*IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*
*Volume 23, Issue 1, Ver. 10 (January. 2018) PP 13-22*
*e-ISSN: 2279-0837, p-ISSN: 2279-0845.*
*www.iosrjournals.org*

# Principals' Instructional Leadership Performance in Hawassa City Administration Secondary Schools, Ethiopia

Dawit Legesse Edamo (PhD)
*College of Education, Hawassa University, Ethiopia*
*Corresponding Author: Dawit Legesse Edam*

**Abstract**: This study aimed to assess principals' instructional leadership performance in secondary schools of Hawassa City Administration. The study employed descriptive survey design and data were collected from seven secondary schools using questionnaire focusing on the different dimensions of instructional leadership. Mean values, percentages, standard deviations and t-test were used to analyze the data. The study indicated that most principals have exercised the instructional leadership roles they are expected to play though some principals were not able to properly exercise instructional leadership roles supposed to be played by them. Thus, improving instructional leadership in the schools requires the education department of the city administration and the regional education bureau to give attention to area of specialization while appointing school principals. In addition, principals who are on duty at present should be given adequate training on instructional leadership dimensions that are affecting performance of the schools in the city administration.

**Keywords:** instructional leadership, instructional resources, principals, secondary schools, role diversity

Date of Submission: 15-01-2018 Date of acceptance: 31-02-2018

## I. INTRODUCTION

Leadership in educational institutions is a process of giving direction and educational leaders are identified on the basis of their relationship with their followers (Chima, 2007; Rogers, 2006). Leaders are expected to influence the behavior of their followers by using appropriate influencing strategies. George and Georgia (2004)summarized characteristics that best describe leadership as involving and exerting influence over other members of a group or organization and supporting a group or organization to achieve its goal. A leader's vision provides followers with a sense of optimism for the future, firmness between the past and future, and a skeleton for decisions and actions. Additionally, it is well established that competencies of leadership in organizations are the combination of skills, abilities, knowledge, and personal attributes(Weiss &Molinaro, 2006; Yukl, 2002). A core characteristic of effective leadership is the ability to create a shared vision that is clearly articulated throughout the organization and aligns the energy and work of followers (Hesselbein,et al.,1996; Hopkins, 2005). In order to address the intended goal of schools, principals are expected to exhibit the instructional competency, knowledge, skill and ability expected of them. Their effectiveness is believed to be critical for successful performance of the schools they are leading. This requires witnessed performance in carrying out instructional leadership roles they are expected to play focusing on the different dimensions of instructional leadership.

Principals as instructional leaders should at all times strive for excellence in teaching and learning with the sole purpose of improving student achievement. They are expected to serve primarily as instructional leaders in schools, and that their commitment to instructional enhancement and perfection should not only be strongly articulated but should be reinforced with experience in the classroom (Boatman & Richard,2011). In order to secure authority in the eyes of the teachers, principals should have sufficient leading as well as teaching experience and should understand with firsthand experience the instructional challenges faced by teachers so that they will be able to take corrective actions appropriate to the situation (Robert, 2003; Seyoum, 2014). Based on the premises of the Education and Training Policy of Ethiopia, school principals are expected to perform well in educational leadership by properly leading and involving the school community in instructional activities which are meant to have great influence on student academic performance (MoE, 1994). In order to meet the demanding requirements of the Ministry of education, principals in schools are expected to play a great role in supervision, research work, planning, goal setting, and provision of instructional materials in schools (MoE, 2013).

Secondary schools in Hawassa City administration are also expected to exercise meaningful instructional leadership through active engagement of the principals. This has to take place with the hope that students achievement can be maximized and performance of schools can be enhanced if instructional leadership is properly implemented (Leskiw & Parbudyal, 2007). The principals' performance and commitment is among the key issues for the success of schools. Studies show that in many cases there is a lack of pragmatic evidence and systematic approach in leadership performance. While the challenges related to leaders performance have been studied in many organizations worldwide, in many developing countries it seems to be more important (Mehrabani & Mohammad, 2011).18 Bleak and Fulmer (2009) argue that there are many problems (in most countries) that result in employees' poor performance. Experience clearly shows that school principals have no similar understanding regarding what to do to promote instruction in the schools. Though instructional leadership has become crucial agenda of Ministry of Education in Ethiopia, and the education offices at different levels, implementation challenges are reported. Therefore, the main aim of this study is to investigate the performance level of school principals in Hawassa City Administration by focusing on the different dimensions of instructional leadership.

