 10-15 16-20 21-25 26-30 31 and above
7. Level of education: Diploma B.A/ BEd/ BSc degree M.A/MSc degree

Part II: Give your response to the questions in short, and be precise

1. Would you mention elaborately the practice of instructional leadership in your school? (Example, setting vision & define mission, managing curriculum, assessment and instruction, monitoring instructional program, supervising and evaluating teaching-learning instruction, creating conducive and health school environment, conflict management, provide regular meeting staff, provide training on teaching skill, etc in your school).
2. Excuse me, would you explain how instructional leaders provide professional support for teachers in your school?

Appendix-D

Dilla University

Institute of Education and Behavioural Science

Department of Educational Planning and Management

A Guide for Document Analysis

The main purpose of this document analysis is to collect relevant data regarding the practices of instructional leadership in supporting teachers in teaching in government general secondary schools of Guji Zone. The data will be used for research purpose only. Therefore, your sincerity in providing and showing to the document is of great importance, and your good response for providing the necessary document would be kept confidential.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation!

Wereda _____ **Name of the school** _____

Venue/place of meeting.....Date.....

Starting time.....Ending time.....Duration.....

No	Items Description	Document	
		Yes	No
1.	Are there documents that show classroom observation made by the school leadership and feedback given for teachers on teaching activities?		
2.	Does the school have supervisor's work manual check list?		
3.	Does the school have broacher that stated Vision and mission?		
4.	Does the school have strategic plan?		
5.	Are there documents that show all teachers' portfolio files?		
6.	Does the school have manual document that feedback given by cluster supervisor during classroom observation?		
7.	Does the school have manual prepared for teachers training purpose?		