

Implementing Instructional Leadership Style: A Challenge for School Effectiveness in the Primary Schools of Kambata-Tembaro Zone, Ethiopia

Markos Mekria Dolebo (PhD)

*Department of Educational Planning and Management, College of Education
Hawassa University, Ethiopia*

Corresponding Author: Markos Mekria Dolebo

Abstract: This article explores the implementation of instructional leadership style in Kambata-Tembaro Zone primary schools. It examined whether, and to what extent principals are able to exert influence to improve school effectiveness. The study was descriptive in nature based on the survey method. It was conducted in a sample of 12 primary schools and on 34 school leaders (principals and deputy principals), 138 teachers and other relevant stakeholders in Kambata-Tembaro Zone, Ethiopia. Data were collected using a concurrent mixed methods research design. Instruments such as questionnaire, semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with different stakeholders including principals, teachers, supervisors, PTAs and SMBs, were employed to collect the data. The validity and reliability of these instruments was ensured through expert opinion and pilot testing. The overall reliability was established at 0.90 alpha level. The findings of the study revealed that principals' instructional leadership practices are the most influential figures that make the difference in the school effectiveness and improvement initiatives. Poor instructional leadership by principals serves as the major impediment to a sound culture of teaching and learning. It was also revealed that the mere implementation of instructional leadership style could not ensure school effectiveness. This research implies that the combination of several leadership styles may enhance leadership effectiveness and thereby improve school effectiveness. The results show that principals' instructional leadership had both direct and indirect effects on student achievement and school effectiveness. Thus, the results of this study indicated that school leaders (principals and deputy principals) should employ a combination of leadership (instructional, participatory, distributed, transformational) styles that may foster effective collaboration among the various categories of staff and other actors.

Key words: Instructional leadership, school leadership, leadership style, leadership practice, learner achievement, school effectiveness

Date of Submission: 11-10-2018

Date of acceptance: 27-10-2018

I. INTRODUCTION

It is evident that the ultimate goal of schools and educational organization is to care about learners and help them to have a maximum learning, that is, to improve school effectiveness. Among the important domains of school improvement, the presence of effective principals who are regarded as instructional leaders in schools is paramount. Most education officials, parents and the local community need their schools to be the best ones. Thus, working towards improving school effectiveness is a major function of instructional leaders. However, Hallinger (2011a:126) argued that instructional leaders alone cannot bring school effectiveness, it takes the combined efforts of all the actors and stakeholders of the school, such as principals, teachers, parents, community, government and others. Hallinger adds that principals today are required to enact a broad range of functions such as developing staff, coordinating the school curriculum, creating a conducive environment for learning, balancing the school budget, and so on. Quinn (2002:447) emphasised that "principals be responsible for informing teachers about new educational strategies, technology, and tools that apply to effective instruction". Principals as instructional leaders are individuals who influence others (especially teachers) to provide appropriate instructional practices to their learners. Bamburg and Andrew (1990:3), explain that effective schools have: clear and focused mission, strong instructional leadership by the principal, high expectation for learners and staff, frequent monitoring of student progress, positive learning climate, parent or community involvement, and an emphasis upon student attainment of core competencies

Instructional leadership is a new paradigm of educational management in Ethiopian schools. Before 1991, the Ethiopian education system was highly centralised, and each school had to follow the guidelines

provided by the National Ministry of Education (MoE), which was responsible for the implementation of education laws and preparations of legislation. However, after the introduction of decentralised education management framework in 1994, schools are directly controlled by the district (Woreda) education office through supervisors and school principals. School principals have a less devolved responsibility, and even more so, their appointment is highly decentralised through the District (Woreda) Education Authority which is appointed by the Woreda Administrative Council (MoE, 2006:32).

Being acutely aware of the challenges in the management of schools, the ministry in its blueprint (MoE, 2009:1) serves to acknowledge that “educational leadership and supervision are professions on their own with established theories and processes”. The ministry indicates that those who assume these roles should be equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills to exhibit proper professional ethics that are necessitated at national, regional, zone, woreda and school levels. High attention was given to the training of instructional leaders, enormous amounts of resources and efforts were expended for improving the outcomes of schooling in the country (MoE, 2009:1).

Yet, despite the importance of instructional leadership, as well as the position, was recognised by the ministry, there seems to be insufficient impact on school effectiveness and improvement. Evidently, there was an apparent gap between what is and what needs to be. The school principals are unable to or are less effective in accomplishing their instructional leadership roles as expected, for the school performance is unimproved as expected and below standard (MoE, 2009:19). As a matter of fact, numerous primary schools in the region are not performing to the standard and expectations of the regional education bureau, and this prompted the researcher to look for identification of strategies, guidelines and practices that the Regional Education Bureau (REB) should put in place to ensure that more schools perform to the expected standards.