**Research Question**

Based on the background and the justification to conduct the study this research has raised the following main question. What is the status of principals' instructional leadership performance and influencing factors in Hawassa City Administration secondary schools?

## II. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

This study employed descriptive survey design to use it as overall plan. Seven secondary schools were selected using lottery method for the study. Data was collected from a total of 82 respondents who were school principals, vice principals, Parent Teacher Association Members, supervisors and education office experts working on quality of education. They were selected using purposive and simple random sampling techniques. The data collection instruments was questionnaire. A five point Likert scale was used to measure the extent to which instructional leadership has been implemented in the schools. The data was analyzed using percentage, mean, standard deviation and t-test through the help of SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences).

## III. RESULTS

Before collection of the main data the questionnaire was pilot tested in one of the schools in the City Administration which was not selected for the main study. The questionnaire was distributed to 20 individuals in the schools and the Cronbach alpha result of 0.92 indicated that the items were internally consistent. The result of the pilot test led to the main study and the results are presented as follows. As noted earlier, seven secondary schools were included in the study and a total of 82 questionnaires were distributed the participants of the study. All the questionnaires were properly filled and returned. Based on the responses the characteristics of respondents are indicated in Table 1.

**Table** 1 The Characteristics Of Respondents By Sex, Age And Qualification

| **No** | **Characteristics** | | **Frequency and percent for respondents characteristics** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Valid percent** | **cumulative Percent** |
| **1** | **Sex** | **Male** | 66 | 80.5 | 80.5 | 80.5 |
| | | **Female** | 16 | 19.5 | 19.5 | 100.0 |
| **2** | **Age** | < 20 years | 7 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 8.5 |
| | | 21-30 years | 44 | 53.7 | 53.7 | 62.2 |
| | | 31-40 years | 31 | 37.8 | 37.8 | 100.0 |
| **3** | **Educational qualification** | Diploma | 12 | 14.6 | 14.6 | 14.6 |
| | | BA/BSc/BEd | 65 | 79.3 | 79.3 | 93.9 |
| | | MA/MSc | 5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 100.0 |
| **4** | **Field of specialization** | Educational planning and management | 8 | 9.8 | 9.8 | 9.8 |
| | | Natural science | 49 | 59.8 | 59.8 | 69.5 |
| | | Social science | 25 | 30.5 | 30.5 | 100.0 |

The data in the above table shows that most of the participants in thee study were males indicating that most of the leaders and teachers in the schools were males, and most of them were young (below 30 years). There were only few holding a masters degree which indicates that their qualification is below the expected level (MoE, 2007). Besides, the area of specialization tells us that most of them were not trained in educational planning and management which has serious implications for the implementation of instructional leadership(McEwen, E.K, 2003: 57).

**School principals performing the dimensions of instructional leadership**

The basic research question was concerned with performance of principals in relation to the different dimensions of instructional leadership. To answer this question data was obtained in relation to availability of instructional resources, role diversity of instructional leaders, professional norms, communicating goals, managing curriculum and instruction, and monitoring students' progress.

**Availability of instructional resources**

Resource availability is one of the key dimensions of instructional leadership. It is the responsibility of instructional leaders particularly school principals to work on conditions to make resources available in their schools. The data obtained in relation to availability of instruction resources is analyzed in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Availability Of Instructional Resources

