RESEARCH ARTICLE

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP PRACTICES IN THE PRIMARY SCHOOLS OF SILTIE ZONE, ETHIOPIA

Zeynee Bilka Mohammed and *Dr. Demissie Dalelo Hankebo

School of Education and Behavioral Science, Wolaita Sodo University, Ethiopia

ABSTRACT

Instructional leadership is essential for the academic success of any schooling situation. The purpose this study was to evaluate the instructional leadership practices employed in the primary schools of Siltie Zone, Ethiopia. Descriptive survey research design was used to conduct the research. Mixed research method was used to collect and analyze data concurrently, and triangulate results side by side. In a year 2018, a total of 228 primary schools are operating in the zone, off these, 74 primary schools were selected as target population by clustering them based on ecological conditions of the zone. Finally, 19 primary schools were selected as a sample via multistage sampling technique. From these 19 primary schools: 92 teachers were selected by simple random sample technique, and 19 school principals and 19 vice principals were also selected by availability sampling technique. In addition, 4 primary schools' supervisors and 4 Woredas (District) heads were engaged in the study. Questionnaire and interview were used to collect data. Data was analysed by calculating mean, standard deviations P-value and t-test. Data collected by interview was narrated and triangulated with result obtained from questionnaires. The findings of the study revealed that all the three instructional leadership dimensions; defining and communicating school mission; managing curriculum and instruction and promoting a positive school learning climate were not effectively applied in the primary schools Siltie Zone, Ethiopia. The study concluded that instructional leaders in the primary schools were not effectively implementing Instructional Leadership Dimensions to improve instructional practices so as to maintain better learning for students and establish effective schools. Finally, it was recommended that tailored and continuous trainings, workshops and experiences sharing events should be organized and commenced by the respective district and zonal education officials to build the instructional leadership capacities of school leaders.

INTRODUCTION

School effectiveness and strong instructional leadership practices are interwoven constructs which directly interplay each other. In this regard, Zepeda Sally (2003) described instructional leadership as critical to the development and maintenance of an effective school. A body of research during the 1960s and 1970s focused on the characteristics of effective school principals, (Austin, 1979). Effective school research focused on schools that successfully created environments and conditions in which students could grow, irrespective of their socio-economic backgrounds (Clark, Lotto and Astuto 1984)). The findings of effective schools' research shown that ''school leaders' matter, they are educationally significant, school leaders do make a difference'' (Huber, 2004). Similarly, Lipham (1961) described as "Good Schools have Good Principals or Effective Principals, Effective Schools".

Corresponding author: **Dr. Demissie Dalelo Hankebo,**
School of Education and Behavioral Science, Wolaita Sodo University, Ethiopia.

Effective leaders were described as those who provided direction and strived to improve instructional practices (Chase and Guba, 1955); supervised teaching (Goldman and Heald, 1968); assessed the quality of instruction, gave feedback to staff, aligned instructional programs with school goals (Bridges, 1967); provided the motivational and material support required for the betterment of teaching; and established academic goals for students, worked on the development of instructional strategies, and monitored student progress (Edmonds, 1979). Instructional Leadership has been debated across the globe for almost four decades. Leithwood (1994), have linked Instructional Leadership to improvement in classroom instructions. Instructional leadership refers to role behavior or practices 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 learning climate (Krug, 1992). More specifically, Barth (1990,) stated, "Show me a good school and I'll show you a good principal".

Currently, the term instructional leadership is defined as actions leaders take to improve teaching and learning (King, 2002). In the 21st century education, the practices of instructional leadership in a school have evolved into primary responsibilities for instructional leaders. In this view, Harris (2003) explained that successful operation of educational institution requires competent school leaders with major duties of: providing instructional leadership and monitoring, setting educational standards and goals, formulate policies and strategies required to achieve them and supervising as well as supporting staff and students. Instructional leadership differs from that of a school administrator or manager in a number of ways. Principals who pride themselves as administrators usually are too preoccupied in dealing with strictly managerial duties, while principals who are instructional leaders involve themselves in setting clear goals, allocating resources to instruction, managing the curriculum, monitoring lesson plans, and evaluating teachers. In short, instructional leadership reflects those actions a principal takes to promote growth in student learning (Flath, 1989). The instructional leader makes instructional quality the top priority of the school and attempts to bring that vision to realization. To this end, good instructional leaders play significant role in effecting students learning and boost the performance of schools so as to be termed effective schools.

