



Journal of eSciences (ISSN:2637-8760)



Assessing The Teaching-Learning Roles Of Instructional Leadership In Some Selected Primaey Schools

Yayew Genet Chekol and Ketema Joro Ayane

Salale University

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate teaching –learning roles of instructional leadership in the full cycle primary schools of Chilga woreda, Central Gondar Zone. To meet the objectives of the sudy descriptive survey design was employed. Teachers, principals, supervisors, and woreda education officers were used as primary sources of data, and annual reports and different document records used as secondary sources of data. Regarding to sampling, teachers were selected by lottery method, and principals, supervisors and woreda education officers were selected by purposive sampling method. Questionnaires, interview and document analysis were used as data collection instruments and the data were analyzed through mean, standard deviation and compare means. The finding of this study revealed that almost all instructional leaders were subject specialists, lacks skill and training, and lacks commitment and moral to accomplish their tasks and severe shortage of finance. Based on the findings, it was concluded that: Schools were to some extent incapable of enhancing teachers' professional skill development and improving the quality of education. The stated vision and defined mission in the school did not command the ownership of its potential stakeholders since it was not supported by its potential stakeholders. Instructional leaders did not possess the required skill, knowledge and attitude through training. In line with the above findings and conclusions it was recommended that: to equip instructional leaderships with necessary knowledge, attitude and skills the Region, Zone and Woreda Education Officials may arrange workshops, seminars, short and long term training in collaboration with different universities, colleges and NGO's and schools need to think of their own income generating sources on top of government budget through improving their relationship with local NGO's and school communities by preparing project proposal and submit to international donors.

Keywords: instructional leadership, practice, challenges, full cycle primary schools, principals

*Correspondence to Author:

Yayew Genet Chekol
Salale University

How to cite this article:

Yayew Genet Chekol and Ketema Joro Ayane. Assessing The Teaching-Learning Roles Of Instructional Leadership In Some Selected Primaey Schools. Journal of eSciences, 2019, 2:10

 **eSciPub**
eSciPub LLC, Houston, TX USA.
Website: <https://escipub.com/>

Introduction

Schools prepare students for the future; teach them the skills they need to be successful in life; and motivate them to read, write and think creatively. Moreover, schools are concerned with the development of students who are not only employable, but also autonomous and responsible individuals who are effective members of the society (Harris, 2003:12). To achieve this, there must be a commitment among the various stakeholders. In supporting of this, Aggrawal (as cited in Million, 2001) explained that in maintaining the above objectives (i.e. for the developments of citizens as well as students), the school requires the effectiveness and commitment of stakeholders particularly teachers, school leaders and management.

Instructional leaders who manage schools are called principal's .The principal is the individual best positioned within the school to evaluate the curriculum and evaluation process. A principal is an individual who directs and monitors the academic and nonacademic activities within a school environment. The principal is the individual who plans and implements the daily routines within an educational setting. This requires that the principal become deeply engaged in the schools instructional program (Hallinger, 2005)

In Ethiopia, primary education lasts eight years and is split into grades 1-4 (primary first cycle) and grades 5-8 (primary second cycle), and the same is true in Chilga Woreda Administration. Education in the country comprises formal and non-formal basic Education opportunities as a system to expand access and as part of an ongoing effort to provide education to its citizens. Side by side, the issue for improving the quality of education at school level is one of the priorities that requires due attention and has been given unlimited involvement by the higher officials and people in the world of academic. Through the provision of necessary inputs to schools and other institutions, achievements have been registered in the form of increased

access to education at all levels. However, despite the progress made in improving the quality of inputs, there is an even greater need to improve the quality of the teaching-learning process through a regular and constant school support and guidance to better and enhanced educational outcomes (MOE, 2005).