| No | Items | Scales | Values | F | % | Mean | Standard deviation | t-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Availability of qualified teachers | 1 | Almost none | 4 | 4.9 | 3.8415 | 1.09397 | 31.384 |
| | | 2 | Very deficient | 8 | 9.8 | | | |
| | | 3 | Undecided | 8 | 9.8 | | | |
| | | 4 | Adequate | 39 | 47.6 | | | |
| | | 5 | More than adequate | 23 | 28 | | | |
| 2 | Availability of text books | 1 | Almost none | 7 | 8.5 | 3.4634 | 4.5493 | 6.794 |
| | | 2 | Very deficient | 23 | 28 | | | |
| | | 3 | Undecided | 20 | 24.4 | | | |
| | | 4 | Adequate | 27 | 32.9 | | | |
| | | 5 | More than adequate | 4 | 4.9 | | | |
| 3 | Availability of teacher guide books | 1 | almost none | 1 | 1.2 | 2.4634 | 1.02071 | 21.411 |
| | | 2 | very deficient | 47 | 57.3 | | | |
| | | 3 | Undecided | 19 | 23.2 | | | |
| | | 4 | Adequate | 13 | 15.9 | | | |
| | | 5 | more than adequate | 2 | 2.4 | | | |
| 4 | Availability of reference books | 1 | almost none | 8 | 9.8 | 2.7683 | 1.02197 | 24.086 |
| | | 2 | very deficient | 25 | 30.5 | | | |
| | | 3 | Undecided | 32 | 39 | | | |
| | | 4 | Adequate | 12 | 14.6 | | | |
| | | 5 | more than adequate | 5 | 6.1 | | | |
| 5 | Availability of stationery | 1 | almost none | 1 | 1.2 | 4.1585 | 0.96186 | 38.68 |
| | | 2 | very deficient | 3 | 3.7 | | | |
| | | 3 | Undecided | 17 | 20.7 | | | |
| | | 4 | Adequate | 22 | 26.8 | | | |
| | | 5 | more than adequate | 39 | 47.6 | | | |
| 6 | Allocation of financial | 1 | almost none | 6 | 7.3 | 2.9268 | 0.97854 | 26.622 |
| | | 2 | very deficient | 22 | 26.8 | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | resources | 3 | Undecided | 28 | 34.1 | | | |
| | | 4 | Adequate | 24 | 29.3 | | | |
| | | 5 | more than adequate | 2 | 2.4 | | | |

In the above table, the calculated t-value (31.384) of item 1 is greater than t-critical (3.416), and shows that there is statistically significant difference between the responses of respondents. From the frequency and percentage (39 and 49.6), it can be noted that availability of qualified teachers in adequate number is recognizable. On availability of textbooks, the t-calculated (6.764) and the t-critical (3.416) show that the difference in the responses of respondents is significant, and observation of 32.9% reveals that there were sufficient textbooks. The availability of qualified teachers, stationery and textbooks might facilitate implementation of instructional leadership though the deficiency in the availability of teachers guides (57.3%), reference materials (30.5%), and scarcity of financial resources (34.1%) were likely to affect it negatively (Leskiw & Parbudyal, 2007).

**Role diversity**

Principals as instructional leaders are expected to play major pedagogical leadership in their schools. They must lead instruction by giving attention to it more than any other activity so as to maximize the achievement of the students and performance of their schools. The data in the table below analyzes the role diversity of principals.

