The purpose of this study was to examine the current status of instructional leadership practices of principals, identifying the dimension of instructional leadership principals give more priority in the management and leadership of schools and identifying the factors that affect instructional leadership. A descriptive survey design was employed in this study. 5 (30%) full cycle primary and 2 (20%) secondary schools in Gondar City Administration were included in the study by using Simple random (lottery) sampling technique. All schools Principals, 7(100%), Vice Principals 7(100%) and 4(100%) Supervisors were included in the study through comprehensive sampling technique. In addition to this, 1 (33.33%) District education expert was included in the study by using simple random (lottery) sampling technique. From the total target population of 346 (100%) teachers in Gondar City Administration 106 (30.63%) of them were selected through stratified random sampling technique. After the size of sample teachers from each school was known, the selection of individual teacher sample was conducted by using simple random sampling (lottery) techniques. Questionnaire, focused group discussion and semi structured interview were the instruments used for data collection. The data collected through the questionnaire were analyzed by using percentage, descriptive statics (mean and standard deviation) and t-test statistical analyses procedures. The data collected from open ended questioners, interview and focused group discussion were analyzed by using narrative description to complement the quantitative data. The result of the study indicated that, the instructional leadership practices of principals in government schools of Gondar City Administration were moderate with the overall mean scores of 3.179(63.58%). But principals were not provided equal attentions to the three dimension of instructional leadership. Accordingly, they were provided much attentions for promoting a positive school climate with the mean value of 3.428(70.68%), while in defining the school’s mission and managing the instructional program principals were provided little attentions with the mean values of 3.115(62.3%) and 2.996(59.73%) respectively. There is no statistically significant mean difference between primary and secondary school principals in terms of the overall instructional leadership practices. Gondar city administration education office should give orientation about principal ship and the role expected from school principals; besides, selection and assignment of principals should be by qualification, experience, interest and must based on their current performance. To be an effective leader, principals should focus on sharing, facilitating, and guiding decisions about instructional improvement for the enhancement of student’s academic achievement.
1. INTRODUCTION

Education is the process by which human being passes the knowledge, skill and attitude accumulated throughout life to the new generation. Education helps human being to understand his/her environment and act up on it to change in a way which suitable for his/her life. It is also assumed that education is the means by which countries ensures development (MOE, 1994). Our context is one of rapid growth in scientific, medical, technological discoveries and the world's population. But it is also a context of growing unevenness in such developments in different parts of the world and/or within individual countries. The consequence of this situation includes the growing of gaps between people, groups and countries. So, the only mechanism to reduce these gaps and becoming competent in the globalized world is providing efficient and quality education for nation (Mulford, 2003).

Schools are primarily responsible organization for the production and provision of qualified human resource. It is generally believed that the society’s future depends on the success of schools in effectively carrying out their objectives. However, this cannot be attained without adequate and proper leadership of the school curriculum and instruction for each level and grades (Mulford, 2003).

There is a great interest in educational leadership in the early part of the twenty first century, this is because of the widespread belief that the quality of leadership makes a significant difference to school and student outcomes. In many parts of the world, including both developed and developing countries, there is recognition that schools require effective principals to provide the best possible education for their students (Bush, 2008).

An educational researcher provides a long list of factors as important determinants for the success of schools and students. Among these factors, the principal’s leadership practice is commonly raised by all as prominent.

In strengthen the above ideas; Habitamu (2013) stated that:

“It is no doubt that the leadership role of a school principal has impact on the improvement of any school directly or indirectly. One of the major causes of variations among schools could be the type of leadership that school principal’s exercise. In a school where the principal is risk taker, change oriented and instruction focused by prioritizing team leadership, it is not surprise to witness improvement. Conversely, in schools where the principals are slackers or managing to keep their statuesque and do not bother to bring about something better, it is unlikely to witness change and innovation. It is mostly common to hear people saying, “Schools seem their leaders”. Hence, the better leadership style one exercise, the better he/she attains school improvement plans and students achievement compared to others”.

Effective leadership is generally regarded as a central component of securing and sustaining school improvement. The primary objective of schools is the provision of quality instruction and attainment of better student result, which can in turn leads to school improvement. Principal leadership makes a difference in the quality of schooling, school development and student learning (Hallinger & Heck 2010).