There have been several calls on the instructional leadership on how to make the education system to be vibrant in the quality of products after several quantity of mass failure and half-baked products of various educational institutions around the world including our country Ethiopia. The quality issue over the years has generated a lot of debate and argument among Ethiopians on the newspapers, radio and television programs, including parents, religious bodies and non-governmental organizations (MOE, 2008)

It is well understood that effective instructional leadership is essential for improving quality education. The recognition that the task of improving instructional leadership in schools and raising the performance of both teachers and pupils rests with all the key performers in the education institution including head teachers, assistant principals, supervisors and parents (Mulugeta et al. (2005).This study will be identifies assessing the practices and challenges of the instructional leadership in primary schools of Chilga Woreda by analyzing sample data.

Regarding Ethiopia, there are some evidences that verify that the instructional leadership practice was not effective. Various studies (e.g., Tesfaye Nigussie, 2010; Alemayehu Tesema, 2011) have been conducted nationally on issues related to practice and challenges of instructional leadership. However, most of them are different in numerous ways from the current study. For example, a study by Tesfaye Nigussie (2010) entitled as "the role of instructional leadership in building organizational climate of schools of Bale Zone" and by Alemayehu Tesema (2011) entitled as "a comparative study of instructional leadership

roles of principal in some selected government and Catholic schools in AddisAbaba” are the two prominent studies, in two different regions, Oromia and Amhara respectively, certify that the practice was not effective. The two researchers indicated above generally identified the following four factors, namely teacher resistance to change; pressure from none instructional jobs; lack of instructional feedback and lack of staff cohesiveness, lack of training and inefficiency in administration are the major hindrances for unsuccessful implementation of instructional leadership in targeted schools. However, they are different from this study in two different ways. Firstly, they focused on the role of instructional leadership but they did not say anything about the practice and challenges played by instructional leaders. Secondly, the methodology they emphasized was quantitative, whereas, this study is both qualitative and quantitative. This study is also different in that its focus is on the practice and challenges of instructional leaders could play in minimizing challenges that has spread in the primary schools whereas, they focus on grade nine and ten.

Regarding the practices in the primary schools of Central Gondar Zone, since the researcher himself has been working in some of the primary schools as teacher, department head and school principal, he has faced a lot of challenges of instructional leadership. In addition, there was a bitter complain from educational officials at the Woreda and Zonal levels regarding the poor performance of principals in relation to their leadership responsibilities, lack of training and inefficiency and lack of commitment. However, to the best of researcher knowledge, no studies were identified that show the degree of the problems and the challenges prevalent in the schools. This by itself initiates the researcher to undertake this study in order to identify the major challenges in the implementation of instructional leadership and recommend some

remedies that could better address the problems

Review of related Literature

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

According to Chris peel, (1992, p.231) instructional leadership behaviors associated with promoting professional growth and staff development yield positive effects on classroom practice. Conversely, instructional leaders that did not engage in monitoring and providing feedback of the teaching-learning process had negative effect on teachers and classroom practices (Blasé and Blasé, 1998). In particular leaders that engage in behaviours that inform staff about current trends and issues, encourage attendance at workshops, seminar and conferences, build a culture of collaboration and learning, promote coaching, use inquiry to drive staff development, set, professional growth goal with teachers, and provide resources foster teacher innovation in using a variety of methods, materials, instructional strategies, reflective practice, and technology in the classroom. Locke and Latham (1990) assert that goal setting is effective way to increase motivation and performance. They postulate that goals increased attention to obtainment of the task, increase the effort

expended on goals relevant to activities, increase persistent to achieve, increase the development of strategies to obtain the goal. This is true even loosely coupled organizations, such as public schools.

In relation to this, many writers explain that frequent communication of school goals by instructional leaders promotes accountability, a sense of personal ownership, and instructional improvement. A principal that define and communicate shared goals with teachers provides organizational structures that guide the school toward a common focus. This common focus on academic press challenges teacher"s behaviours with in the class room, which leads to more effective schools.