**Table 3:** Role Diversity

| No | Items | Scale | Values | F | % | Mean | Stdv | t-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Instructional activities are given much time by the principal | 1 | Strongly disagree | - | - | 3.9756 | 0.80086 | 44.387 |
| | | 2 | Disagree | 6 | 7.3 | | | |
| | | 3 | Undecided | 9 | 11 | | | |
| | | 4 | Agree | 48 | 58.5 | | | |
| | | 5 | Strongly agree | 19 | 23.2 | | | |
| 2 | Administrative matters are given much time my the principal | 1 | Strongly disagree | - | - | 4.0976 | 0.7952 | 46.092 |
| | | 2 | Disagree | 3 | 3.7 | | | |
| | | 3 | Undecided | 13 | 15.9 | | | |
| | | 4 | Agree | 39 | 47.6 | | | |
| | | 5 | Strongly agree | 27 | 32.9 | | | |
| 3 | Too many responsibilities of principals are affecting instructional leadership. | 1 | Strongly disagree | 1 | 1.2 | 3.5122 | 0.89227 | 35.137 |
| | | 2 | Disagree | 10 | 12.2 | | | |
| | | 3 | Undecided | 26 | 31.7 | | | |
| | | 4 | Agree | 36 | 43.9 | | | |
| | | 5 | Strongly agree | 9 | 11 | | | |
| 4 | Teachers get appropriate support through classroom supervision by principals | 1 | Strongly disagree | | | 3.6829 | 0.94121 | 34.952 |
| | | 2 | Disagree | 8 | 9.8 | | | |
| | | 3 | Undecided | 29 | 35.4 | | | |
| | | 4 | Agree | 26 | 31.7 | | | |
| | | 5 | Strongly agree | 19 | 23.2 | | | |
| | | 2 | Disagree | 8 | 9.8 | | | |
| | | 3 | Undecided | 22 | 26.8 | | | |
| | | 4 | Agree | 43 | 52.4 | | | |
| | | 5 | Strongly agree | 8 | 9.8 | | | |
| 5 | The principal uses delegation as a means to promote instruction | 1 | Strongly disagree | 5 | 6.1 | 3.7927 | 1.0392 | 32.613 |
| | | 2 | Disagree | 3 | 3.7 | | | |
| | | 3 | Undecided | 15 | 18.3 | | | |
| | | 4 | Agree | 40 | 48.8 | | | |
| | | 5 | Strongly agree | 19 | 23.2 | | | |

Table 3 shows that 58.5% of the respondents agreed that the school principals spend much of their time on academic activities in the study area though the t-value indicates that there are differences among the respondents. However, what was reflected as a response to item 2 indicates that principals spend much of their time on administrative matters (47.6%) which was contradictory to the response to item 1. Thus it was not yet clear whether principals were giving much time to instructional or administrative activities. On item 2 the t-value 35.137 is greater than t-critical (3.416)indicating that there is statistically significant difference between the responses of each respondent. However, 43.9% of the responses reveal that too many responsibilities of principals were likely to affect their instructional leadership role. Responses on support provided to teachers through supervision indicate that the respondents were unable to decide. However, the data indicated that there is delegation of responsibilities to teachers. Yet, it has to be claimed that the delegation needs to be meaningful (Bleak & Fulmer, 2009).

**Professional Norms**

Effectiveness of a principal is determined by the professional norms he/she plays by having a clear vision regarding how to improve instruction and serve the students in the school. He/she is expected to provide the school with professional leadership by engaging others in the school. His/her proven engagement of others in important school activities is critical for the success of the school (Putman, 2012). The data in the table exhibits the professional norms inculcated in the schools.

**Table 4 professional norms**

| **No** | **Items** | **Scale** | | **F** | **%** | **Mean** | **Standard deviation** | **t-value** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Values | | | | | |
| **1** | Encouraging teachers to take decisions on instructional matters | 1 | not at all | 1 | 1.2 | 3.7561 | 1.06064 | 31.641 |
| | | 2 | Minimal | 14 | 17.1 | | | |
| | | 3 | not so much | 10 | 12.2 | | | |
| | | 4 | Much | 36 | 43.9 | | | |
| | | 5 | very much | 21 | 25.6 | | | |
| **2** | Involvement of the Principal in instructional decisions | 1 | not at all | | | 4.2073 | 0.73262 | 51.385 |
| | | 2 | Minimal | 1 | 1.2 | | | |
| | | 3 | not so much | 12 | 14.6 | | | |
| | | 4 | Much | 38 | 46.3 | | | |
| | | 5 | very much | 31 | 37.8 | | | |
| **3** | classroom visit practice by principal | 1 | not at all | 4 | 4.9 | 3.7561 | 1.01301 | 33.129 |
| | | 2 | Minimal | 2 | 2.4 | | | |
| | | 3 | not so much | 24 | 29.3 | | | |
| | | 4 | Much | 32 | 39 | | | |
| | | 5 | very much | 20 | 24.4 | | | |
| **4** | Principal's experience of solving problems facing teaching learning | 1 | not at all | 4 | 4.9 | 3.7927 | 1.0392 | 32.613 |
| | | 2 | Minimal | 4 | 4.9 | | | |
| | | 3 | not so much | 18 | 22 | | | |
| | | 4 | Much | 35 | 42.7 | | | |
| | | 5 | very much | 21 | 25.6 | | | |
| **5** | Principals invite teachers to implement CPD | 1 | not at all | 5 | 6.1 | 4.0122 | 1.11659 | 32.133 |
| | | 2 | Minimal | 1 | 1.2 | | | |
| | | 3 | not so much | 17 | 20.7 | | | |
| | | 4 | Much | 24 | 29.3 | | | |
| | | 5 | very much | 35 | 42.7 | | | |
| **6** | Principal encourages the use of continuous assessment | 1 | not at all | | | 4.1951 | 0.90866 | 41.309 |
| | | 2 | Minimal | 5 | 6.1 | | | |
| | | 3 | not so much | 12 | 14.6 | | | |
| | | 4 | Much | 27 | 32.9 | | | |
| | | 5 | very much | 38 | 46.3 | | | |
| **7** | Principal request the community to participate in solving school problems | 1 | not at all | 9 | 11 | 3.5732 | 1.23759 | 25.779 |
| | | 2 | Minimally | 3 | 3.7 | | | |
| | | 3 | not so much | 24 | 29.3 | | | |
| | | 4 | Much | 24 | 29.3 | | | |
| | | 5 | very much | 22 | 26.8 | | | |
| **8** | There is clearly | 1 | not at all | 1 | 1.2 | 4.0488 | 0.94153 | 38.459 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | communicated goal and vision in the school | 2 | Minimal | 4 | 4.9 | | | |
| | | 3 | not so much | 16 | 19.5 | | | |
| | | 4 | Much | 30 | 36.6 | | | |
| | | 5 | very much | 31 | 37.8 | | | |