There are different theories of educational leadership and management because of the existence of diverse educational institutions (ranging from small rural primary schools to very large universities and colleges), different international contexts and the varied nature of the problems encountered in schools and colleges (Bush, 2008). So, a different school needs different approaches and solutions in order to maintain the quality of education. As a result, several perspectives may be valid simultaneously. (Bush 2008) classified theories of educational management into six major models (managerial, participative, transformational, interpersonal, transactional, moral and instructional perspectives).
Moreover, instructional leadership gets more attention at the present world because it has strong relation with the key tasks of schools i.e. teaching and learning (Goddard & Miller, 2010). So, instructional leadership added to be one of the major duties of principals in addition to the various traditional responsibilities.

The term instructional leadership is associated with measures that a principal takes or delegates to others for the enhancement of students’ learning. The instructional leader gives top priority to improve instruction and making efforts to realize the vision as well as the missions of school. It focuses on teaching, learning and on the behavior of teachers in working with students (Flath, 1989).

Researchers identified different instructional leadership roles of principals in their studies. For instance, McEwan in Tedla (2012), had identified the instructional leadership roles of principals as establishing clear instructional goals, being resourceful for staff, creating a school culture and climate conducive to learning, communicating the vision and mission of the school, setting high expectations for staff, developing teacher leaders, maintaining positive attitudes toward students, staff and parents. In the same way Hallinger (2012), proposes three dimensions for the instructional leadership role of the principal (Defining the school’s mission, managing the instructional program and promoting a positive school learning climate).

According to ministry of education in Ethiopia, the principals need to have the competence to create a shared vision and clear goals for their schools and ensure continuous progress towards achieving the goals; support the implementation of high-quality standards based instruction that results in higher levels of achievement for all students, provide opportunities for all members of the school community to build their capacity and participate in important school decisions, allocate resources, manage school operations and engage all stake holders in the educational process (MOE, 2013).

Among the core educational problems that have been raised by different Ethiopian governments in the past and still today is a problem related to quality of education. Following the formulation of education and training policy (1994), the Ethiopian government has taken different measures to alleviate those educational problems and remarkable change has been exhibited in education and other sectors (MOE, 2008).

In spite of the efforts made, the question of quality is still the major concern of the country today. Especially, educational quality needs to be the primary focus of principals because principals play pivotal roles in managing all activities that brings quality education in their schools (MOE, 2013). So, quality of education may not be realized if principal’s practice as an instructional leader is not examined because principals occupies a key position that bridges the gaps between context and school, policy and program, means and ends. Therefore, the aim of this study is assessing the instructional leadership practices of principals in government schools of Gondar City Administration.

2. Statement of the problem

Principals play an indispensable role for the effectiveness of school from the setting of the goals to accomplishment of goals. The school principals are required to be considering two important points in order to make their schools effective. First, they have to be professionally skilled and update themselves with the new technology (Hallinger & Walker, 2017). Second, they need to make instruction is their top priority. So, school principals become a good instructional leader in order to bring a desired changes in their schools because they occupies a key position that bridges the gaps between context and school, policy and program, means and ends (Hallinger & Walker, 2017).
Instructional leadership gives high priority for the improvement of students learning and school’s success in achieving their educational goals. More clearly, it also can be attributed to the dimensions or practices of the leaders they play in improving students and staff learning, setting and applying standard of excellence, managing curriculum and instruction building strong school culture, creating conducive climate using data to identify and apply instruction improvement and sharing school responsibilities with concerned stakeholders (Hallinger, 2012).

While most would agree that instructional leadership is a key for the realization of effective Schools, it is given lesser attention by principals. For example, the Milken family foundation and national association of school principal (as cited in Poirier, 2009), suggested that from the total amount of working hours in a week principals spends sixty-two hours (62 hours) on administrative duties such as parental issues, community related tasks, discipline and facilities management. Principals spend only 11% of their time for work related to instructional activities (Poirier, 2009).

In Jamaica, the schools fight with many obstacles in the education system, therefore, the roles of the principals become more crucial. The question that often appears is ‘why some student’s progress in their studies while others do not?’ The answer relates with the quality of instructional leadership of principals (Ezenne, 2010). However, in the daily practice, in Jamaican schools, many principals spend most of their time on routine activities and not enough time focusing on the instructional elements. There is a need for instructional leadership and management in order to improve students’ achievement. This can happen by creating a good collaboration and cooperation between principals and teachers (Ezenne, 2010).

In Philippines, there is a great need to improve educational management at the school level. In previous research, done by Sindhvad (2009), who focused on education system in the Philippines revealed that factor which contributes to principals’ sense of capacity for improving school quality. The most significant factor is the instructional supports can make a difference in a classroom, it relates to principals capacity for providing instructional supervision and professional development. This factor would provide important insights for strengthening education management at the school level (Sindhvad, 2009).

