IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)
Volume 24, Issue 12, Series. 1 (December. 2019) 51-61
e-ISSN: 2279-0837, p-ISSN: 2279-0845.
www.iosrjournals.org

Challenges towards Effectiveness of Instructional Leadership in Secondary Schools of South West Shoa Zone, Oromia, Ethiopia

Anteneh Wasyhun (PhD)[1] and ZerihunTeshome (MA)[2]
[1] *College of Education, Hawassa University, Ethiopia*
[2]*South West ShoaZone Education Office*

Abstract: The main purpose of this study was to examine the challenges towards effectiveness of instructional leadership practice in secondary schools of South West Shoa Zone,Oromia Region. To this end, the study employed descriptive survey design whereby both qualitative and quantitative research methods were used in the study. The study involved 212 teachers and 30 principals (both main and vice principals), 7 secondary school supervisors and 7 Woreda/district education office heads as the subjects of the study using simple random sampling and availability sampling respectively. The data were collected through questionnaire, semi-structured interviews, and document analysis. The data obtained through closed ended questionnaires were analyzed through frequencies, percentages, mean and t-test, whereas those collected through open- ended questionnaires, interviews, and document analysis were analyzed thematically. It was also found that lack of knowledge and skills on the area, administrative work over load, lack of relevant timely and sufficient professional trainings, and shortage of necessary resources were the major challenges that negatively affected the effectiveness of instructional leaders in the study area. Based on the findings, it is recommended that MoE, Oromia Regional Education Bureau, West Shoa Zone Education Department and the respective Woredas/districts Education officials and cluster supervisors are advised to give due attention in monitoring and supporting school leaders regularly, creating experience sharing program on good practices, and providing relevant trainings continuously on the core dimensions of instructional leadership in collaboration with nearby colleges, and universities.

Key Terms: Instructional Leadership, Effectiveness, Challenge, Secondary School

---

Date of Submission: 22-11-2019 Date of Acceptance: 06-12-2019

I. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Now a day educational leadership is more important than ever. The ongoing dramatic changes and the ever mounting demands and the over increasing interests of the society from the educational institution put educational leadership at the forefront. Hence, currently states recognize that educational institutions particularly schools cannot meet the demanding requirements for improving their achievements without effective educational leadership (Wallace Foundation, 2013).

To this end, it is clear that schools are the only formal educational institution where youngsters and citizens are well prepared in all aspects so as to play their roles in bringing about the required rapid economic, political, cultural and social development in their countries. In relation to this, schools are expected to prepare students academically so that they can compete on a global level and held accountable. Schools can only achieve this mission if they are led by effective educational leadership (UNESCO, 2003).

Educational leadership is abroad term which involves working with teachers and other educational professionals on systematic plans to improve educational programming and outcomes by implementing responsibilities such as analyzing student data and observe classes to pin point potential problems and areas for improvement; build teams and committees; change organizational structure; create and update budgets; hire, evaluate and manage teachers; set curriculum and standards (Kort, 2008).

However, the major emphasis in educational arena of 21st century has been the continuing demand for greater accountability to increase student performance. National and state expectations require schools to ensure that all students achieve mastery of curriculum objectives, and schools focus on implementing those requirements to the best of their ability. As a result school leaders are expected to be instructional leaders in order to make instructional functions their primary role in the schools. School principals can no longer function simply as building managers, tasked with adhering to district rules, carrying out regulations and avoiding mistakes. Principals today must be instructional leaders capable of developing a team of teachers who deliver effective instruction to every student (Wallace Foundation, 2013).

In educational leading system, instructional leadership (IL) is the most important model of leadership to achieve schools' goals. Although instructional leadership has no uniform definition that satisfies every one (Kruger, 2002), different scholars define instructional leadership in different manner. For instance, Harris and Daniel(2005) defines instructional leadership as a model of leadership which focuses on student learning and achievement through development of others, and also invests in capacity building by developing social and academic capacity for students and all intellectual, professional capacity for teachers. It is also a leadership that directly related to the process of instruction; teachers, learners, and the curriculum (McEwan, 2003).

According to King, (2002) instructional leadership (IL) is actions that leaders take to improve teaching and learning. It is a construct comprised of the principal's explanation of the school mission and goals with the emphasis on community and trust, focusing on instruction. He conceptualized principals' instructional role in terms of three distinct but overlapping areas as follow: explaining and communicating the school's mission and goals, his/her primary focus on instruction and his/her responsibility to create an atmosphere of collegial trust in the school among the staff members.

LeithWood (2002), on the other hand, described instructional leadership as focusing on the behaviors of teachers as they engage in activities directly affecting the growth of students. In similar fashion, Flath (1989) understood instructional leadership as those actions that principal takes, or delegates to others, to promote growth in student learning. Conley(cited in Kruger,2002) define instructional leadership as specific part of educational managers' function that is carried out by the school leaders to help and provide service to teachers both as individuals and group to improve instruction and there by improve student learning.