The data in the above table shows that there is participation of teachers in decision-making (43.9%), and principals are also involving in instructional decisions as more than two-third of the respondents reflected this. Establishing the norm of engaging teachers in decision making and the principals involvement in instructional decisions are likely to promote instructional leadership in the schools (Ho, 2010). The same is true with other items as participants have responded that there is a trend of visiting classrooms, encouraging teachers to implement active learning and solving problems affecting teaching-learning in the schools. However, the minimal participation of the community in school affairs is likely to affect instructional leadership negatively (Hofman & Hofman, 2011) and the performance of the schools.

**Communicating Goals**

In schools, it is the responsibility of principals to develop goals and communicate those goals with the school community. Unless clear goals are developed and communicated, it will be difficult for schools to achieve their improvement targets. Data has been collected regarding whether principals are properly developing annual goals and properly communicating them to the school community.

**Table 5 Communicating Goals**

| No | Items | Scale | Values | F | % | Mean | Stdv | t-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Goals focusing on student learning are developed and communicated | 1 | Strongly disagree | 1 | 1.2 | 4.0488 | 0.9674 | 37.431 |
| | | 2 | Disagree | 5 | 6.1 | | | |
| | | 3 | Undecided | 15 | 18.3 | | | |
| | | 4 | Agree | 29 | 35.4 | | | |
| | | 5 | Strongly agree | 32 | 39 | | | |
| 2 | Students' academic performance data is used to develop goals | 1 | Strongly disagree | 6 | 7.3 | 3.9268 | 0.93993 | 37.35 |
| | | 2 | Disagree | 21 | 25.6 | | | |
| | | 3 | Undecided | 28 | 34.1 | | | |
| | | 4 | Agree | 27 | 32.9 | | | |
| | | 5 | Strongly agree | 5 | 6.1 | | | |
| 3 | Goals developed are properly communicated to the staff. | 1 | Strongly disagree | 5 | 6.1 | 3.6585 | 1.16767 | 27.985 |
| | | 2 | Disagree | 9 | 11 | | | |
| | | 3 | Undecided | 17 | 20.7 | | | |
| | | 4 | Agree | 29 | 35.4 | | | |
| | | 5 | Strongly agree | 22 | 26.8 | | | |
| 4 | Goals are properly communicated to students | 1 | Strongly disagree | 8 | 9.8 | 3.5244 | 1.24945 | 25.181 |
| | | 2 | Disagree | 9 | 11 | | | |
| | | 3 | Undecided | 17 | 20.7 | | | |
| | | 4 | Agree | 28 | 34.1 | | | |
| | | 5 | Strongly agree | 20 | 24.4 | | | |
| 5 | Goals are properly communicated to parents | 1 | Strongly disagree | 6 | 7.3 | 3.5122 | 1.10268 | 28.432 |
| | | 2 | Disagree | 7 | 8.5 | | | |
| | | 3 | Undecided | 22 | 26.8 | | | |
| | | 4 | Agree | 33 | 40.2 | | | |
| | | 5 | Strongly agree | 14 | 17.1 | | | |