The education system of South Africa has shown a greater need for accountability in school leadership. Based on the South African Schools Act, Act No. 84 of 1996, a school principal has a central position in the process of developing effective school leadership. The principal must undertake any applicable professional leadership; this means that a principal can delegate some of management tasks to his subordinates. However, a principal cannot delegate his responsibilities of leadership in the organization of instructional and educational administration (Zulu, 2004).

Since 1997, South Africa has been implementing the new curriculum, Outcomes Based Education (OBE), which has brought confusion among the principals as instructional leaders. The principals had to lead and manage the school, especially the teachers with only little or no training at all. As instructional leaders, principals seem to encounter some problems in guiding and monitoring the teachers. As a result, the need for accountability in school leadership has arisen. The school needs the adequate leadership of principals; otherwise performance of schools will decrease. Therefore the principal has to exercise strong instructional leadership for the success and effectiveness of the school (Zulu, 2004).

Currently MOE gives high priorities on the professional development of principals in charge of education at different level to keep quality. In ESDP-4(2010), MOE stated that educational leaders are professionals and
those who equipped the necessary skills to exhibit proper professional ethics, knowledge and skill of leadership that are necessary to achieve school goals and objectives (MOE, 2010).

Ministry of education on the implementation of ESDP III (2005/2006-2010/2011), revealed that one of the challenges of Ethiopian education sector that need to be addressed in the plan of ESDP IV (2010/2011-2014/2015) is an improvement in student achievement through a consistent focus on the enhancement of the teaching and learning process and the transformation of the school into a motivational and child-friendly learning environment. In order to address this challenge, the school principals are expected to work on implementing the curriculum, developing the staff, coordinating and working with the community towards school improvement and creating conducive teaching -learning environment in the school (MOE, 2013).

If instructional leadership is a desirable leadership for change and school improvement, the aim of this study was assessing its presence, identifying the existing levels and identifying the major challenges in government primary and secondary schools of Gondar City Administration.

To my knowledge there was scarce research conducted on practices of school principals’ as instructional leader in Ethiopia in general and in the study area in particular. my experience that I had on teaching in secondary schools for more than ten years and serving as a secondary school principal for four years attracted me towards this topic. Especially, I am impressed by different reports presented by Gondar City Administration education office, most school principals was overwhelmed with some administrative activities like preparing urgent reports to upper officials, conducting meetings, resolving disputes among different groups and scheduling different activities in school. But, principals ignore the main activities that bring changes in their school (i.e. leading instructional activities).

3. Basic research questions
To see the performance of principal’s instructional leadership practices, the study raised the following basic questions:

- To what extent principals are performing the functions of instructional leadership activities?
- To what dimension of instructional leadership principals give more priority in the management and leadership of schools?
- What are the major challenges that school principals encounter in playing their roles as an instructional leaders?

4. Objectives of the study

4.1 General objectives
The general objective of the study was assessing the instructional leadership practices of principals in government schools of Gondar City Administration.

4.2 Specific objective
- Assessing the leadership practices of school principals as an instructional leader.
- Identifying the dimension of instructional leadership that principals give more priority in the management and leadership of school.
- Identifying the major challenges that school principals encounter in playing their role as an instructional leaders.

5. Significance of the study
The study was concerned with assessing the instructional leadership practices of principals in government schools of Gondar City Administration. So; the study is useful and timely as the current emphasis of the country is on strengthening the educational leadership. The result of the study possibly may help the following stake holders:

- The result of the study is expected as a feedback for Gondar City Administration, school principals, teachers, Students, PTA members and education offices.
Gondar City Administration education office may have clear insight into the existing practices in instructional leadership and influencing factors. So that, take appropriate measures that boost the instructional leadership of principals based on the findings and recommendations of the study.

The study may contribute additional information to the existing finding by revealing the practical experiences in the world. Besides, it considered be used as a reference material for further studies in the area.

6. Delimitation of the study

There are 46 full cycle (grade level 1-8) primary and 11 secondary schools in Gondar City Administration. All government schools were not included in the study. This is done due to time and financial constraints. Among the various stake holders in the educational system, the researcher was included teachers, school principals, vice principals, cluster supervisors and District education expert as target groups of the study in order to gather relevant data. Because these groups are assumed to provide more information about the instructional leadership practice of principals than others as they have a close relation with overall activities.