2.1 Promoting Professional Skill Development

Instructional leaders can play a key role in providing and promoting in-service professional development programs for teachers. It is essential that instructional leaders understand this aspect of leadership as one of their key responsibilities. They can ensure that teacher professional development is relevant to the local school context and aligned with overall school improvement goals and with teachers" needs. To enhance school leaders" capacity to promote staff development, policy makers should emphasize the core responsibility of teacher professional development and consider devolving discretion over training and development budgets to the school level so that school leaders can offer and coordinate meaningful professional learning opportunities for all their teachers (Leithwood et al., 2006).

In-service training at school level is one of the means to achieve professional development of teachers. The school leaders and supervision committee can deliver the training to all teachers of the school. Through the training, teachers could share useful ideas and experiences, acquaint with new teaching methodologies and curriculum innovations, develop mutual support and stand for common goals. To attain those activities, training

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

2.2 Building Effective Relationship in Schools

In institutional setting like schools everything starts with relationships, whether those relationship are among ideas (Marx,2006:135).Teachers, administrators, supervisions, students and parents need to come together to define their aspiration, design procedures for decision making, the mobilization of resources and the evaluation of learning outcomes. The role of instructional leader in team building and developing team cohesion is aimed at defining common goals. In school setting everyone wants to be safe, to be appreciated, to be accepted as part of the school community and be recognized as contributing to the school effectiveness.

2.3 Conflict Management role of instructional leaders in school

According to Barge (1994) conflict is a social phenomenon that is heavily ingrained inhuman

relation, expressed and sustained through communication and occurs when individuals or groups became dependent on one another to meet identified needs. The social context of the school is comprised of different groups, with different and sometimes opposing interests but interdependent on each other, the existence of conflict is inevitable. Effective managers and school principals need to understand the nature of conflict and develop practical skill to manage it. Leaders who are skilled in the arts of resolving conflict are prepared to deescalate the rhetoric and posturing on both sides of the dispute and substitute search for solutions that give each side of the opportunity to compromise without losing face. Such leaders go to the root of the communication breakdown, whether it is anger, fear, mistrust or differing assumption and definitions. They press each side to understand the way others perceive the problem, recognizing that how an adversary perceives the problem. Therefore, instructional leader generate alternative solutions to solve the problem in the school setting.

2.4 Instructional Leadership and School Climate

Basically some scholars of educational management, for instance Halpin and Craft (in Hoy, Tarter and Kott Kamp 1991) suggest two dimension of school climate. These are as follows: principal’s behaviors and teacher’s perceptions.

This dimensions deals with the manner of principals interacts with teachers, students and parents. This is to large extent seems to be affect the way teachers interact with one another, with students and parents. This interaction has a considerable impact on the general atmosphere of the school.

Method of the study

Result and discussion

Teaching- Learning Roles of Instructional Leadership

3.1 Professional Skill Development

The researcher has summarized the methods of the study with the following table 1

Types of respondent	Population	Sample size	Sample size in %	Sampling technique	Data gathering instruments
Teacher	160	80	50%	Simple random sampling	Questionnaire
Principals	10	10	100%	Purposive sampling	Questionnaire
Cluster supervisor	2	2	100%	Purposive sampling	Interview
Woreda officers	10	10	100%	Purposive sampling	Interview
Total	182	102	56.04 %		

Table 2: Professional Skill Development

No.	Item	Respondents response							
		Teachers		Principals		Gra. Mean	Compare means		
		Mean	Std	Mean	Std		t-value	df	Sig. lev.
1	Play an active role in facilitating teachers professional skill Development	3.5	1.127	3.36	1.146	3.43	0.844	114	0.400
2	Identify the professional development needs of teachers	3.4	1.067	3.34	1.188	3.38	.370	114	0.712
3	Conduct teachers professional development activity in your School	3.58	1.124	3.38	1.131	3.48	1.244	114	0.216
4	Encourage teachers to collaborate with surrounding schools for Experience sharing.	3.44	1.097	3.54	1.074	3.49	1.244	114	0.625
5	Give regularly teachers suggestions as to how they can improve their teaching	3.48	1.085	3.48	.953	3.48	-.490	114	0.981
6	Arrange program for staff training to create a spirit of cooperative working atmosphere	3,47	1.026	3.48	1.054	3.47	0.024	114	0.956
7	Provide adequate time for professional skill development	3.3	1.067	3.48	1.092	3.39	-.055	114	0.379
8	Organize professional skill development opportunity for all staff	3.71	1.200	3.16	1.058	3.44	-.882	114	0.013
9	Create awareness for teachers about the importance of professional skill development	3.54	1.084	3.24	.895	3.39	2.515	114	0.173
10	Encourages teachers to review individual professional growth goals consistent with school goals and priorities	3.45	1.139	3.44	1.151	3.45	1.370	114	0.946
		3.43		3.49		3.46			