It is globally agreed up on that instructional leadership is one of the most useful tools for creating an effective teaching and learning environment (Hallinger& Walker, 2014). It is an educational leadership that focuses on the core responsibility of a school, namely teaching and learning, by defining the school vision, mission, and goals, managing the instructional program and promoting the school climate (Hoy &Miskel 2008).

Instructional leadership is quite different from other aspects of educational leadership. As to McEwen (2003) instructional leadership is different from non-instructional leadership. Instructional leader demonstrate two qualities i.e. symbolize leadership quality directly related to instruction and curriculum, and possess the ability of inducing people towards shared educational goals. Educational administrators, unlike instructional leaders focus on administrative routine and instructional issues. Therefore, instructional leaders unlike administrators are servant leaders that minister the need of school community and their environment. By ministering as Sergiovanni (2001) says, instructional leaders share values and purpose to the school community; and encourage followers to because leaders that endeavor to achieve common educational goals.

In supporting the above fact, King (2002) asserted that the role of an instructional leader differ from that of a traditional school administrator in a number of meaningful ways: where as the conventional head of school spends majority of his/her time dealing strictly with administrative duties, the head of school who is an instructional leader is charged with redefining his/her role to become the primary learner in a community striving for excellence in education. As such, it becomes the head of school's responsibility to manage the instructional program.

A number of researches confirm that schools with strong instructional leadership has positive impact on students' academic achievement .Effective school principals are second only to teachers as the most influential school-level factor in student achievement(Louis; LeithWood, 2010).Moreover , Robinson (2011) also asserted that schools which have effective instructional leadership includes conducive learning environment, a system of clear teaching objectives and high teacher expectation area success full in achieving students' academic performance.

In the case of Educational system in Ethiopia efforts have been made to make the educational management system decentralized and professional so as to improve the quality of teaching and learning. Moreover ,improving the instructional methods including the use of ICT ,and the supervisory skills of school leaders and their management of resources at their disposal, and the quality of school environment in which staff lead and teach and in which students learn has become the major concern of ESDP V(MoE, 2015).

The literature reviewed indicated that IL is a significant factor in facilitating, improving and promoting teacher's class room instructional practices and the academic progress of students (Lewis, 2009; Zuberi, 2009).Worldwide empirical studies also confirmed that IL plays a central role in shifting the emphasis of school level activities more on to instructional improvements that lead to students learning better (Elmore, 2000).

According to MOE (1994) in Ethiopia, efforts have been done to make the educational management system decentralized and professional. This grants the schools with certain autonomy; however, autonomy alone does not guarantee improved instructional leadership, unless school leaders spend time on core activities which support curriculum and instruction so as to enhance students' learning. Hence a lot has to be done to shift the role of school principals from activities of management to activities of instructional leadership.

Therefore, in view of the facts stated above in relation to instructional leadership activities, the present study attempted to assess and investigate the extent to which school leaders were effective in their core

dimensions of instructional leadership and the major challenges of instructional leadership in the selected Secondary Schools of South West *Shoa* Zone of *Oromia* Region. The finding of this research might bring some light on secondary schools' leaders instructional leadership gaps, training, and challenges and inform educational leaders and policy makers to design the training system of school leaders in the Secondary schools of South west *Shoa* Zone educational system.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In today's schools, leadership effectiveness plays a significant role in bringing about the quality of education in general and student achievement in particular. Hence, it is widely agreed up on among the scholars that the role of school leadership is very essential and non-negotiable as it is one of the major factors that identify successful schools from unsuccessful schools. Schools success particularly students' academic achievement is critically linked with instructional leadership effectiveness. Among school related factors school leadership is second only to classroom instruction or teaching learning process in its potential influence on students' academic achievement.

A number of recent research studies have confirmed that school instructional leaders have an impact on student learning (Leith Wood &SeaShore-Louis, 2011; Robinson, 2011).This can only be achieved if school leaders give due attention towards instructional leadership activities and directly involve in teaching and learning process. They should be educational visionaries; instructional and curriculum leaders. Principals should require intervening to ensure that teachers focus on the central mission of the school (Murphy J.1988). Hence, Secondary school principals should be instructional leadership to ensure that every student receives the highest quality instruction each day and so as to improve teaching and learning in the schools.

Moreover, school leaders required to be not only managers of finance and property but also, and primarily, leaders of learning. They should spend much of their time on teaching and learning. Furthermore, they need to possess specific competencies to spearhead the management of the curriculum and to lead and manage instruction.

In supporting the above facts, Robinson (2011) states principals need to be the prime role models of learning. In addition, if principals are to take the role of instructional leader seriously, they have to free themselves from bureaucratic tasks and focus their efforts toward improving teaching and learning.

As also believed by Marzano et al. (2005), effective instructional principals support instructional activities and programs by modeling expected behaviors and consistently prioritizing instructional concerns day-to-day. They strive to become a learner among learners; involve in curriculum, instruction, and assessment which are crucial to the idea of instructional leadership. As a part of their ongoing instructional leadership responsibilities, effective school principals are also highly visible through contact and parents, thus promoting the concept of a learning community.