Instructional leadership deals with diversified dimensions. Including all dimensions would be beyond the researcher’s resources capacity. Therefore, the scope of the study was delimited to Hallinger and Murphy (1985), model of instructional leadership because it is used most frequently in empirical investigations and the main dimension of this model coincides with the national professional standards of principals in Ethiopia.

7. RESEARCH METHODS

7.1 Design of the Study

A descriptive survey design was employed in this study. Because the intention of the study is to assess the existing situation and describe opinions of participants of the study and look into principals practices with regard to instructional leadership practices. With regard to the use of descriptive survey research design, Best and Kahn (2003; p. 14) have argued that this design is concerned with conditions or relationships that exist, opinions that are held, process that are going on and effects that are evident or trends that are developing. Thus, this design was preferred on the ground that the leadership practices and problems of school principals in line with instructional leadership perspectives are better perceived from the opinion of school principals, vice principals, cluster supervisors, teachers and education experts.

To realize the purpose of the study, the researcher employed both quantitative and qualitative methods. Quantitative approach is considered as appropriate because it uses the survey in collecting data from a wide area by selecting a representative sample of a large population. Besides, the qualitative approach was employed so as to obtain detailed descriptions of the phenomenon such as direct quotations, personal perspectives and experience of instructional leadership through an in depth interview and focus group discussion (Yalew, 1998).

7.2 Population, Sample size and sampling techniques

The target area for this study was Gondar City Administration which is located in Amhara Regional State, Central Gondar Administrative Zone. According to Gondar City Administration education office 2018 annual report, there are about 46 full cycle primary and 11 Secondary schools. In the 5 Full Cycle primary schools there are about 138 teachers (95 males and 43 females), 5 principals (4 males and 1 female) and 3 (all are male) supervisors. While in the 2 secondary schools there are about 208 teachers (199 males and 29 females), 2 principals (all are males), 2 Vice principals (all are males) and 1 supervisor. The district education office expert was also included in the study because they have detailed information about the activities of school principals. 5 (30%)
full cycle primary and 2 (20%) secondary schools in Gondar City Administration were included as a sample of the study by using simple random (lottery) sampling technique in order to make the study more reliable and valid. All primary schools Principals, 5(100%), vice Principals 5(100%) and 3(100%) supervisors were included in the study through comprehensive sampling technique assuming that they will provide more information about leadership practice and roles than others as they have a close relation with overall instructional activities of schools. Likewise, all secondary schools principals, 2(100%), vice Principals 2(100%) and 1(100%) supervisor included in the study through comprehensive sampling technique. In addition to this, in the current administration; educational experts are assigned at district education offices, these experts have the responsibility of facilitating and providing different services for schools and cluster centers. Therefore, from these groups, 3(100) of them 1 (33.33%) was included in the study by using simple random sampling (lottery) technique. Finally, out of 138 (100%) primary school teachers in Gondar City Administration 44 (31.88%) and from the total of 208 (100%) secondary school teachers 62 (30%) of them were selected through stratified random sampling technique with the assumption that the number of sample teachers from each schools were proportional to the size of teachers in each primary and secondary schools. After the size of sample teachers from each school was known, the selection of individual teacher sample was conducted by using simple random sampling (lottery) techniques in order to provide equal chance for each teachers from their school. To determine sample size from each school, the researcher was used the following formula:

\[ n_k = \left( \frac{n}{N} \right) N_k \]

Where, \( n_k \) = Sample size for \( K^{th} \) strata  
\( N_k \) = population size for \( K^{th} \) strata  
\( N \) = Total sample size

7.3 Sources of data

The sources of data were teachers, principals, vice principals, supervisors and District education office expert. The data obtained directly from these primary sources through questionnaire, focus group discussion and interview to examine the instructional leadership practice of primary and secondary school principals, to identify dimension of instructional leadership that principals giving more priority in the management and leadership of school and identify the major challenges of instructional leadership.

7.4 Data gathering instruments

Three instruments were used in the process of gathering the necessary data for the study. These are questionnaire, interview and focus group discussion.

7.4.1 Questionnaire

The first data collecting instrument employed in the study was questionnaire. This data gathering instrument was decided to be used because the numbers of respondents are very large. The questionnaire consists of both open and close ended items based on Hallinger and Murphy (1985) model of instructional leadership and the National professional standards of school principals in Ethiopia. The questionnaire was carefully selected and presented to respondents with 4(four) subsequent sections: background information of respondents, Instructional leadership practices, challenges of leading instructional activities and possible solutions to improve those challenges.