Mean scores 1.00-1.80 = Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60 = Disagree, 2.61- 3.40 = Undecided, 3.41-4.20 = Agree and 4.21-5.00 = Strongly Agree. Df= degree of freedom t= critical value sig. lev. = significant level gra.mean =grand mean

Nonetheless, in the remaining activities of instructional leadership, with respect to encouraging teachers to review individual professional growth goals consistent with school goals and priorities, giving regularly teachers suggestions as to how they can improve their teaching, arranging program for staff training to create a spirit of cooperative working atmosphere, providing adequate time for professional skill development and encouraging teachers to collaborate with surrounding schools for experience sharing items with mean values of 3.44, 3.48 and 3.54 were found to be agreed. This implies that the instructional leaders effectively implemented the tasks.

On the other hand, the view of teachers not match with the principals because they rated almost all the items which fail under agreement level except item number 7 of teachers mean score which found to be under undecided scale. This implies that teachers' respondents were better understanding than that of instructional leaders. In general, this shows that both groups have different idea on the same items.

In interview session the school professional skill development, supervisors and Woreda education officers were asked how they evaluate the implementation status and the effectiveness of professional skill development program in school. They replied as most of them similar with two groups of respondents responses in the questionnaires.

They said that:

There were low professional skill development activities in the schools due to lack of budget and lack of knowledge from concerned bodies on the issues. This shows that professional skill development was not effectively practiced in the sampled schools.

In general, the instructional leader's effectiveness in this role of professional skill development ranges from undecided to agree. However, most activities were found to agree and least activities remain at the undecided

level. The above finding shows that, it is possible to conclude that the role of school leaders in professional skill development at the school under study is more of agreement between two groups of respondents.

The result of independent sample t-test values for all items indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the means of the two groups as obtained p values which ranges from-.055 to 1.370 were greater than 0.05 (see table 2). Except item 5 which show that there is statistical significance difference between the means of both groups as obtained t values which is 0.024 was less than 0.05. All obtained t-values are less than t-critical (1.99) when tested at alpha level 0.05. So, this implies the consistency of responses between the groups. These results might be due to the fact that both principals and teachers have similar thoughts on the effect of professional skill development program in teaching and learning process. Both groups understood that the professional skill development program played a great role in improving the process of teaching and learning even though it has not been implemented fully as it was intended

3.2 Building Effective Relationship in School

As can be seen from table 3, the overall items in the dimension were rated as agreement level of performance with the average mean value of 3.63 and 3.59 by both principals and teachers respectively. This implies that both groups of respondents were almost similar views in the elements of instructional leadership roles.

Concerning to each items analysis, the mean value of principals and teachers indicate that maintaining good working relationship with teachers and other staff members, understanding and analyze the school situations and effectively interact with community and school members, treating school community equitably and fairly, listening to and accept teachers suggestions and encouraging teachers help and support each others were rated relatively higher than the rest

of other items in the dimension with a mean value of (3.65,3.58,3.61,3.66 and 3.72).In other words, instructional leaders strongly strive to items 1,4 and 7 must adapted the way how to the teachers master building effective relationship in their the respective school.

Whereas ensuring open and collaborative communication within staff and causing the evaluation of school community relations were rated as in agreement level of performance with mean value of 3.43 and 3.47 by both groups of respondents respectively.