Instructional Leadership Models: Research have shown that there are a wide variety of competing leadership models which were developed and suggested by scholars as impacting students learning. These include: Hellinger and Murphy Models (1985), Model Murphy (1990), Model Weber (1996), and Mc Ewan Model (2009). Hellinger and Murphy (1985) define instructional leadership as principals' behaviors aimed at promoting and improving the process of teaching and learning in schools involving teachers, students, parents, school planning, school management, school facilities and resources. Many instructional leadership researchers make Model Hellinger and Murphy (1985) as the main reference. Accordingly, Hellinger and Murphy (1985) proposed conceptual framework incorporated three dimensions in instructional leadership roles: Defining the School's Mission, Managing the Instructional Program, and Promoting a Positive School Learning Climate. These dimensions were further delineated into 10 instructional leadership functions. These include: Framing the School's Goals and Communicating the School's Goals, Supervising and Evaluating Instruction, Coordinating the Curriculum, and Monitoring Student Progress, Protecting Instructional Time, Promoting Teacher Professional Development, Maintaining High Visibility, Providing Incentives for Teachers, and Providing Incentives for Learning, (Hellinger, 2015). The three leadership dimensions and their respective sub-functions were further discussed hereunder.

Defining the School's Mission: Under defining the school's mission, the principal is expected to exercise pivotal role in working with staff to ensure that the school has a clear mission and that mission is well communicated to all the school community. In doing so, the principal executes two functions, Framing the School's Goals and Communicating the School's Goals. For defining the school mission, that is the mandate of the school in which it established to do, broadly, the principal may use what is actually given by the government as a mandate for the if the school is government school (like Ethiopian context)or define a new school mission with the

school community. Defining the school's mission is not an end by itself, rather it is a means to the end. Therefore, the school principal by all means need to effectively communicate the mission and goals of the school to staff, students, community members and the society at large. Effective execution of this dimension is very crucial for effective implementation of the subsequent dimensions. Hence, the school principal must work hard to ensure that the school's mission and goals are well understood and regularly articulated by the school community. If this dimension is well done, the school community exhibit a sense of shared purpose underlying staff effort to improve teaching and learning in the school. As Hallinger (2015) confirmed the effective execution of this dimension is the starting point for creating a learner-centered school.

Managing the Instructional Program: The second dimension is Managing the Instructional Program. This incorporates three leadership functions: Supervising and Evaluating Instruction, Coordinating the Curriculum, and Monitoring Student Progress, Hallinger (2015). This dimension focuses on the role of the principal in "managing the technical core" of the school (Hallinger et al., 1983; Murphy, Hallinger, Weil & Mitman, 1983). The school leaders need to be knowledgeable about and provide guidance in curriculum and instruction. Effective school leader actively promotes more effective practice in the teaching and learning processes in his/her school. The key to instructional leadership is in the school leaders defining their roles in terms of recognizing instructional priorities rather than by serving as a school manager also have noted that school leaders' focus is to be knowledgeable about professional educational issues, rather than the management of the day-to-day functioning of the school. The school leader's primary responsibility is to promote the learning and success of all students (Lunenburg 2010). Demands for greater accountability, especially appeals for the use of more outcome-based measures, requires the school leaders to be instruction oriented. Further, the school principal need to be very clear on these questions: Are the students learning? If the students are not learning, what am I going to do about it? The focus on student achievement; the focus on students learning at high levels, can only happen if teaching and learning become the central focus of the school (Blankstein, 2010).

Moreover, managing instructionally programs effectively demands taken together and ensuring the application of five dimensions that provide a compelling framework for accomplishing sustained district wide success for all children (Fullan, 2010; Marzano & Waters, 2010); (i) Focusing on learning, (ii) Encouraging collaboration, (iii) Using data to improve learning, (iv) Providing support, (v) Aligning curriculum, instruction, and Assessment. When they are well constructed and implemented, assessment can change the nature of teaching and learning. For curriculum goals to have an impact on what happens in classrooms, they must be clear.