Close ended questions were used for their easiness in tabulation, objectivity and suitability to keep respondents on the subjects of discussion. Responses from participants were taken by using Likert Scale method of rating and the respondents was expressed their degree of agreement on five points scales (i.e. 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=undecided, 4=agree and 5= strongly agree) that is relevant to the issues. A total of sixty one (61) close
ended items under four (4) tables were prepared and distributed for forty (14) school leaders (principals and vice principals). Likewise, a total of sixty one (61) close ended items fewer than four (4) tables were prepared and distributed for one hundred six (106) sample teachers. Open ended questions was included because, it gives freedoms to respondents to provide their extended views on the issue, one (1) open ended questions regarding to the possible solutions for the challenges of instructional leadership were prepared and distributed to participants of the study. In order to reduce language barriers and maintained the reliability as well as validity of the study all items of the questionnaire were translated in to Amharic language and distributed to respondents.

Table 1.1 Distribution of sample size, sampling techniques and data gathering instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Types of respondent</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Percentage of sample size</th>
<th>Sampling techniques</th>
<th>Data gathering instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M  F  T</td>
<td>M  F  T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>274 72 346</td>
<td>82 24 106</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>Stratified sampling</td>
<td>Questioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simple random</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>6 1 7</td>
<td>6 1 7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Comprehensive sampling</td>
<td>Questioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vice principals</td>
<td>7 - 7</td>
<td>7 - 7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Comprehensive sampling</td>
<td>Questioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>4 - 4</td>
<td>4 - 4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Comprehensive sampling</td>
<td>Focus group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>district education expert(Mersu Head)</td>
<td>3 - 3</td>
<td>1 - 1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>Simple random(lottery)</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>294 73 367</td>
<td>100 25 125</td>
<td>34.05%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.4.2 Interview

Interview was the second important data gathering instrument in this study. This data gathering instrument is selected with the belief that deeper information was obtained on the leadership practice of principals as an instructional leader. It is also being used to cross-check the information obtained through questionnaire and it let the interviewee to express her/his feeling freely (Best and Kahn, 2003).

In order to obtain deeper information related to the practices of instructional leadership in the study area, four (4) semi structured interview questions related with the leadership practices of school principals as an instructional leader, instructional leadership dimension of school principals, challenges and possible solution of those challenges of principals while exercising instructional leadership in their school were prepared and interviewed with one (1) District Education office expert. This respondent was selected for interview with the belief that more information can possibly obtained from him due to his position and daily engagements in the core activities of principals. The interview question was discussed with the interviewee in Amharic language to reduce communication barriers and gets more information.

7.4.3 Focus group discussion

A focus group discussion is a discussion made by a panel of 5-12 respondents led by a trained facilitator. The facilitator should be equipped with sufficient skill so that he/she can maintain a high degree of interaction among group members in all sample schools. Because the qualitative data that focus groups produce used for enriching all level of research questions trough panel discussions. So that, question for group discussion were employed to collect crucial information from the samples. In order to get sufficient information the question is prepared in Amharic language structurally and conducted with 4(100%) cluster school supervisors.

7.4.4 Validity and reliability of the instruments

Reliability of the Instruments

Before the final questionnaires were administered, pilot testing was conducted in Teda primary school and Angereb general secondary school which was not included in the sample study. Pilot testing was helped to ensure that the respondents understand what the questionnaire wants to address and was done with the objectives of checking whether or not the items contained in the instruments could enable the researcher to gather relevant information, identify and eliminate problems in collecting data from the target population. The draft questionnaires were distributed for 2(two) school principal, 2(two) vice principals, and 29 (twenty nine) teachers of the above stated schools. Both sample schools and sample teachers, principals and vice principals for pilot testing was selected by using simple random sampling techniques. The reliability of items were measured by using Crobanchs alpha method by the help of SPSS version 23. The obtained test result was 0.789. Then as the result indicated it was a good indication of the internal consistency of items. That is the instrument was found to be reliable as statistical literature recommend a test result of 0.65 (65% reliability) and above as reliable.