Table 3: Building effective relationship in school

No.	Item	Respondents response							
		Teachers		Principals		Gr a. Me an	Compare mean		
		Mea n	SD	Mea n	Std		t- val ue	df	Sig lev.
1	Maintain good working relationship with teachers and other staff members	3.62	1.270	3.67	1.194	3.65	0.202	114	0.850
2	Ensure open and collaborative communication within Staff	3.4	1.120	3.45	1.153	3.43	0.259	114	0.961
3	Understand and analyze the school situations and effectively interact with community and school Members	3.62	1.067	3.55	1.185	3.58	-.364	114	0.500
4	Treat school community equitably and fairly	3.58	.971	3.64	1.185	3.61	0.274	114	0.785
5	Listen to and accept teachers suggestions	3.74	1.209	3.59	1.11	3.66	-.676	114	0.71
6	Causes the evaluation of school community relations	3.48	1.058	3.47	1.12	3.47	-.049	114	0.79
7	Encourage teachers help and support each other	3.70	1.199	3.78	1.19	3.74	0.189	114	0.84
Mean value		3.63		3.59		3.61			

Mean scores 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60=Disagree, 2.61- 3.40=Undecided, 3.41-4.20=Agree and 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree. Df= degree of freedom t= critical value sig. lev. = significant level gra.mean =grand mean

Table 4: Supportive roles of instructional leaders

No.	Item description	Respondents response							
		Teachers		principals		Gra. Mean	Compare means		
		Mean	Std	Mean	Std		t-value	df	Sig. lev.
1	Set exemplary roles by working hard themselves with staff	3.46	1.147	3.65	1.098	3.56	0.674	114	0.980
2	Goes out of their ways to help teachers	3.66	1.110	3.67	1.126	3.66	0.031	114	0.661
3	Explains the reasons to criticism teachers	3.78	1.166	3.52	1.140	3.63	-1.227	114	0.222
4	Use constructive criticism	3.44	1.053	3.53	1.141	3.49	0.440	114	0.222
5	Looks out for the personal welfare of staff	3.46	1.092	3.48	1.162	3.48	0.025	114	0.975
Mean value		3.56		3.6		3.58			

Mean scores 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60=Disagree, 2.61- 3.40=Undecided, 3.41-4.20=Agree and 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree. Df= degree of freedom t= critical value sig. lev. = significant level gra.mean =grand mean

Table 5: directive role of instructional leaders

No.	Item	Respondents response							
		Teachers		principals		Gra. Mean	Compare means		
		Mean	Std	mean	Std		t-value	df	Sig. lev.
1	Take much of the time when teacher-principals conferences are held on	3.46	1.092	3.59	1.152	3.53	0.648	114	0.518
2	Closely checks teacher's activities	3.64	.985	3.58	1.047	3.60	-.291	114	
3	Keep a close check on sign-in time	3.44	1.091	3.94	1.201	3.72	2.306	114	0.771
4	Tell what they do, guide and direct	3.66	1.272	3.64	1.302	3.65	-.110	114	0.023
5	Monitor everything the teachers do	3.56	1.264	3.89	1.067	3.75	1.428	114	0.913
Mean value		3.55		3.73		3.64			

Mean scores 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60 = Disagree, 2.61- 3.40 = Undecided, 3.41-4.20 = Agree and 4.21-5.00 = Strongly Agree. Df= degree of freedom t= critical value sig. lev. = significant level gra.mean =grand mean

Table 6 :conflict management roles of instructional leaders

No.	Item description	Respondents response							
		Teachers		Principals		Gra. Mean	Compare mean		
		Mean	SD	Mean	Std		t-value	df	Sig. leve.
1	Use problem framing and solving skill effectively	3.58	1.03	3.73	1.144	3.66	0.716	114	0.476
2	Challenging and mediating resistance	3.62	1.105	3.62	1.160	3.62	0.006	114	0.995
3	Confront and resolve problems in timely manner	3.58	1.31	3.64	1.090	3.61	0.253	114	0.801
4	Provide a safe and supportive environment	3.32	1.151	3.85	1.193	3.62	2.399	114	0.018
Mean value		3.53		3.71		3.62			