To realize the necessary progress leaders in school should be competent in setting and shaping school vision, mission and objective. Although they say it in different ways, researchers who have examined education leadership agree that effective instructional principals are responsible for establishing a school wide vision of commitment to high standards and the success of all students. They should also be effective in creating a climate hospitable to education that could facilitate the learning and improve high academic performance of students. School principals should have to have the ability to clearly define the goals and objectives of schools, cultivating leadership in others, managing people, and data to foster school improvement (Wallace Foundation, 2013).

Furthermore, effective school leaders know how to focus the work of the school on the essential. They have a clear mission or purpose for the school and identify goals that align with that mission. They communicate the purpose and goals in a meaningful way such that all stakeholders understand what they need to do (McIver, Kearns, Lyons, &Sussman, 2009).

According to MoE (1994) school principals as effective instructional leaders should focus on the core business of instructional leadership such as facilitating the setting of the schools' vision and mission, managing curriculum and instruction, maintaining academic standards, monitoring student progress, shaping school climate and enhancing parental involvement.

As it is also stated in the National Professional Standard for school principals in Ethiopian context, the most effective principals are expected to have a clear vision of how the school could serve its students; have aligned resources and priorities with the vision; and could engage other key players, within and outside the school, in achieving the goals embedded in the vision. Moreover, effective school principal should provide vision, leadership, and direction for the school and ensures that it is managed and organized to meet its aims and targets (MoE, 2012).

However, from the researcher own experience as teacher, main principal, vice principal and department head for the last sixteen years in different primary and secondary schools in South West *Shoa* Zone as well as observation made on the stated instructional leadership activities of secondary schools leaders of the research

area, instructional leaders seem to have less performance and under expectation in delivering their instructional leadership activities effectively, particularly in the areas of core instructional leadership dimensions such as setting direction(vision, mission ,and goals), managing curriculum and instruction, supervising and supporting instruction, monitoring and evaluating and in promoting a positive school learning climate.

According to Jita (2010), instructional leaders (IL) should go beyond the traditional role of school administrators and spend a lot of time focusing on developing knowledge and implementation of the curriculum, as well as instruction and assessment. However, it seems that secondary schools' instructional leaders in the South West *Shoa* Zone focused on handling routines like budgeting, scheduling, political affairs, teacher evaluation and management of school building and maintenance of facilities.

Despite the fact that IL is significant in promoting student learning, South West *Shoa* zone Secondary school principals were rarely engaging in implementing instructional leadership activities as expected in order to bring changes in the school system as possible. According to the report of Zonal Educational performance appraisal of 2016/2017 academic year, many secondary school principals in the zone, for instance, did not include their schools' vision, mission and goals' in the strategic planning. As a result school staff did not know and understand their school vision, mission and goals. Moreover, many schools were under performed in issues related to classroom supervision, curriculum evaluation and making learning environment conducive. As a result there was a bitter complain from educational officials at woreda and Zonal levels regarding the poor performance of school leaders(main and vice principals) in relation to their leadership functions and commitment to bring changes and improve students' academic achievement in the schools. However, to the best of my knowledge, no studies were conducted in the area that showed the degree of the problems and the challenges noticed in the secondary schools

Moreover, it is obvious that school leaders are constantly challenged with a seemingly endless list of mandates and challenges for implementing their instructional leadership activities effectively. The literature recommends that school leaders should focus on instruction, work cooperatively with teachers, and develop teachers' leaders. The principals as instructional leaders need the time as well as the capacity to contribute to practices that positively affect teaching and learning. They ought to have sufficient time to support teaching and learning in the school. In fact, effective principals strike a balance; they must pay very close attention to instructional practices but must also pay close attention to other issues that affect the welfare of their school (Datnow& Castellan, 2001; Leith Wood &Louis, 2012).

Based on the above facts, the researcher attempted to investigate the effectiveness and the actual practices of secondary schools' instructional leaders in accomplishing their leadership activities effectively and to assess the core challenges that they faced in accomplishing their instructional leadership roles effectively in the secondary schools of South West *Shoa* Zone of *Oromia* region. Thus, the study would attempt to obtain reliable response for the following basic questions.

1. What are the major challenges which hinder school leaders' instructional effectiveness in secondary schools of South West Shoa Zone?

III. RESEARCH METHODS AND MATERIALS

3.1 Research Design

The research design employed in this study was descriptive survey method. The main reason to select this designwas it is appropriate to determine challenges that hinder instructional leadership effectiveness of secondary School principals of South West Shoa Zone (Kothari. 2004, Creswell. 2009).

3.2 Research Method

Both quantitative and qualitative approaches were employed in this study. Quantitative approach was preferred because it uses the survey in collecting data from a wide area by selecting a representative sample size of a large population. In addition, qualitative approach was employed so as to obtain detailed information of the phenomenon such as people personal views and their experiences of instructional leadership effectiveness through interview (McLaughlin, 2007).

3.3 Sources of Data

Both primary sources of data and secondary sources of data were employed for this study. The primary data was collected from educational leaders at different levels,namely; secondary school principals and vice principals, secondary school supervisors, *woreda* Education office heads, and Teachers. Ssecondary data was collected by reviewing relevant literature and pertinent documents which were related to secondary school instructional leaders' effectiveness.