Validity of the instruments

To be sure of the face validity, senior colleagues were invited to provide their comment. The participants of the pilot test was also 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 items were improved before they were administered to the main participants of the study. Finally, after the necessary improvement made, the questionnaires were duplicated and distributed with necessary orientations by the researcher to be filled by respondents.
### Table 1.2 Item reliability statistics of the ten dimensions of instructional leadership and challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>No. Of items</th>
<th>No. Of respondents</th>
<th>Crobanchs alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Framing the school goals</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communicating the School's Goals</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Supervising and Evaluating Instruction</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Coordinating the Curriculum</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Monitoring Student Progress</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Promoting Professional Development</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Protecting Instructional Time</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Maintaining High Visibility</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Providing Incentives for Teachers and providing incentives for learning</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Developing High Expectations</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Challenges of instructional leadership</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average reliability: 0.798
8. Methods of Data Analysis

Depending on the nature of the variables quantitative as well as qualitative data analysis methods were employed. To begin the analysis, first respondents were categorized under different groups in terms of Sex, educational qualification and service. Then, different characteristics of respondents were analyzed by using frequency, percentage and bar graphs. Secondly, the quantitative data obtained through Likert Scale in questionnaires were organized and tabulated around the sub-topics related to the research questions. Descriptive statistics like arithmetic mean and standard deviation were calculated for those items prepared in Likert type of scale.

For more advanced statistical operations and decision making, data was inserted into modern statistical software or SPSS version 23 program and further analysis were done. To measure the views of respondents’ on the instructional leadership practices of principals a five point Likert Scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree were employed. For the sake of analysis and interpretation, the Corresponding quantitative values were given as 5 for highest degree of agreement and 1 for the lowest degree of agreement. The cutoff point at intervals of length is 4/5=0.8 because there are 5 categories and the range of the data is 4 (i.e., 5-1=4). Therefore, the mean scores 1.00-1.80 considered as very poor performance scale, 1.81-2.60, as poor performance scale, 2.61-3.40 as moderate scale, 3.41-4.20 as good performance scale and 4.21-5.00 as very good performance scale.

For the case of analysis strongly agree and agree indicate effective implementation of each item in the school and undecided presents neither positive nor negative agreement. Similarly strongly disagree and disagree indicates ineffective implementation of the items in the task. An independent sample t-test were used to make sure whether or not there is a significant difference in the distribution of preferences between two groups of respondents in terms of a given items. In such a way that, t-critical (1.99), degree of freedom (109) and alpha level of 0.05 were used for comparison of the various respondents’ degree of agreements.

The data collected from the semi-structured interview and open ended items were analyzed qualitatively. The written notes of interview were transcribed; categorized and compiled together into theme and translated into English. The result of open-ended questions and focus group discussion were summarized and organized with related category. Finally, the qualitative data was analyzed and reported through narrative description to complement the quantitative data.

9. MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

MAJOR FINDINGS

❖ Concerning to the overall assessment of principals leadership practice in the dimension of framing the school's goal, the data shows that principal's leadership practices lies on moderate scale with the grand mean values of 3.13(62.6%). Thus, Principals were not highly effective in framing the schools goals and one can infer principals in Gondar City Administration schools do not provide effective and efficient leadership and guidance in framing the schools goals.

❖ With regard to principals leadership practice in the area of communicating the school's goals, the overall assessment implied that school principals in Gondar City Administration performed at moderate scale with average mean value of 3.13(62.6%). Thus, Principals were not in a position of effectively communicating their school goals to staff, parents and learners through the use of formal and in formal communication techniques.

❖ Coming to the leadership practices of principals in the area of supervising and
evaluating instruction, the overall assessment of items under this dimension implies that principals in Gondar City Administration schools were performed at moderate level with average mean value of 3.13 (62.6%). Thus, from the above statement one can infer that principals were ineffective in frequently observing classroom instruction in their school and offering concrete, constructive suggestions to teachers and assisting them in improving their instructional practices.

❖ The overall assessments of principal’s leadership practices in the area of managing school curriculum were show that, principals performed this dimension at moderate scale with mean value of 2.96 (59.2%). Thus, one can infer that principals were not effective in leading and managing school curriculum.

❖ Concerning to principal’s leadership practices on monitoring student progress in the teaching learning process, the respondents rated the performance of principals at moderate scales with the grand mean value of 2.865 (57.4%). Thus, one can infer that principals were not in a position of devoting much of their capacities on monitoring student progress in the teaching learning process.

❖ Coming to the leadership practice of principals in the dimension of protecting instructional time, the overall assessment of items under it implies that principals in Gondar City Administration primary and secondary schools had good performance with grand mean value of 3.58 (71.6%). Thus, one can infer that principals were better in protecting instructional time.

❖ With regard to the leadership practice of principals in the area of promoting teachers professional growth which helps to foster students progresses.

❖ The overall assessment of principal’s leadership practices in the area of maintaining visibility, the respondents were rated the performances of principals at good scale with the grand mean value of 3.72 (74.4%). Thus, one can infer that principals were effective in maintaining visibility in their school.