Mean scores 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60=Disagree, 2.61- 3.40=Undecided, 3.41 4.20=Agree and 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree. Df= degree of freedom t= critical value sig. lev. = significant level gra.mean =grand mean

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare promoting professional skill development for both principals and teachers. As a result, they rated all the items in the dimension as high performance with no statistically significant difference in their responses. All obtained t-values are less than t-critical (1.99) when tested at alpha level 0.05. So, this implies the consistency of responses between the groups.

As a whole, the role of instructional leaders with regard to building effective relationship in the school was agreed on. Therefore, it can be said that the role of instructional leaders in building effective relationship among teachers in the school was successful.

In connection to this, Marx (2006) stated that school leaders establish and maintain open and productive relations among the school community by working with teachers, students, parents and the community at large and need to be able to develop and maintain positive relationship with all.

3.3 Supportive Roles of Instructional Leaders

As observed in the above table 4, item numbers 1up to5 both groups of respondents almost rated similarly and the mean scores of principals were ranges from 3.48-3.67 and that of teachers were ranges from 3.44 - 3.78 respectively and the average mean scores of two groups of respondents felt to agree.This indicates that both groups' of respondents agreed that the activities were effectively implemented in the sampled schools.

With reference to the supportive role of instructional leaders in looking out for the personal welfare of staff, explains the reasons to criticism teachers, using constructive criticism to the teachers, Setting exemplary roles by working hard themselves with staff and goes out of their ways to help teachers rated with the mean values of 3.48, 3.52, 3.53, 3.65, and 3.67 respectively were found to agreed. In the same way, the teachers respondents have rated the aforementioned activities fail under agreed scale. As result teaching force in their respective schools were not face difficulties in their performance, highly interested in their job, and develop positive attitude on their instructional leaders. From this one can conclude that there were high interaction in

between teachers with teachers, teachers with instructional leaders and teachers with students. In general this situation may lead to high commitment of teachers in their work that result to the provision of high quality education for learner, and high academic achievement.

In relation to this, Halpin (1966) indicated that supportive role of school leader has to be done with how the school leader relates and respond to staff needs and this contributes to caring environment in which every body cares for one another and invariable foster excellent teaching learning process. From this it can be concluded that the supportive role of school leaders was rated as moderately performed in the full cycle primary schools of the study area.

Finally, an independent sample t-test was employed to compare supportive roles of instructional leaders for both instructional leaders and teachers. As a result, they rated most items in the dimension as high performance with no statistically significant difference in their responses. All obtained t-values are less than t-critical (1.99) when tested at alpha level 0.05. Except item 5 which show that there is statistical significance difference between the means of both groups as obtained t values which is 0.025 was less than 0.05. So, this implies the consistency of responses between the groups.

As a whole, the role of instructional leaders (school principals and department heads) with regard to supporting teaching-learning activities was better agreement between teachers and leaders. For that reason, it can be concluded that the supportive role of instructional leaders was effectively practiced in the sampled schools.

3.4 Directive Role of Instructional Leaders

As depicted in the above table 5, regarding to directive roles of instructional leaders, item number 1 up to 5 both respondents almost rated similarly and the mean scores of principals were ranges from 3.58 up to 3.94 and that of teachers were ranges from 3.44 up to

3.66 respectively and the average mean scores were 3.73 and 3.55 respectively, both mean and average mean values of respondents were found to be under agreed scale. This average mean value implies that principals interaction with teachers was found to be relatively more directive than supportive.

Item 1, 3 and 5 of the table presents that teachers" respondents contradictorily when compared with principals, that is, teachers mean scores of items ranges from 3.46, 3.44 and 3.56 respectively. This implies that teachers considered instructional leaders as leading each activity by using force rather than supporting them.