Promoting Positive School Learning Climate: School climate is a stable set of organizational characteristics that capture the distinctive tone or atmosphere of a school (Smylie, 2010). As to this definition school climate reflects; students, school personnel and parent social, emotional, ethical and academic experience of school life. All these elements are interrelated and interdependent especially in the area of teaching learning process. A growing body of research indicates that positive school climate is a critical dimension

linked to effective risk prevention and health promotion efforts as well as teaching and learning (Cohen, 2006). According to Hellinger and Murphy, (1985), the third dimension namely: Promoting a Positive School Learning Climate includes several functions: Protecting Instructional Time, Promoting Teacher Professional Development, Maintaining High Visibility, Providing Incentives for Teachers, and Providing Incentives for Learning. This dimension is broader in scope and intent than the second dimension and overlaps with dimensions incorporated into transformational leadership frameworks (Hallinger, 2003; Leithwood et al., 2006).It has been found that a positive school climate can yield positive educational and psychological outcomes for students and school personnel; similarly, a negative climate can prevent optimal learning and development (Harris, 2002) conclude aspects of school climate, including "trust, respect, mutual obligation, and concern for other's welfare can have powerful effect on educators' and learners' interpersonal relationships as well as learners' academic achievement and overall school progress". Even though, this dimension is wide in scope and interwoven with the school culture, the school leaders need to exert the maximum influence to inculcate positive school climate in their schools to maintain effective and continuous learning school environment.

Objective of the Study: The major objective of this study was to evaluate the instructional leadership practices of primary school principals' in Silita Zone, Ethiopia and suggest possible solutions to improve the schools' performance. Accordingly, the study attempted to answer the following basic research questions:

How well School Principals' are Exercising Leadership as per the Dimensions of Instructional Leadership in Silite Zone Primary schools'?

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Research Design: In this study descriptive survey design (specifically cross-sectional survey) was employed. This design was used to collect data form large homogeneous number of primary schools (288) available in Silite Zone, Ethiopia. More specifically, this survey research focuses on describes attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, and perceptions of teachers, principals, supervisors' and District Education Office experts towards the practices of instructional leadership in effecting the teaching and learning process and thereby student's outcome. According to Best (1970), descriptive survey research, is concerned with conditions or relationships that exist; practices that prevail; beliefs, points of views, or attitudes that are held; processes that are going on; effects that are being felt; or trends that are developing.

Research Methods: Concurrent mixed methods were used in this study to simultaneously collect both quantitative and qualitative data, combine the data, and use the results to answer the research problem and make meaning on the actual practices of instructional leadership in the primary schools. The basic assumption is that the uses of both quantitative and qualitative methods, in combination, provide a better understanding of the research problem and question than either method by itself. In this regard, (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011), indicated that mixed research method was used as a procedure for collecting, analyzing, and "mixing" both quantitative and qualitative methods in a single study or a

series of studies to understand a research problem and analyse side by side by triangulating to validate the responses obtained by instruments from different respondents.

Participants: The participants' engaged in this study were 92primary school teachers, 19 principals and 19 vice-principals, and 4 primary schools' supervisors and 4 experts from District Education Offices a total of 138 (33.7%) out of 409 target population of the study.

Data Collecting Instruments: Questionnaires and interview were used to collect data for the study. Accordingly, a set of questionnaires were used to gather information about the practices of instructional leadership from teachers and principals (including the vice principals). On the other hand, interview items were used to collect data from 4 supervisor and 4 education office experts.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Various kinds of rating scales have been developed to measure attitudes and opinions directly. The most widely used is the Likert scale (1932).For summarizing data collected by likert scale type mean, standard deviations and p-values were used. To determine the minimum and the maximum length of the 5-point Likert type scale, the range is calculated by $(5 - 1 = 4)$ then divided by five as it is the greatest value of the scale ($4 \div 5 = 0.80$). Afterwards, number one which is the least value in the scale was added in order to identify the maximum of this cell. The length of the cells is determined below:From (1.0-1.80, strongly disagree); (1.81-2.60disagree); (2.61-3.40 slightly agree); (3:41-4:20 agree) and (4:21-5:00strongly agree). Hereunder, data on the three dimensions of instructional leadership based on Hallinger and Murphy, (1985), was collected form primary school teachers and instructional leaders. The questionnaire was mainly self-developed by taking the contextual realities of the primary schools under the study. Accordingly, data analysis, results and discussion were done in line with the three dimensions, namely: Defining the School's Mission, Managing the Instructional Program, and Promoting a Positive School Learning Climate. In line with the three dimensions of instructional leadership, items were organized, analysed and interpreted as follows.