3.4 Population, Sample and Sampling Techniques

There are 27 secondary schools in South West Shoa Zone. Of these much, ten (10) sample secondary schools (37%) were selected using simple random sampling. Regarding the respondents, all Principals (main and vice principals), supervisors and *Woreda* Education Heads from the ten sampled secondary schools were taken based

on availability sampling technique because their number was limited and manageable. To this end, 30 principals (all main and vice principals), 7 supervisors and 7 *woreda* Education Heads were selected.
On the other hand, in the selected ten (10) secondary schools, the total numbers of teachers were 424. Hence, from this total number of teachers, 212 (50%) of them were selected for this study using simple random sampling method. The main reason to select (50%) of teacher informants for the study was the expectation of the researcher to get the reliable data with the help of the standard size of samples and simple random sampling method was preferred to give equal chance and this technique allowed to select better representative respondents from a large number of population. Therefore, 212 teachers, 30 principals (both main and vice principals), 7 secondary school supervisors and 7 *Woreda* Education Office heads were included as the subjects of the study.

3.5 Instruments of Data Collection

The researcher had employed three types of data collecting instruments. The data for this study was collected through Questionnaire, interview and document analysis.

3.5.1 Questionnaire

The researcher used questionnaire, because it is suitable for collecting factual information, opinion and attitude from large population and it can be easily and quickly analyzed .Hence it was utilized as the chief instrument to collect the data. It was made of both close and open ended items.

The questionnaires with similar contents were prepared for both Principals' (main principals and vice principals), and teachers' respondents. The items of questionnaires were prepared in English Language, because the expected qualification for secondary school teachers, and principals was first degree and above. The contents of the questionnaire were mainly focused challenges or barriers affected the effectiveness of secondary school leaders' instructional leadership.

3.5.2 Interview

Interview was used to collect the primary data about the instructional leaders' effectiveness of secondary schools that would help to extract further deep information. To this end, semi-structured interview which involved similar ideas with questionnaire was used. For this purpose, similar interview guidelines were prepared for seven secondary schools' supervisors and seven *Woreda* education office heads. To this end questions for interviews were prepared in English language since the officials were qualified and BA Degree holders and above.

3.6 Procedures of Data Collection

Before the actual data collecting activities were done, the questionnaires were pilot tested in Dilella secondary school which was not included in the sample study so as to make the reliability of the instruments. It enabled enable the researcher to make sure that the respondents understand what the questionnaires want to address and was accomplished with the aim of checking whether or not the items contained in the instruments can enable the researcher to collect relevant information, to identify and eliminate problems in collecting data from the target population. Hence, the draft questionnaires were distributed to 3 school principals, and 18 teachers of the selected secondary school. Moreover, the researcher checked the willingness of respondents through self introduction and letter of cooperation .The respondents were also informed the aim the questionnaires so as to avoid confusion. Furthermore, the researcher selected facilitators from each school and gave adequate awareness on the contents of the items. Appropriate time was also arranged with respondents before distributing the questionnaires. An interview and document analysis were also done in the same procedure

3.7 Tools of Data Analysis

In this study, relevant statistical techniques which included tables and descriptive techniques were used to present data. Data collected through questionnaires from the principals (main principals and vice principals), and teachers were checked, scored, tabulated, coded and analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS version 20). Then the statistical descriptions like frequency and percentage were calculated to analyze the general characteristics of respondents. On the other hand statistics such as mean, and t-test were calculated for organizing, analyzing and summarizing sets of numerical data collected through five-point scale in the close ended questionnaires using on the basis of the basic questions. Whereas data obtained from secondary school supervisors and *woreda*education office heads through interview and data obtained from document reviews had been analyzed, interpreted and reported qualitatively through narrative description to complement the quantitative data.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULT

4.1 Characteristics of Respondents

The following table shows the characteristics of respondents involved in the study.

Table 1. Characteristics of Respondents

No	Item	Category	Respondents						Total	
			Teachers		Principals		Supervisors and WEH			
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Sex	Male	135	68.18	30	100	14	100	179	74
		Female	63	31.81	-	-	-	-	63	26
		Total	198	100	30	100	14	100	242	30
2	Age in years	25&below	24	12.12	-	-	-	-	24	9.9
		26-35	98	49.5	16	53.3	5	35.7	119	49.1
		36-45	38	19.24	12	40	7	50	57	23.6
		46-55	29	14.6	2	6.7	2	14.28	33	13.63
		56&above	9	4.54	-	-	-	-	9	3.71
		Total	198	100	30	100	14	100	242	100
3	Level of education	Diploma	5	2.52	-	-	-	-	5	2.06
		BA/BSC/BED	179	90.40	25	83.3	10	71.4	214	88.42
		MA/MSC/MED	14	7.07	5	16.7	4	28.6	23	9.50
		Total	198	100	30	100	14	100	242	100
4	Work Experience	5years & below	24	12.12	-	-	-	-	24	9.91
		6-10 years	80	40.40	7	23.3	1	7.14	88	36.36
		11-15 years	45	22.72	15	50	8	57.14	68	28.09
		16-20 years	35	17.7	5	16.7	4	28.6	44	18.18
		21 & above	14	7.07	3	10	1	7.14	18	7.4
		Total	198	100	30	100	14	100	242	100
5	Field of study	Subject matter	191	96.5	22	73.3	10	71.4	223	92.1
		EdpM	7	3.5	8	26.7	4	28.6	19	7.9
		Total	198	100	30	100	14	100	242	100
6	Service in current position	5 years & below	24	12.12	12	40	9	64.2	45	18.6
		6-10 years	80	40.40	14	46.7	4	28.6	98	40.5
		11-15 years	45	22.72	4	13.3	1	7.14	50	20.7
		16-20 years	35	17.7	-	-	-	-	35	14.5
		21 & above	14	7.07	-	-	-	-	14	5.8
		Total	198	100	30	100	14	100	242	100