With regarding to each items analysis, the instructional leaders taking much of the time when teacher-principals conferences are held on, keeping a close check on sign-in time and monitoring everything the teachers do were rated agreed level with the mean values of 3.56, 3.89 and 3.94) by instructional leaders, in the same time, school leaders closely checks teacher's activities and telling what they do, guide and direct were rated as agreed level of scale with the mean values of 3.64 and 3.66 by teacher respondents. From this data one can deduce that almost decision making authority were on the positional leaders of respective schools. Staff members may have little influence in the decision making process. As result staff members may be in low morale, follow leaders" direction while renewing that the direction are wrong. In general this condition may influence staff member's autonomy in planning and implementing their work, since staff members are staffed by professional who able to do what right and best for their schools.

In connection to this, Halpin (1966) stated that the school leader who emphasizes directive very strongly believes that, people work best under tension and pressure. This type of principal behavior influences how the staff will discharge their responsibilities and it will ultimately affect the schools.

Finally, an independent sample t-test was employed to compare directive roles of instructional leaders for both instructional leaders and teachers. As a result, they rated most items in the dimension as high performance with no statistically significant difference in their responses. All obtained t-values are less than t-critical (1.99) when tested at alpha level 0.05. Except item 2 which show that there is statistical significance difference between the means of both groups as obtained t values which is 0.006 was less than 0.05.

In general, the role of instructional leaders with regard to directing role of teaching-learning activities was did not have better agreement between teachers and principals. For that reason, it can be concluded that the directive role of instructional leaders may affect working force motivation and interest to their job that come up with low performance and low academic achievement of the learners in the sampled schools.

3.5 Conflict Management Roles of Instructional Leaders

As it can be seen from table 6 above, with reference to roles of instructional leaders in challenging and mediating resistance, confronting and resolving problems in timely manner, using problem framing and solving skill effectively and providing a safe and supportive environment both instructional leaders and teachers respondents, indicated that the instructional leaders role were ranges from 3.62 to 3.85 and 3.58 to 3.62 respectively and the average mean scores were 3.71 and 3.53 respectively, both mean and average mean values of respondents were found to agreed. These averages mean values implies that instructional leaders are dominant or not participatory of teachers in conflict resolutions methods in the dimension.

Concerning to each item analysis, the instructional leaders using problem framing and solving skill effectively, challenging and mediating resistance, confronting and resolving problems in timely manner and providing a safe

and supportive environment were agreed with each of the 4 items stated with mean values of (3.73, 3.62, 3.64 and 3.85) by principals, in the same time, teachers respondents using problem framing and solving skill effectively, challenging and mediating resistance and confronting and resolving problems in timely manner were rated as lower than that of instructional leaders with the mean values of (3.58 3.62 3.58 and 3.32) by teacher respondents except item 4 (providing a safe and supportive environment) of teachers mean values which found to be under undecided. From this data one can deduce that almost all conflict management authorities were on the positional leaders of respective schools. Staff members may have little influence in the problem solving process.

As result staff members may be in low morale, follow leaders' direction while renewing that the direction are wrong. In general this condition may influence staff member's autonomy in deciding and managing the ability of problem solving in their own work, since staff members are staffed by specialized who able to do what right and best for their schools. Furthermore, the observed conflict managing role of instructional leaders may affect working force motivation and interest to their job that come up with low performance of the learners in their perspective schools.

In addition to this, open ended items were asked to both groups of respondents. Accordingly, instructional leaders used the school rules and regulation to maintain and resolve the conflict rose between individual and groups. Here they were not following the scientific way of problem solving in their respective schools. In relation to this, Barge (1994) stated that, a wise leader must have ethically and to do so should be open to new information and be willing to change his or her mind as well as others mind. Effective school leaders need to understand the nature of the conflict and develop practical skill to manage it. From these findings, it is possible to conclude

that, the practice of managing conflict was highly affected the task of teachers respondents in the full cycle primary schools of the study area.