Defining the School's Mission: Under this dimension, the school principal is expected to execute two major functions, namely, Framing the School's Goals and Communicating the School's Goals. Accordingly, how well school principals in the primary schools of Silite Zone, Ethiopia have practiced these functions to maintain good understanding, articulation and sense of sharing schools' missionsin the whole school community to promote better students learning in the schools. The following items were used to assess how well these functions are being practiced in the primary schools of Silite Zone, Ethiopia. In the table1, item 1, both teachers and school principals in the primary schools were asked that- "How well are they engaged in the preparation of the annual school wide plan of their primary schools?". The calculated result for both teachers and school leaders (M =2.37, SD=1.23) and (M=2.22, SD=1.28) respectively show that they disagreed. This indicates that annual school-wide plans in the primary schools of Silite Zone were not developed by engaging all respective stakeholders. Further, the t-test value (t=.632, p = 5.29) which is greater than 0.05 shows that there is no significant opinion

Table 1. Data Analysis on Defining and Communicating School Mission

No	Items	Respondents'	N	Mean	Std. D	T	Sig.(2-tailed)
1	Every year annual school wide plan/goal that focus on student learning was prepared by engaging all staff, students' representative and school board leaders.	Teachers	90	2.37	1.23	.632	.529
		Leaders	36	2.22	1.28		
2	While preparing the school goals/plan data on student academic performance and school's performance were used.	Teachers	90	2.40	1.11	-2.014	.046
		Leaders	36	2.80	.709		
3	The school plan was framed with the school goals in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them.	Teachers	90	2.30	1.14	-2.543	.012
		Leaders	36	2.86	1.04		
4	The schools' goals were further discussed with students, parents and wider community at the beginning of the year.	Teachers	90	2.14	1.17	-3.471	.001
		Leaders	36	2.88	.820		
5	Notify the school goals in highly visible displays in the school so that the communities clearly understand them.	Teachers	90	2.68	.805	-1.555	.122
		Leaders	36	2.83	.774		
	Overall score of teachers& Principals	Teachers	90	2.52	1.09		
		Principals	36	2.72	0.93		

Table 2. Analysis of data on Managing curriculum and instruction

No	Items	Respondents'	N	Mean	Std. D	T	Sig.(2-tailed)
1	Ensure the proper assignment of teachers and their work load necessarily for instructional process	Teachers	90	2.12	1.06	-3.809	.001
		Leaders	36	2.86	.723		
2	Prevent instructional time Wastage	Teachers	90	2.55	1.08	.276.	.276
		Leaders	36	2.50	.845		
3	Prepare plan for co-curricular activities implementation in the support of the formal instructional process.	Teachers	90	2.74	1.11	-1.501	.136
		Leaders	36	3.05	.860		
4	Encourage and support teachers to revise and improve their curriculum	Teachers	90	2.56	.994	.337	.737
		Leaders	36	2.50	1.03		
5	Conduct regular meeting with the departments focused on the purpose of improving curriculum and instruction implementation.	Teachers	90	1.96	1.15	-.406	.398
		Leaders	36	2.05	1.01		
6	Conduct classroom observation with the purpose of instructional improvement with planed sessions.	Teachers	90	2.36	1.17	-.206	.004
		Leaders	36	2.41	1.38		
7	Point out specific strengths and weakness of teachers' instructional practices in post observation conferences and set strategies for improvement.	Teachers	90	2.26	.946	-.779	.203
		Leaders	36	2.41	1.05		
8	Discuss the item analysis of tests with the department to identify strengths and weaknesses in the instructional program	Teachers	90	2.47	1.15	-.870	.386
		Leaders	36	2.66	.956		
9	The principal meets individually with teachers to discuss students' academic progress	Teachers	90	2.42	1.00	-.429	.669
		Leaders	36	2.50	.655		
10	Identify student's continuous assessment result that indicate a need for special instructional help.	Teachers	90	2.73	1.197	.460	.646
		Leaders	36	2.83	.8106		
11	Use test result to assess progress toward school goals	Teachers	90	2.61	.857	-1.20	.229
		Leaders	36	2.58	1.10		
	Overall score of teachers and principals	Teachers	90	2.43			
		Principals	36	2.58			