As shown in item 1 of the above table, while the male teachers constituted 135(68.18%), the female teachers' respondents hold up 63(31.81). whereas in relation to principals, supervisors and woreda Education Heads all respondents are males i.e. 30(100%) and 14(100%) respectively. This implies that much of the necessary data was mainly obtained from male respondents. From this one can easily understand that the participation of females in teaching profession particularly in leadership and management is null compared to males in secondary schools of Southwest Shoa Zone of Oromia Region. Therefore, from the data it can be concluded that, the leadership position of secondary schools was dominated by males. This creates management gaps in empowering females

Regarding the age distribution of the respondents indicated under item 2 of table 2, 24(12.12%) of the teachers were categorized below the age of 25, and 98(49.5%) of the teacher respondents were categorized under the age ranges of and 26 to 35. The rest 76(38.38%) were above 35 years old. Hence, it could be possible to conclude that majority of the teachers were in their productive age.

With regard to principals respondents, the majority of them, 16(53.3%) and 12(40%) were lied in the age ranges of 26 to 35 and 36 to 45 years old, Whereas only 2(6.7%) principal respondents were ranked under the age of 46 to 55 years old. On the other hand, while a large number of supervisors and Woreda Education Heads, 5(35.7%) and 7(50%) lies between the age ranges of 26 to 35 and 36 to 45 respectively, only a few 2(14.28%) of them are under the age ranges of 46 to 55 years old. Hence, from the above table 3, it can be easily understood that the majority of the respondents are in their productive age and they are old enough to provide genuine response with regard to the issues under the study.

As it is reflected under item 3 of table 2, while the majority of teachers, i.e.179 (90.40%) ,principals i.e. 25(83.3%) and Supervisors and Woreda Education Heads,i.e.10(71.4%),) were BA/BSC/BED degree holders , the remaining insignificant number, 14(7.07%) of teachers, 5(16.7%) of principals, and 4(28.6%)of supervisors and WEOHs respondents were MA/MSC/MED degree holders. From the figure in the above table it can be inferred that the majority of teachers teaching in the secondary schools (9-10) of South West Shoa Zone are qualified and satisfied the minimum required standard of the level. However a large number of Secondary schools' principals and Supervisors (9-10) did not satisfy the minimum requirement of standard set by the MoE(1996) which requires at least MA/MSC/MED degree. Hence, it would be possible to conclude that attention was not given for the level of education in the placement of principals and supervisors in a leadership position of Secondary schools of the zone.

According to item 4 of table 2, 24(12.12%) of teacher respondents had an experience of 5 years and below, whereas the remaining 174(87.88%) of teacher respondents had served 6 to 20 years. The rest 14(7.07%) of the teacher respondents had an experience of 21 years and above. In relation to principals respondents, 7(23.3%) and15 (50%) of them had experience of 6 to 10 and 11 to 15 years respectively, whereas the remaining 8(26.7%) of principals respondents had served for 16 years and above. On the other hand a considerable number of secondary schools Supervisors and Woreda Education Heads respondents, 12(85.6%) had a service of 11 to 20 years .Therefore, it can be concluded that information obtained from the respondents were valid.

In the above table 2 of item 5,as the majority of teachers ,191(96.5%), principals(22%), and Supervisors and Woreda Education Heads,10(71.4%) respondents were specialized in the academic subject area, the remaining 7(3.5%) teachers,8(26.7%) principals, and4(28.6%) Supervisors and Woreda Education Heads' respondents were graduates of Educational Planning and Management. Although the academic qualification required for secondary schools' principals, Supervisors is Master of Art Degree in Educational Planning and Management, the majority of them in Southwest Shoa Zone were subject area graduates. Therefore, from the table it can be inferred that still there is a problem with regard to the qualification of secondary school principals.

As it is shown in item 6 of table 2, 12(40%) of the principals and 9(64.2%) of the supervisors and WEHs' respondents has served for 5 years and below in their current leadership position; whereas the remaining 14(46.7%) and 4(28.6%) have been serving for 6 to 10 years in their current position. From the figure it can easily be concluded that Secondary school principals and Supervisors are not settled in the school leadership position for a long period of time in South West Shoa Zone of Oromia Region.