Finally, an independent sample t-test was employed to compare conflict management roles of instructional leaders for both instructional leaders and teachers. As a result, they rated most items in the dimension as high performance with no statistically significant difference in their responses. All obtained t-values are less than t-critical (1.99) when tested at alpha level 0.05.

As a whole, the role of instructional leaders with regard to conflict management in teaching-learning activities was better agreement between teachers and leaders. As a result, it can be concluded that the conflict management role of instructional leaders over acting on the staff members and also staff members may have little influence in the problem solving process.

4 Conclusions

Concerning about the teaching learning roles of instructional leaders that make strive to improve teachers teaching skill, giving positive directions to teachers and other staff members and supporting teachers in constructive suggestions and materials were not fairly implemented or less effective. While, providing professional skill development, building positive relationship with stakeholders, supportive role of instructional leaders, and conflict management strategies were well or efficiently practiced in the study area except directive role of instructional leaders was ineffective. However, the findings of the previous sections revealed that the term as well as the teaching learning roles of instructional leadership was not appropriately implemented among full cycle primary schools of Chilga Woreda. Therefore, it can be concluded that schools were more or less capable of giving positive directions to teachers and non-teaching staffs and improving the quality of schools output for the need of

participatory teaching learning roles from the instructional leaders' side.

5. Recommendations

Concerning to teaching learning roles of instructional leadership, the instructional leaders should be strengthen their relationship with teachers and school community by spending more time in classroom instructional observation, support teachers by indicating necessarily respect for each other's, telling and participating and by minimizing showing negative direction in the school by working with woreda education offices nearby to improve the quality of classroom instructions or teaching learning process as well as others school stakeholders.

Even though this research work may have its own contributions in understanding the practices and challenges of instructional leadership and may serve as lesson for other educational leaders who are practicing or want to practice in the future, the outcomes of the study was not complete as it was initially anticipated. Therefore the researcher recommended that there is a need for those people who interested to conduct further study on this issue.

References

1. Alemayehu Tesema (2011). Educational Leadership Problem of Government Secondary School Principals. (AAU, Unpublished MThesis).
2. Barge, J.K. (1994). *Leadership: Communication Skills for Organizations and Groups*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
3. Barth, R. (1999). *The Teacher Leader*. Providence, RI: The Rhode Island Foundation.
4. Beare, H., Caldwell, B., & Millikan, R. (1989). *Creating an Excellent School*. London: Routledge
5. Blase, J. and Anderson, G. (1995). *The Micro-Politics of Educational Leadership: From Control to Empowerment*. London: Cassel.
6. Blasé, J. and Blasé, J. (1999). Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: teacher perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(3), 349-378.
7. Blase, J and Balse, J (1999). Effective Instructional Leadership: Teachers' Perspectives on how Principals Promote Teaching and Learning in

- Schools. *Journal of Educational Administration* v, 38, n-2.
8. Hollinger, P. and Murphy, J. (1989). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School, Journal*, 86(2).
 9. Hollinger. and F. Murphy (1987). *Assessing and developing principal leadership*. Englewood Cliffs NG: Prentice Hall
 10. Leith wood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation
 11. LiwthWood, K.A and Rich. (2008).What We Know About Successful School Leadership. Retrieved October 10/2018 from www.cepn.gse.retgers.org.
 12. Locke, A., Edwin and Latham (1990). *The essence of leadership*. New York: Macmillan Inc.
 13. Marx, Gray.(2006). *Future-Focused leadership.Preparing Schools, Students, and Communities for Tomorrow's Realities*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
 14. MoE, (2006). Educational Statistics Annual Abstract 2005/6.Addis Ababa.
 15. Phillips. (2011).*Manager-Administration to Instructional Leader: Shift in the Roles of the School Principal*. New York: Teachers College Press.
 16. Seyoum Tefera and Ayalew Shibeshi (1989). *Fundamentals of educational research*. AA: AAU Printing Press
 17. Tesfaye Nigussie, (2010).*The Role of Instructional leadership in Building Organizational*
 18. TGE (1994). Education and Training Policy. Addis Ababa: EMPDA