Table 3. Promoting learning Climate in the school

No	Items	Respondents'	N	Mean	Std. D	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
1	You often communicate to teachers and students that all students have the capacity to learn/excel	Teachers	90	2.64	.825	-.143	.886
		Leaders	36	2.66	.676		
2	Apply school level policy focusing on staff professional development.	Teachers	90	2.56	.925	-.654	.514
		Leaders	36	2.69	1.14		
3	Develop school level policy that communicates the need for protecting instructional time from disruptions.	Teachers	90	2.32	1.08	.210	.834
		Leaders	36	2.27	1.06		
4	Apply different recognition systems for motivating staff for greater achievement.	Teachers	90	2.42	.959	-.742	.459
		Leaders	36	2.55	.773		
5	Apply different reward systems for greater achievement of students	Teachers	90	2.48	.951	-.062	.950
		Leaders	36	2.50	.775		
	Overall score of teachers and principals	Teachers	90	2.48			
		Principals	36	2.53			

difference between teachers and school leaders that principals only develop their annual school wide plans. Hence, this shows that the primary schools have no well-defined, shared and articulated school wide annual goals focused on students learning. In line with this, it is stated that operating without clear mission is like beginning a journey without having a destination in mined (Doyke, 2002).

In item 2, both groups of respondents were asked that-"During school goals/plan preparing, data on student academic and school's performance were used as information inputs?". The mean values for both teachers and school leaders were (M =2.30, SD=1.14) and (M=2.86, SD=1.04) showed disagreement and moderate agreement respectively. The t-test value of both group of respondents was (t=-2.54., p = .012) which is less than 0.05, shows that the school leaders were arguing that they were using students and schools'

performances data while framing their school wide annual plan. However, teachers were not engaged in the process of annual plan preparation (as observed in the analysis result item1), they were not sure that either students and schools' performance data were used by the school leaders during framing the annul school plans solely or not.

In item 3, teachers and school leaders in the primary schools of Silite Zone were asked- the school plan was framed with the school goals in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them. The computed mean values for teachers indicated that they were disagreed (M=2.40, SD=1.119) whereas school leaders (M=2.80, SD=.709) described moderately agreed. Besides, the t-test value (t=-2.04, p =.046) which is less than 0.05 indicated that there is significant opinion difference between teachers and school leaders on framed the school goals in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them. From this it can be said that school leaders did not use of data on students' academic performance when developing the school goals. In item4, both teachers and principals were asked- after the schools' goals were set, was it further communicated to students, parents and wider community at the beginning of the year?". The calculated mean results teachers indicated disagreement (M=2.14, SD=1.176) buts chool leaders were moderately agreed *(*M=2.88, SD=.820).The opinion differences were also observed on the t-test value (t=-3.471, p= .001) which is less than 0.05.This show that school leaders in Silite Zone, not only preparing their schools plan/goals alone but also, they were not communicating (selling) it to the respective stakeholders to get consent and create shared vision. Rather, in their response, they were defending their position as if they were doing so.

Item5, on the table1 both groups of respondents were asked about- the practices of notification of the school goals in highly visible displays in the school so that the communities clearly understand them. The calculated mean values for teachers and school leaders were (M=2.68, SD=.80) and (M=2.83, SD=.774) which indicate that the two groups were moderate agreed on the management functions they were asked. This was also verified by the t-test value (t=-1.55 p =.122) which is greater than 0.05 that indicate both groups have no opinion difference. Responses obtained via interview confirmed that "notifying the school mission and vision on big board was among the criteria in which school principals were supervised, hence they display it as well not to be accountable". To sum up, regarding the first dimension, that is, defining and communicating school mission and goals in the primary schools of Silite Zone, Ethiopia, as the grand mean values of both teachers (2.52) and school leaders (2.72) indicated, this dimension was not well practiced. In other words, teachers in the primary schools were boldly disagreed but school leaders were moderately agreed. This implies that, school leaders in the primary schools of Silite zone were not only framing their schools' goals solely but also,they were not effectively communicating the schools' goals/plans to the school community.

Managing the Instructional Program: Under this dimension, the school principal is expected to execute three leadership functions: supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum, and monitoring student progress. Accordingly, how well school principals in the primary schools of Silite Zone, Ethiopia have practiced these key functions. As Lipham (1961) described "Good Schools have Good Principals or Effective Principals, Effective Schools".