❖ With regard to the leadership practice of principals in the area of providing incentives for teachers and students, the respondent rated at good scale with grand mean value of 3.48 (69.6%). Thus, one can infer that, the leadership practices of principals were effective in providing incentives for teachers and students.

❖ Coming to the leadership practice of principals in the area of promoting a positive learning climate dimension with the mean value of 3.428 (70.68%). From this one can conclude that principals were better in creating appositive environment in their schools. These activities were more related to administrative tasks of principals, while in the remaining two dimensions of instructional leadership, these are defining the school’s mission and managing the instructional program principals leadership practices were decreased with the mean values of 3.115 (62.3%) and 2.996 (59.73%). From this one can infer that principals in Gondar City Administration were not gives much attentions in their leadership in the
dimensions of defining the school’s mission and Managing the instructional program.

- The instructional leadership practices of primary school principals found to be on moderate scales with the grand mean value of 3.22. Accordingly, the instructional leadership practices of primary school principals in the dimension of maintaining visibility had greater emphasis with the mean value of 4.23, while the least dimension that primary school principals emphasized were framing the school’s goals with the mean value of 2.07.

- Primary school principals had good performance in creating apposite learning environment in their schools with the mean values of 3.596. These activities were more related to administrative tasks of principals, while in managing the instructional program and defining the school’s mission principals had moderate performance with the mean values of 2.94 and 2.71 respectively. From this one can infer that primary school principals in Gondar City Administration were not giving much attention in their leadership in the dimensions of defining the school’s mission and managing the instructional program.

- Likewise, the instructional leadership practices of secondary school principals found to be on moderate scales with the grand mean value of 3.34. Accordingly, the instructional leadership practices of secondary school principals in the dimension of framing the school’s goals had greater emphasis with the mean value of 4.31, while the least dimension that secondary school principal emphasized were monitoring student progress with the mean value of 2.29.

- Secondary school principals had good performances in defining the school mission and creating apposite environment in their schools with the mean values of 3.58 and 3.45 respectively. While, in managing the instructional program principals had moderate performance with the mean values of 3.01. From this one can infer that secondary school principals in Gondar City Administration were not giving much attention in their leadership in the dimensions of managing the instructional program.

- There is no statistically significant mean difference between leaders qualified in EDPM and subject specialists on their practices of instructional leadership. Thus, qualification has no statistically significant relation with success in instructional leadership.

- An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in instructional leadership practices between secondary and primary school principals. As it can be indicated, the computed t-value is \( t (51, 60) =1.318, \ t_{critical}=1.99 \). \ 1.99>1.318, thus we accept the null hypothesis; there is no statistically significant mean difference between primary and secondary school principals interims of the overall instructional leadership practices. Thus school cycle (primary and secondary school) has no statistically significant relation with success in instructional leadership.

- There is statistically significant difference in instructional leadership practices between primary and secondary school principals interims of framing the school’s goals (the computed t-value is \( t (51, 60) =2.695, \ t_{critical}=1.99 \). \ 1.99<2.695 thus we accept the hypothesis; there is statistically significant mean difference between primary and secondary school principals practices interims of framing the school’s goals. Thus school cycle (primary and secondary school) has statistically significant relation with success in framing school’s goals.

- There is statistically significant difference in instructional leadership practices between primary and secondary school principals interims of monitoring students progress
(the computed t-value is ($t_{(51, 60)} = 2.985$, $t_{\text{critical}} = 1.99$). $1.99 < 2.985$ thus we accept the hypothesis; there is statistically significant mean difference between primary and secondary school principals practices interims of monitoring students progress. Thus school cycle (primary and secondary school) has statistically significant relation with success in monitoring student’s progress.

- There is also statistically significant difference in instructional leadership practices between primary and secondary school principals in terms of maintain visibility (the computed t-value is ($t_{(51, 60)} = 2.849$, $t_{\text{critical}} = 1.99$), $1.99 < 2.849$, thus we accept the hypothesis; there is statistically significant mean difference between primary and secondary school principals practices interims of maintain visibility. Thus school cycle (primary and secondary school) has statistically significant relation with success in maintain visibility.

- Coming to the challenges of instructional leadership, respondents were rated lack of courage and a commitment from principals as a major challenge of instructional leadership with the mean score of 4.01 and standard deviation of 1.31. Heavy work load on principals is the second major factor that affects principal's instructional leadership with the mean values of 3.74. From this, one can infer that lack of courage and commitment from principals and heavy work load on principals are the two most important factors that hinders principals instructional leadership practices.