4.2. Analysis on Challenges of effectiveness of instructional leadership

Many contextual factors negatively affect instructional leadership performance. To this end, eight issues assumed to be common barriers which hinder the practices of instructional leadership effectiveness were administered to the respondents.

Table 9. Challenges of Instructional leadership effectiveness

No	Item	Respondents																					P- Value
		Teachers											Principals										
		VH		H		MD		L		VL		Mean	VH		H		MD		L		VL		Mean	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
1	Lack of cooperation and commitment of the staff for instructional improvement	10	5	20	10	152	76.8	10	5	5	2.5	3.11	-	-	5	16.7	21	70	4	13.3	-	-	3.03	.552
2	Lack of understanding the vision and mission of the school	67	33.8	111	56	15	7.6	5	2.5	-	-	4.21	10	33.3	15	50	-	-	5	16.7	-	-	4.00	.144
3	Administrative work overload and concentration on routine and non-instructional tasks.	182	91.9	10	5	6	3	-	-	-	-	4.89	27	90	3	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.90	.884
4	Lack of instructional leadership competence	15	7.6	150	7.6	20	10	13	5	-	-	3.84	4	13.3	18	60	8	26.7	-	-	-	-	3.87	.854
5	Lack of support from top authorities	50	25.2	128	64.6	20	10	-	-	-	-	4.15	6	20	24	80	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.20	.658
6	Lack of proper monitoring and constructive feedback	13	6.6	155	78.2	25	12.6	5	2.5	-	-	3.89	4	13.3	19	63.3	7	23.3	-	-	-	-	3.90	.917
7	Lack of resource availability and allocation	29	14.6	1	0.5	159	80.3	9	4.5	-	-	3.25	3	10	7	23.3	20	66.7	-	-	-	-	3.43	.219
8	Lack of training for teachers, supporting staff and principals	34	17.1	155	78.2	9	4.5	-	-	-	-	4.13	10	33.3	17	56.7	-	-	2	6.7	1	3.3	4.10	.805
Average mean value												**3.97**											**3.96**	

NB. 1-1.49= mild problem, 1.5-3.49= moderate problem 3.5-5 high problemSTD= standard deviation, df = n-2, where n=228, then df=228-2=226

Commitment is the product of motivation and competency. Commitment is the state or quality of being dedicated to a cause, activity, etc. The data indicated in item 1 table 3, had shown that152(76.8%) of teacher respondents with mean value of 3.11 and 21(70%) of principal respondents with mean values 3.03 replied that lack of cooperation and commitment of the staff for instructional improvement was moderately affecting the effectiveness of instructional leadership in the study area. The item has also p-value (0.552) which indicated there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups Therefore, from the data it can be concluded that, staff members were not motivated and cooperated and in turn affected the performance of instructional leaders.

Successful principals understand that it is important to establish clear vision and mission and striving to communicate the vision and mission of their schools to school- wide and even community wide (Leith wood and Rich, 2003). In contrast to this reality,178(89.9%) of teachers with mean values of 4.21 and 25(83.3%) of principals with mean values of 4.00 responded that lack of understanding the vision and mission of the school was highly influencing the effective implementation of instructional leadership dimensions in the secondary schools of the zone. The item has also p-value (0.144) which indicated there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. Hence, it can be inferred that, school community had not understand the vision and mission of their school.

All schools need principals to exercise their roles as instructional leader who ensure the quality of instruction. Quality of instruction and spending more time in class rooms should be the top priority for instructional principals (Portein et al., 2003). They need to spend much of their time in the core business of teaching, learning and developing knowledge. Nevertheless, the data in table 9 of item number 3, indicated that the majority of teacher and principal respondents i.e.192 (96.9%) and 30(100%) with mean values of 4.89 and 4.90 had highly confirmed that leaders of their school had mostly been engaged on routine and non-instructional tasks. The item has also p-value (0.884 which indicated there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

Similarly according to the responses made from teachers and principals open ended questions principals spent most of their time dealing with students' discipline, staff affairs, responding to letters from top authorities, and taking part on irrelevant meetings from different bodies. Moreover, in an interview made with cluster supervisors and woreda education heads, they had confirmed that most secondary schools principals were spending their time for doing the routine chores of their office that have less strategic relevance for the accomplishment of their schools' mission, which would negatively affect the quality of instruction in their schools. They said that school leaders had to liberate themselves from being mired in the bureaucratic aspects of teaching. They would have to redouble their efforts in improving teaching and learning process in their schools. Therefore, from the responses of respondents it can be concluded that the majority of, secondary school staff members spent much of their time on non instructional activities.

With regard to item 4 of table 3, the respondents were asked to verify whether lack of instructional leadership competence was a challenge for secondary schools in the zone or not. Accordingly, 165(83.3%) of teachers with mean values of 3.84 and 22(73.3%) of principals with mean values of 3.87 had highly confirmed that principals' lack of instructional leadership competence had been one of the major challenges of instructional leaders in secondary schools of South West Shoa zone. The item has also p-value (0.854 which indicated there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. Hence, it can be concluded that, lack of professionally capable principals was still found to be highly influencing the effectives of instructional leadership practices of principals.