Effective principals provide clear direction and strive to improve instructional practices (Chase and Guba, 1955); regularly supervise teaching (Goldman and Heald, 1968); frequently assess the quality of instruction, gave feedback to staff, aligned instructional programs with school goalsso as to promote the learning and success of all students in the schools. The following items were used to assess how well these functions are being practiced in the primary schools of Silite Zone, Ethiopia.

In table 2, item 1, teachers and school leaders in the primary schools of Silite zone were asked about the practices of proper assignment of teachers' workloads. In their response, teachers disagreed (M=2.12, SD=1.06) but school leaders moderately agreed (M=2.86, SD=.723) on the assignment practices of workloads. The t-test value of both groups was (t=-3.809, p =.001) which is less than 0.05. This indicates that, teachers claimed that instructional workloads assignments were not properly undertaken but school principals defend themselves as they were assigning workloads for teachers properly. In items2 & 4, both groups of respondents were asked about- proper utilization practice of instructional time and principals support for teachers to revise and improve their curriculum. The mean values on both items indicated that both group of respondents were disagreed(M= 2.55, SD = 1.08), (M =2.50, SD =.845) and(M= 2.56, SD =. 99), (M =2.50, SD =1.02).Similarly, the t-test values for both items were (t =. 267, p =.267) and (t=.337, p=.737) which is greater than 0.05 respectively. These implies that both teachers and school leaders were disagreed on the effort exerted in the primary schools to utilize instructional time efficiently and on supports given for teachers to revise and improve instruction.

In items 3& 10, respondents were asked about the practices of preparing a plan for co-curricular activities implementation in the support of the formal instructional process and Identify student's continuous assessment result that indicate a need for special instructional help. The mean values for both teachers and school leaders were (M=2.74, SD =1.11, & M =3.05, SD =.86) and (M=2.73, SD =1.97, & M =2.83, SD =.810) respectively. This indicates that both teachers and school leaders mildly agreed on the issue. Similarly, the t-test value (t =. -50, p=.13) and (t=.460, p=.646)which in both issues greater than 0.05 that show that there is no significant opinion difference between teachers and school leaders regarding planning co-curricular activities to support the formal instruction process. In other words, both teachers and school leaders are in favor on the existence of these two functions in the primary schools. In table 2,items 5,6 & 7; both groups of respondents were asked about the practices of principals regular meeting with the departments, conducting planned classroom observation and discussion on post observation conferences. The means and p-values of all the three items were (M=1.96, SD=1.14, M=2.05, SD=1.01, t=-.406, p=.398); (M=2.36, SD=1.17, M=2.41, SD=1.38, t=-.206, p=.004) and (M=2.26, SD=.946, M=2.41, SD=1.05, t=-.779,p=.203)respectively for both teachers and school leaders indicating disagreement on the issues. In other words, in the primary schools of Silite Zone, school principals were not adequately discussing with department heads on instructional issues on regular bases and conducting regular classroom observations and post conferences to improve the teaching learning process. In item 8, both groups were asked on the practices of exam item analysis results discussion with department heads.

The mean values indicated that teachers disagreed (M=2.47, SD =1.153) but school leaders moderately agreed (M =2.66, SD =.956). Item 9, the both groups of respondents were asked about the practices of principals' individual discussion with teachers on students' academic progress. Accordingly, teachers disagreed (M=2.42, SD=1.00) but school leaders moderately agree (M=.2.5, SD= .65) respectively. The t-test values for both items were (t =. -870, p =.386) and (t=. -429, p=.669) which is greater than 0.05 respectively. Finally, the last item in table 2 is about the practices of utilization of test result to assess progress toward school goals. The mean values for both teachers and school leaders were (M=2.61, SD =.857, & M =2.58, SD =1.10) respectively. These indicate that teachers are slightly agreed but school leaders disagreed. Further, the t-test value (t=-1.20, p =.229) which is greater than 0.05 further indicate that though both group of respondents have no opinion differences on the issue, it seems slight in this case.

To this end, regarding the second dimension, that is, Managing the Instructional Program in the primary schools of Silite Zone, Ethiopia, as the grand mean values of both teachers (2.43) and school leaders (2.58) indicated, like the first dimension, the second dimension was also not well practiced. In other words, both teachers and school leaders in the primary schools were disagreed on effectiveness managing practices undertaken. This implies that, school leaders in the primary schools of Silite zone were notpracticing the leadership functions: supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum, and monitoring student progress. In other terms, effective principals provide clear direction and strive to improve instructional practices (Chase and Guba, 1955); regularly supervise teaching (Goldman and Heald, 1968); frequently assess the quality of instruction, gave feedback to staff, aligned instructional programs with school goals so as to promote the learning and success of all students in the schools. However, these key qualities of effective principals were not experienced by the school leaders in the primary schools of Silite Zone.