- On the other hands, inconsistent operation of instructional activities, selection and placement of school principals, problems of managing change, quick turn over of the principals appointment, lack of in-service training in the area of instruction, unsatisfactory communication with staffs within the school and interference by District education offices in decision making process are also rated as a moderate scale factors that affects principals instructional leadership activities with the mean values of 2.99, 2.99, 3.05, 3.05, 3.15, 3.19 and 3.38 respectively.

- The least factors that challenges principals in leading instructional activities were includes: Lack of instructional materials, interference by District education office in decision making process and shortage of time to perform instructional activities with the mean values of 2.35, 2.66 and 2.66 respectively.

- With regard to the possible mechanisms used to address challenges of principals instructional leadership, the participants of the study listed the mechanisms as follows: Motivating and encouraging principals, providing enough resources for schools, providing professional development and in service training, reduce the work load of school principals to focus on academic affairs, provide incentives for those principals who effectively play their instructional leadership roles and provide frequent supervisions are the major possible mechanisms.

CONCLUSION

- Based on data analysis and summary of the major findings, the following conclusions were made: The instructional leadership practices of principals in schools of Gondar Administration were moderate with the overall mean scores of 3.179 (63.58%). But principals did not provide equal attentions to the three dimension of instructional leadership. Accordingly, they provide much attention for promoting a positive school climate, while in defining the school’s mission and managing the instructional program principals provide little attentions.

- Primary school principals had good performance in creating appositive environment in their schools with the mean values of 3.596. While, in managing the instructional program and defining the
school’s mission principals had moderate performance with the mean values of 2.94 and 2.71 respectively. Secondary school principals had good performances in defining the school mission and creating a positive environment in their schools with the mean values of 3.58 and 3.45 respectively. While, in managing the instructional program principals had moderate performance with the mean value of 3.01.

The study attempted to find the factors affect principal’s instructional leadership activities. Accordingly, lack of courage and commitments from principals and heavy work load on principals are the two major factors that affects principals instructional leadership practices. On the other hands, inconsistent operation of instructional activities, selection and placement of school principals, problems of managing change, quick turn over of the principals' appointment, lack of in-service training in the area of instruction, unsatisfactory communication with staffs and interference by District education office in decision making process are also factors that affects principals instructional leadership activities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusion reached the following possible solutions are recommended so as to increase instructional leadership practices of school principals. The recommendations provided in this section are based on the key areas of study.

- Principals need to come up with leading the development of the vision of the school. Principals understand, mediate and serve the best interests of the community. This manifested through the strategic vision, cultural values, traditions and positive ethos they seek to promote across the school.
- Principals need to come up with communicating all school goals to stakeholders and developing shared commitments for the effective implementation of school priorities.
- Principals should ensure the success of all students by collaborating with families and stakeholders who represent diverse community interests and needs and mobilizing community resources that improve teaching and learning.
- Principals should build, monitor and evaluate different teams’ activities in line with the school goals.
- Principals should share and distribute responsibilities to provide quality, effectiveness and coherence across all components of the instructional system (such as curriculum, instructional materials, pedagogy, and student assessment).
- Principals engage in continuous inquiry about effectiveness of curricular and instructional practices and work collaboratively to make appropriate changes that improve results. Principals have a current knowledge and understanding of research into teaching, learning and child development and how to apply such research to the needs of the students in the school.
- Principals’ apply knowledge and understanding of current developments in education policy, schooling and social and environmental trends and developments to improve educational opportunities in the school.
 Principals provide opportunities for all members of the school community to build their capacity and participate in important school decisions.

Gondar City Administration education office should prepare educational programs and seminars which will gear towards improving and developing appropriate instructional leaders in general so as to enhance the academic performance of students.

Gondar City Administration education office should work closely with school principals on instructional aspects and by giving greater value to it in the appraisal of principal’s performance and promotions.

Gondar City Administration education office should give orientation about principal ship and the role expected from school principals; besides, selection and assignment of principals should be by qualification, experience and must based on their current performance.

Gondar City Administration education office should raise the job satisfaction of principals through performance appraisal and promotions.

Gondar City Administration education office in collaboration with the school administrations should come up with programs that are geared towards providing in-service training on the various aspects of curriculum being implemented. These trainings should be able to guide teachers and principals in general on how they may be effective in implementing curriculum in the school so as to enhance the overall academic performance of students.

Gondar City Administration education office should encourage the experience sharing between primary and secondary school principal’s interims of instructional leadership.
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