As indicated in table item 5 of table 3, respondents were requested to rate on to what extent lack of support from top authorities hindered the effectiveness of instructional leaders in their secondary schools. The calculated mean scores of responses of 178(89.9%) of teachers and 30(100%) of principals were found to be 4.15 and 4.20 respectively. These mean values indicated that lack of support from top authorities was another factor which challenged the instructional leadership effectiveness of secondary schools' leaders. The item has also p-value (0.658) which indicated there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

The majority of secondary school supervisors and woreda education heads in an interview session had also confirmed that they didn't give adequate support for the secondary school instructional leaders regularly. Most officials said that they only visited schools once or twice a year. Hence, this lack of regular supervisory support was highly constraining the performance of school instructional leaders'.

In replying to item 6 of tables 3, respondents were asked to rate on the extent to which lack of proper monitoring and constructive feedback for school leaders challenged the performance of instructional leaders' .Hence, while the mean value of168(84.8%) teachers was 3.89, the mean value of 23(76.7%) of principals was 3.90. From these mean values one can conclude that that lack of proper monitoring and constructive feedback for school leaders from top officials had been a major barrier for the effectiveness of instructional leadership in

the secondary school of the Zone. The item has also p-value (0.917) which indicated there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

With respect to item 7 of table 3, respondents were asked to rate on if lack of allocating available resources for instructional activities had become the challenges of instructional leadership. Both teachers' and principals' respondents i.e. 159(80.3%) and 20(66.7%) with mean values of 3.25 and 3.43 respectively rated to undecided. The item has also p-value (0.219) which indicated there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

Hence, from the values of the mean it can be inferred that lack of available resource allocation for instructional activities in the schools was a challenge affected the effectiveness of instructional leaders in the schools. The data obtained from interview had also confirmed the responses of teachers and principals respondents.

According to item 8 of table 3, the respondents were in agreement with lack of up-to-date trainings for principals on instructional leadership dimension. The item had mean score of 4.13 and 4.10 with 189(95.4%) of teacher respondents and 27(90%) of principal respondents respectively .The item has also p-value (0.805) which indicated there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. From the data it can be concluded that woreda education experts and cluster supervisors had not worked on updating instructional leaders' practice of instructional activities. A t-test was computed to verify if there was difference between the responses of teachers and principals in relation to barriers which could influence instructional leaders' effectiveness. The computed p-values for each t- tests of all challenges were above 0.05.As a result it can be understood that there wasn't statistically significant difference between the responses of the two respondents.

Moreover, in the open ended questions, the respondents were asked to list other factors which hindered the effectiveness of school instructional leaders. Hence, students' disciplinary problems, lack of parental involvement, lack of teachers' motivation were some of the other factors listed by the respondents.

An interview was also held with secondary school supervisors and woreda education heads so as to find out the major factors which can influence the effectiveness of principals' instructional leadership. Regarding this item, they listed problems such as: work over load, shortage of budget, lack of sufficient trainings, unsupported from top officials, taking part in unplanned and irrelevant meetings set by upper officials were some challenges listed by the respondents.

V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusion

In Secondary schools of South Western Shoa, instructional leadership roles of school leaders are mainly being due to lack of cooperation and commitment among the staff members for the improvement of instructional activities, lack of school wide vision and mission,lack of instructional leadership competency, lack of support from top officials and administrative work over load had been identified as the major constraints affected the effectiveness of instructional leaders in the research area. Moreover, lack of proper monitoring and constructive feedback for instructional leaders, lack of available resource allocation, lack of up - to - date trainings for principals on instructional leadership were some barriers which were found to be negatively affected the effectiveness of instructional leaders.

Moreover, it can be concluded that schools were led by unprofessional in the field of school leadership and management. As a result, many school leaders were not familiar with instructional leadership model and they did not have adequate knowledge and skill to lead secondary schools. This in turn had adversely affected the quality of education in the research area.

5.2. Recommendations

On the basis of findings obtained and conclusions drawn, it is believed that the following recommendations can help concerned bodies to improve the instructional leadership functions of secondary schools' leaders.

In order to overcome and minimize the barriers of instructional leadership identified in this study, all educational stake holders (principals, teachers, students, cluster supervisors, community members, and different officials leading the education sector at different levels) should work together in identifying, monitoring, and finding immediate solutions to challenges of instructional leadership effectiveness.

Although this study has brought about some insights on the core dimensions of instructional leadership model and its challenges, the study was not complete and absolute. Hence, it is recommended a further deep study on this model of leadership.