As illustrated in Table 5 above, the data unambiguously communicates that principals are developing school goals. The responses strongly agree (39%),and agree (35.4%) shows that the majority of respondents responded the principals develop goals focused on students learning and this might positively influence the performance of school leaders, and the schools. However, the agreement of less than half of the respondents(39% both agree and strongly agree) to development of goals based on student performance data shows that goals developed may not be on the basis of evidences generated from students' performance. This is likely to influence the performance of the principals negatively(Raynor, 2004).From the above data it can be easily recognized that principals were communicating the goals to the staff in most cases as the majority agreed (35.4%) and strongly agreed(26.8%) to the item. Yet, significant number of respondents (20.7%) could not decide on the item, and the rest (17.1%) showed disagreement to the item. In a similar fashion, the data shows that goals are communicated to students and their parents. The ability of the school principals to communicate the goals to the staff, students and parents is likely to positively influence their performance during goal accomplishment (Hofman & Hofman, 2011).

**Managing curriculum and instruction**

Schools have sole responsibility of managing the curriculum they teach to students and the instructional process. It is not only the responsibility of the principals, but all who are in the school are expected to play their part. However, the principal has play a leading role.

**Table 6 Managing Curriculum and Instruction**

| No | Items | Scale | Values | F | % | Mean | Stdv | t-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Classroom instruction is properly monitored by principals | 1 | Strongly disagree | 4 | 4.9 | 3.5488 | 1.10165 | 28.759 |
| | | 2 | Disagree | 10 | 12.2 | | | |
| | | 3 | Undecided | 22 | 26.8 | | | |
| | | 4 | Agree | 29 | 35.4 | | | |
| | | 5 | Strongly agree | 17 | 20.7 | | | |
| 2 | Principals assist and encourage teachers to evaluate the curriculum | 1 | Strongly disagree | 3 | 3.7 | 3.6463 | 1.12625 | 28.916 |
| | | 2 | Disagree | 12 | 14.6 | | | |
| | | 3 | Undecided | 17 | 20.7 | | | |
| | | 4 | Agree | 29 | 35.4 | | | |
| | | 5 | Strongly agree | 21 | 25.6 | | | |
| 3 | The principals encourages teachers to develop instructional materials | 1 | Strongly disagree | 4 | 4.9 | 3.4878 | 1.14659 | 27.151 |
| | | 2 | Disagree | 13 | 15.9 | | | |
| | | 3 | Undecided | 22 | 26.8 | | | |
| | | 4 | Agree | 25 | 30.5 | | | |
| | | 5 | Strongly agree | 18 | 22.0 | | | |
| 4 | Teachers are assisted by principals on matters related to laboratory | 1 | Strongly disagree | 14 | 17.1 | 2.9512 | 1.29484 | 20.290 |
| | | 2 | Disagree | 16 | 19.5 | | | |
| | | 3 | Undecided | 24 | 29.3 | | | |
| | | 4 | Agree | 16 | 19.5 | | | |
| | | 5 | Strongly agree | 12 | 14.6 | | | |

The way the respondents(56.1%) rated showing agreement that monitoring of classroom instruction has been carried out by principals. Though small number of respondents (17.1%) were in disagreement, the position of 26.8% of respondents was not clear regarding whether the principals were monitoring classroom instruction or not. The data also shows that the majority of respondents agreed(60% agree and strongly agree together) that the school principals' were helping teachers to evaluate curriculum and the school principals were encouraging teachers to evaluate curriculum. On item 3 of the above Table, the data shows that the majority of respondents confirmed that principals were assisting and encouraging teachers in developing instructional

materials. This will have a positive impact on the improvement of instruction in the schools (Raynor, 2004; Sandra, 2007). But the responses indicate that the principals were not providing meaningful support to teachers in matters related to laboratories in the schools. This might affect the success of students in those subjects which require intensive laboratory work (Harrison, 2010, Marsh, 2015).