Promoting a Positive School Learning Climate: The third dimension is broader in scope than other two dimensions whereby the school principal is expected to execute a lot of functions. According to Hallinger and Murphy, (1985), this instructional leadership dimension includes several functions: Protecting Instructional Time, Promoting Teacher Professional Development, Maintaining High Visibility, Providing Incentives for Teachers, and Providing Incentives for Learning. The following items were used to assess how well these functions are being practiced in the primary schools of Silite Zone, Ethiopia. In table 3, items 1 & 2; both groups of respondents were asked about the practices of principals continuously articulating to teachers and students that all students have the potential to learn and apply school level policy focusing on staff professional development. The means and p-values of these items were (M=2.64, SD=.825&M=2.66, SD=.676, t=-.143, p=.886) and (M=2.56, SD=.925& M=2.69, SD=1.14, t=-.654, p=.514) respectively. Hence, both teachers and school leaders were moderately agreed on these issues. In other words, school principals in the primary schools of Silite Zone were moderately perusing students to use their potential and leading staff development practices. The t-test values of both items were greater than 0.05. These indicate that both groups of respondents have no significant opinion difference on the practices of the issues mentioned.

Item 3 in the table 3, is about the practices of developing school level policy that communicates the need for protecting instructional time from disruptions. The mean values for both teachers and school leaders were (M=2.32, SD = 1.08, & M =2.27, SD =1.06) respectively. Both teachers and school leaders indicated their disagreement. This indicates that primary schools in Silite Zone has no school level policy which protects instructional time wastage. The t-test value (t=.210, p =.834) which is greater than 0.05further indicate that both group of respondents have no opinion differences on the issue. In items4 & 5, both groups of respondents were asked about the application of different recognition systems for motivating both teachers and students in the primary schools of Silite Zone. The means and p-values of these items were (M=2.42, SD=.959& M=2.55, SD=.773, t=-.742, p=.459) and (M=2.48, SD=.951& M=2.50, SD=.775, t=-.062, p=.950) respectively. Hence, both teachers and school leaders were disagreed on these issues. In other words, in the primary schools of Silite Zone there were no recognition systems in place to motivate both teachers and students for their better performances. The t-test values of both items were greater than 0.05. These indicate that both groups of respondents have no significant opinion difference on the absence of recognition systems in the primary schools. To sum up, regarding the third dimension, that is, promoting a positive school learning climate in the primary schools of Silite Zone, Ethiopia, as the grand mean values of both teachers (2.48) and school leaders (2.53) indicated their disagreement. In other words, both teachers and school leaders in the primary schools were disagreed on the actual practices of promoting a positive school learning environment in the primary schools of Silite zone.

Conclusions and Recommendation

The findings of many studies revealed that instructional leaders can make differences on students learning and schools' effectiveness. As Huber, (2004) indicated that ''school leaders' matter, they are educationally significant, school leaders do make a difference'' Similarly, Lipham (1961) described as "Good Schools have Good Principals or Effective Principals, Effective Schools". Others like (Chase and Guba, 1955; Goldman and Heald, 1968; Bridges, 1967; and Edmonds, 1979) shown that effective leaders were described as those who provided direction and strived to improve instructional practices; supervised teaching; assessed the quality of instruction, gave feedback to staff, aligned instructional programs with school goals; provided the motivational and material support required for the betterment of teaching; and established academic goals for students, worked on the development of instructional strategies, and monitored student progress. The findings of this study revealed that the three dimensions of instructional leadership were not effectively practiced in the primary school of Silite zone, Ethiopia. In this regarding the first dimension, that is, defining and communicating school mission and goals in the primary schools of Silite Zone, Ethiopia, teachers in the primary schools were boldly disagreed but school leaders were moderately agreed. This implies that, school leaders in the primary schools of Silite zone were not only framing their schools' goals solely but also, they were not effectively communicating the schools' goals/plans to the school community.