REFERENCES

[1]. Blasé, J. and Blasé, J. (1999).*Principals' Instructional Leadership and Teacher Developmen*t: Teacher perspective. Educational Administration Quarterly, 35(3), 349-378.
[2]. Kothari (2004).*Research Methodology, Methods and Techniques*. New Delhi:New Age International publisher.
[3]. Cohen,L., Manion,L. & Morrison, K. (2002). *Research Methods in Education (5th ed.).* London and Newyork: RoutledgeFanmer.
[4]. Cresswell.JW.(2009).*Educational Research Planning and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative research(4th .ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ:Merrill.
[5]. Elmore, R.(2000). *Building a new structure for a school leadership*. Washington DC: The Albert Shanker Institute.
[6]. Flath, B.(1989).The principal as instructional leader.ATA magazines.
[7]. Hallinger, P., & Walker, A. (2014). Exploring whole school vs., Subject Department improvement in Hong Kong secondary schools. School improvement and School Effectiveness.
[8]. Harris, A and Daniel (2005). Improving School through Teacher Leadership. New York: Open University Press.
[9]. Hoy ,W., &Miskel, C. (2008). Educational administration: Theory, research and practice. New York: McGraw Hill.
[10]. Jita, L. C. (2010). Instructional leadership for the improvement of Science and Mathematics in South Africa.Procodia-Social and Behavioral Sciences.
[11]. King, D. (2002). The Changing shape of Leadership. Educational Leadership.
[12]. Kort., E., D. (2008). What, all, is leadership? "Leadership" and plural action. The leadership quarterly
[13]. Kothari (2004). Research methodology: Method and Techniques, printed at Ram print graph, New Delhi.
[14]. Kruger, A.G. and et al (2002). School management international and external Environment, study Guide. UNISA, Pretoria.
[15]. LeithWood ,K. & Louis (2012) .Linking leadership to student learning.Sanfrancisco,CA: Jossey- Bass.
[16]. Leith Wood, K. (1999).Developing Expert leadership for future school. London: Falmer.
[17]. Leith Wood, K., & Rich (2003). What we know about successful school leadership. Newyork,NY:Teachers college press.
[18]. Leithwood, K.., &Mascall, B. (2008). Collective Leadership effects on Student Achievement. Educational Administration Quarterly, 44(529), 1-34.
[19]. Leithwood, K., C. Day, P. Sammons, A. Harris and D. Hopkins (2006). Successful school leadership: What it is and How it influences pupil learning, DFES, London.
[20]. Leithwood, K., Duke. (2002).Making schools smarter (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks,CA: Corwin Press
[21]. LeithWood, K., Seashore Louis, K., 2011; Robin Son, 2011). Review of Research: How leadership influences student learning.
[22]. Louis, K. S., Leithwood. (2010). Investigating the links to improved student learning. Final report of research findings, Retrieved from Wallace Foundation.
[23]. MacBeath, J. (2003). Effective Leaders and Effective Schools. London: Paul Chapman publishing.
[24]. Marzao, R.J., T. Waters and B.A. McNulty (2005). School Leadership that works: from Research to Results, Association for Supervision and Curricula development Alexandria, VA.
[25]. McEwen, E.K. (2003). Seven steps to instructional leadership. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin press.
[26]. McLaughlin M.W.& Talbert J.E. (2007). Building Professional Learning Communities in high schools: Challenges and promising practices in professional learning communities: Divergence Depth and Dilemmas. Berkshire, Uk: Open University press.
[27]. Mclver, M., Kearns, Lyons, &Sussman, M. (2009). Leadership: AMCREL report prepared for Stupski Foundations Learning System.
[28]. MOE (2009).Continuous professional development for primary and secondary schoolTeachers, leaders, and supervisors in Ethiopia: The Framework. AddisAbaba(Unpublished Training Manual).
[29]. MoE. (1994). Education and Training Policy of Ethiopia, Addis Ababa. MoE.
[30]. MoE. (2008). General Education quality improvement package (GEQIP). Addis Ababa. Ethiopia.
[31]. MoE. (2008).The Review of the Ethiopia Education and Training policy, and implementation. Addis Ababa: EMPDA.
[32]. MoE. (2009. CPD for primary and secondary school Teachers, Leaders and Supervisors in Ethiopia: The practical toolkit (Addis Ababa).
[33]. MOE.(2012). National Professional Standard for School Principals. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Ministry of Education.
[34]. MoE. (2015), Education Sector Development program Five (ESDP V). Addis Ababa. Ethiopia
[35]. MoE.(2005). Educational sector development program II. Addis Ababa: MOE

[36]. Portin, B. S. (2003).Compounding roles: A study of Washington's principals.InternationalJournal of Educational Research.
[37]. Roach, J. (2006). Leadership Styles and Practices in Effective Schools. Johannes burg: Published by MGSLG.
[38]. Robinson (2011). The impact of Leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types.
[39]. Robinson, (2011). School leadership and Student outcomes: Indentifying what works and why.
[40]. Sergiovanni, T.T. (2001). The principal ship: A Reflective practice perspective (4 thed). London: Allyn and Bacon.
[41]. UNESCO (2003).Decentralization in education, National policies and practices.
[42]. Wallace Foundation, (2013). The School principal as leader: Guiding schools to better Teaching and Learning. The Wallace Foundation. New York.

Anteneh Wasyhun (PhD). " Challenges towards Effectiveness of Instructional Leadership in Secondary Schools of South West Shoa Zone, Oromia, Ethiopia ." IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS). vol. 24 no. 12, 2019, pp 51-61.