**Monitoring Students' Progress**

Schools as institutions are expected to work for improvement of students' achievement. This requires establishing monitoring strategies of students' progress regularly through discussion with teachers as well as their parents. Unless progress is properly monitored, performance level of schools cannot be easily determined. Considering the importance of monitoring as important dimension of instructional leadership the following data has been generated.

**Table 7** Monitoring Students Progress

| No | Items | Scale | Values | F | % | Mean | Stdv | t-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Principals discuss the academic progress of students with teachers | 1 | Strongly disagree | 10 | 12.2 | 3.7073 | 1.27161 | 26.045 |
| | | 2 | Disagree | 4 | 4.9 | | | |
| | | 3 | Undecided | 9 | 11.0 | | | |
| | | 4 | Agree | 36 | **43.9** | | | |
| | | 5 | Strongly agree | 23 | 28.0 | | | |
| 2 | Examination results of students are monitored and used to evaluate school goals | 1 | Strongly disagree | 3 | 3.7 | 3.8415 | 1.01190 | 33.929 |
| | | 2 | Disagree | 4 | 4.9 | | | |
| | | 3 | Undecided | 19 | 23.2 | | | |
| | | 4 | Agree | 33 | **40.2** | | | |
| | | 5 | Strongly agree | 23 | 28.0 | | | |
| 3 | Principals inform the school performance results in relation to students' achievement to teachers and parents in a report form | 1 | Strongly disagree | 7 | 8.5 | 4.0366 | .92222 | 39.145 |
| | | 2 | Disagree | 12 | 14.6 | | | |
| | | 3 | Undecided | 34 | 41.5 | | | |
| | | 4 | Agree | 29 | 35.4 | | | |
| | | 5 | Strongly agree | | | | | |

As illustrated in the above Table, the data on item 1 shows that principals discuss the academic progress of students with teachers as most of the respondents(71.9% both agree and strongly agree) showed agreement to the idea. This significant number shows that the there is discussion among principals and teachers regarding the progress of their students. From the reflection of respondents on item 2, it could be understood that test results were used by principals to assess the progress of their respective school towards goal achievement. This is in line with requirements of the Ministry of Education (MoE, 2011; MoE, 2008). The data on item 3 regarding informing the school's performance results to teachers and parents by linking to students' progress, 41.5% of respondents were unable to decide on the issue while 23.1% showed disagreement to the idea.

## IV. DISCUSSION (CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS)

In the preceding sections an attempt has been made to show the status principals' performance regarding instructional leadership in the selected schools. This was done by focusing on the different dimensions of instructional leadership. It was found that most principals have given good attention to the instructional leadership role they are expected to play. The results also indicate instructional leadership is not properly implemented by some of the principals as they could not effectively perform in each instructional leadership dimension. This was probably because they were assigned to the post without having educational planning and management skills. This requires the education department of the city administration and the regional education bureau to give attention to area of specialization while appointing school principals. In addition,

principals who are on duty at present should be given adequate training on instructional leadership dimensions that are affecting performance of the schools in the city administration. Besides, the findings indicated that scarcity of reference materials, shortage of financial resources and shortage of teacher guides are negatively affecting the instruction leadership practices in the schools. If schools are facing critical shortage of reference materials for their students and teachers, if they financial resources are short off, and if teachers do not have books that can guide them, instruction may not become successful, and instructional leaders will continue to face challenges while playing the leadership role. Therefore, it is suggested that respective schools facing those challenges should work with the broader community to help schools secure necessary resources (both material and financial) so that they can minimize the challenges indicated above. Finally, similar study needs to be conducted on a larger scale by taking a large sample size, and focusing on instructional leadership dimensions which are not included in this research.