Furthermore, regarding the second dimension, that is, Managing the Instructional Program in the primary schools of Silite Zone, Ethiopia like the first dimension, this dimension was also not well practiced. In other words, teachers in the primary schools were boldly disagreed but school leaders were moderately agreed favoring their deeds. This implies that, school leaders in the primary schools were not effectively applying the leadership functions: supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum, and monitoring student progress. Finally, third dimension, that is, promoting a positive school learning climate in the primary schools of Silite Zone, Ethiopia, like the other two dimensions, teachers in the primary schools disagreed but school leaders moderate agreed. In other words, teachers in the primary schools were boldly disagreed that there are no such practices in their schools, however, school leaders argued that they were moderately taking legal actions to promote a positive school learning environment in their primary schools. To sum up, instructional leaders in the primary schools of Silite Zone, Ethiopia were not effectively exercising Instructional Leadership Dimensions to improve instructional practices, maintain better learning for students and establish effective schools. It was recommended that tailored and continuous trainings, workshops and experiences sharing events should be organized and commenced by the respective district and zonal education officials to build the instructional leadership capacities of school leaders.

REFERENCES

Austin GR 1979. Exemplary schools and the search for effectiveness. Educational Leadership 37(1):10–14.

Barth, R. 1990 *Improving schools from within*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Best, J.W. 1970. *Research in Education.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Blankstein, A. M. 2010. Failure *is not an option: 6 principles for making studentsuccess the only option* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bridges, E. 1967. Instructional leadership: A concept re-examined. Journal of Educational Administration 5(2): 136–147.

Chase FS. and Guba EG. 1955. Administrative roles and behavior. Review of Educational Research 24(4): 281–298.

Clark DL., Lotto LS. and Astuto TA. 1984. Effective schools and school improvement: A comparative analysis of two lines of inquiry. Educational Administration Quarterly 20(3): 41–68.

Cohen, J. 2006. Social, emotional, ethical and academic education: Creating a climate for learning, participation in democracy and well-being. Harvard Educational Review, 76, 201–237.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. 2011. *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Edmonds R 1979. Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership 37(1): 15–24.

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

Fullan, M. 2010. *All systems go: The change imperative for whole system reform*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Goldman H and Heald JE (1968) Teacher expectations of administrative behavior. Educational Administration Quarterly 4(3): 29–40.

Hallinger, P. 2003. Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 33*(3), 329–351.

Hallinger, P. 2015 Assessing and Developing Instructional Leadership in Schools. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/280858234.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985a). Assessing the instructional leadership behavior of principals. *Elementary School Journal, 86*(2), 217–248.

Hallinger, P., Murphy, J., Weil, M., Mesa, R.P., &Mitman, A. 1983. Effective schools: Identifying the specific practices and behaviors of the principal. *NASSP Bulletin, 67*(463), 83–91.

Harris, A. 2003.Effective leadership for school improvement. New York: Rout ledge.

Harris, E. 2002. *The relationship between principals' instructional leadership skills and the academic achievement of high-poverty students.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

Huber SG (2004) Preparing School Leaders for the 21st Century. New York: Routledge Falmer.

King, D. 2002. The changing face of leadership. Educational Leadership, 59(8), 61-63. Retrieved from http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/pdfplus/10.1108/025805410110097 70

Krug, S. E. 1992.“Instructional Leadership :A Constructivist Perspective.” *Educational Administration Quarterly.*28(3),430 –443.

Leithwood, K. 1994. Leadership for school restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 30*(4), 498-518.

Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. 2006. *Seven strong claims about successful school leadership*. Nottingham, UK: National College for School Leadership.

Likert, R. 1932. A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 140,

Lipham, J. 1961. *Effective principal, effective school*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Lunenburg, F, C. 2010. The Principal as Instructional Leader. National Forum of Educational and Supervision Journal Volume 27, Number 4, 2010.

Marzano, R. J., & Waters, T. 2010. *District leadership that works: Striking the right balance*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

McEwan, E. K. 2009. *Ten traits of highly effective schools: Raising the achievement bar for all students.* Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

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

Smylie, M. A. 2010. *Continuous school improvement.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Weber, J. 1996. Leading the instructional program. In S. Smith & P. Piele (Eds), *School leadership* (253–278). *Clearinghouse of Educational Management.* Eugene, Oregon.

Zepeda Sally 2003. *The Principal as an Instructional Leader: a handbook of Supervision*, Eye on Education, New York.

****