## REFERENCES


[1]. Bleak J. L. & Fulmer R.M. (2009).Strategically Developing Strategic Leaders Excerpted from Linkage Inc's, Best Practices in Leadership Development Handbook. 2nd Edition, San Francisco, Pfeiffer.
[2]. Boatman, L. & Richard, B. (2011). Time for a Leadership Revolution. Global Leadership Forecast.Washington. DDI's Inc.
[3]. Chima G.U.K. (2007). Organizational Leadership Strategies in Indigenous Companies in a Developing Economy. Adele Road, Apapa – Lagos, Nigeria. St. Clements University
[4]. Drengler, K.A (2001). The design and implementation of a leadership development program for greenshank fan corporation. (MAThesis). Retrieved from Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 1395513).
[5]. George, R. and Georgia, J. (2004). Encyclopedia of Leadership: Volume 1. Sage Publications
[6]. Harrison, L. (2010). Leaders Developing Leaders: Capitalizing on the Demographic Gift to Revive Your Leadership Development Program. Washington, D.C.HCI.
[7]. Hesselbein, F., Goldsmith, M., & Beckhard, R. (1996). The leader of the future. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
[8]. Ho, CWD. (2010). Teacher participation in curriculum and pedagogical decisions: Insights into curriculum leadership. Educational management administration & leadership, 38 (5): 613-624.
[9]. Hofman, WHA & Hofman, RH. (2011). Smart management in effective schools: Effective management
[10]. configurations in general and vocational education in Netherlands. Educational Administration Quarterly,
[11]. 47(4): 620-645.
[12]. Hopkins, D. (2005). Instructional Leadership and School Improvement. London: Routledge Flamer.
[13]. Leskiw, S. & Parbudyal, S. (2007). "Leadership development: learning from best practices", Leadership &
[14]. Organization Development Journal, Vol. 28, 2007 Marsh, S. (2015). A model for leadership that improves learning: New insights for schools and scholars. Leadership and Policy in Schools, 14(1):67-103.
[15]. Mehrabani S. & Mohamad N. (2011). Leadership Development Characteristics in Iran's Oil Industry. Singapore. IPEDR vol.7 (2011). Press.
[16]. Ministry of Education, Ethiopia (MoE). (2011). Governing guideline for the implementation of the school
[17]. improvement program (revised). Addis Ababa: MoE.
[18]. MoE. (2013). National Professional Standard for School Principals. Addis Ababa: Subi printing press.
[19]. MoE. (2008). General education quality improvement package (GEQIP). Addis Ababa: MoE.
[20]. MoE. (2007). General education quality improvement program (GEQIP), 2008/09-20012/13 program
[21]. document. Addis Ababa: MoE.
[22]. MoE. (1994).The education and training policy of Ethiopia. Addis Ababa: St. George printing press.
[23]. Putman, LA. (2012). Using shared leadership to achieve school improvement goals: one school's journey. Liberty
[24]. University, Virginia: Doctoral thesis.
[25]. Raynor, A. (2004). Individual schools, unique solutions: Tailoring approaches to school leadership. New York:
[26]. Routledge Falmer.
[27]. Robert, K.A. (2003). What We Know About Successful School Leadership. Toronto, USA: National College for School Leadership.
[28]. Rogers, G. (2006). Theory and Practice of leadership. Northouse Paperback. Sage Publications Ltd
[29]. Sandra, M. (2007). A leadership development strategy implemented by manufacturing organization in South Africa. University of South Africa. Unpublished MA Thesis.

[30]. Seyoum A.K. (2014). Leadership Effectiveness of School Leaders in Implementing School Improvement Program in Illubabore zone Government Secondary Schools. Jimma University.
[31]. Weiss D. & Molinaro V. (2006). Integrated leadership development. Industrial and commercial trading. Emerial Pub. Ltd,Vol.38 No.1 2006.
[32]. William, P. (2009). Developing a Leadership Strategy**.** Critical Ingredient for Organizational Success. (Available from http://www.ccl.org.html).
[33]. Yukl, G. (2002). Leadership in organizations (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Dawit Legesse ,"Principals' Instructional Leadership Performance In Hawassa City Administration Secondary Schools, Ethiopia." IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS). vol. 23 no. 1, 2018, pp. 13-22.