The research questions guiding this study were:

- To what extent are different instructional leadership practices implemented by school principals to impact school effectiveness in Kambata-Tembaro Zone?
- Is there significant difference between the opinion of principals and teachers regarding the implementation of instructional leadership practices by principals?
- What are the challenges of instructional leaders with regard to improving their schools?
- How can the instructional leaders and schools be assisted to become effective in Kambata-Tembaro Zone?

In order to address these research questions, the researcher analyzed the three years learners achievement results on Grade eight Regional Examination; and the combined information drawn from teachers and school leaders (principals and deputy principals) survey as well as interviews and focus groups focusing on the extent of implementation of principals’ instructional leadership styles/practices and school effectiveness.

II. PREVIOUS RESEARCH STUDIES ON INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS

Although leadership has been seen as a key factor in organisational effectiveness, the interest in educational leadership has increased over recent decades (Hallinger, 2005). This has to be associated with some factors that are often related to the political changes to the education system. This includes the growth of school-based management in many countries over the past few decades, which has meant more influence for the school and therefore a greater role for school leadership, as power and responsibilities have been devolved from the national to local or school level. This has inevitably led to growth in the importance of the school principal and his/her individual role, and therefore to “a greater interest in leadership as a key factor in school effectiveness and improvement” (Muijs, 2011:52).

As more countries are expecting higher performance and greater achievements from their schools, and are granting greater autonomy to schools in designing their curricula and managing their resources to achieve school goals, the role of the school leader has expanded beyond that of being a school administrator. The term instructional leadership was originated during 1970s effective schools movement, at which time researchers compared schools that were effective with those schools that were ineffective. Leithwood (1994:3) defines instructional leadership as “a series of behaviours that is designed to affect classroom instruction”. Quinn (2002:447) described instructional leadership as critical to the development and maintenance of an effective school. Supovitz, Sirinides and May (2009:38) conceptualised instructional leadership as a construct comprised of the principal’s explanation of the school’s mission and goals, with the emphasis on community and trust, focusing on instruction.

Early research on instructional leadership focused on characteristics of successful leaders. For example, Ronald Edmonds’s landmark study provided an empirical foundation for what many new intuitively: effective schools always have heads focused on instruction (Edmonds, 1979 in Neumerski, 2014). Subsequent research has markedly expanded Edmonds’s original notion of “instructional leadership” demonstrating that the work of improving teaching not only rests in the hands of the principal but also is distributed across a host of leaders

(Spillane & Diamond, 2007; Spillane, Diamond & Jita, 2003). Yet, despite substantial developments in instructional leadership studies (Marks & Printy, 2003; Hallinger, 2005; Robinson et al, 2008), scholars contend that our knowledge of how these instructional leaders improve teaching remains limited (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Spillane & Diamond, 2007).

According to Hallinger (2005), Instructional leadership literature remains overwhelmingly centered on the principal. He attempted to assess the development of instructional leadership role of the school principal over the preceding twenty-five years and argued for conceptualization of the instructional leader that eschewed the “heroic model” (Hallinger, 2005:232). Marks and Printy (2003:291) took as a starting point that “the importance of instructional leadership if schools are to improve”. Chell (2007:1), by referring to some earlier researchers such as Bookover and Lezotte (1982); Duke(1983); Edmond(1979); Kroze(1984); and Stronge(1988) stresses the importance of instructional leadership responsibilities of the principal. However, the consensus in the literature regarding this issue is that it is seldom practised.

Sebastian and Allensworth (2012:8) maintain that “the framework of organizational support for the learners’ learning starts with instructional leadership as the driver for change”. The effectiveness of schools in educating learners to achieve better is highly dependent upon the nature and style of the leadership provided by the individual principal within the particular school (Wing, 2013:274). Wing further argues that scholars in educational leadership agree that instructional leadership is a recent significant conceptual development to emerge in the field.

Sammons, Hillman and Mortimore (1995) by referring previous studies (e.g., Bookover & Lezotte, 1979; Edmonds, 1981; Edmonds & Frederikson, 1978; Lezotte, 2001; Madden, Lawson & Sweet, 1976; Rosenholtz, 1985; Weber, 1971) concluded that among the lists of characteristics of effective schools, a key was the role of the principal as a strong instructional leader. All those studies demonstrated that there was “no evidence of effective schools with weak leadership” (Sammons et al., 1995:17).

Later studies moved beyond personal characteristics, focusing on general behaviours of principals in effective schools. For instance, successful principals systematically monitored student progress and were highly visible in their supervisory role, visited classes, observed teaching and then provide feedback, they were experts in curriculum development and teaching and generated a common sense of vision among their staff (Hallinger, 2005; Marks & Printy, 2003).

School effectiveness is seen as the degree to which schools achieve their goals or school performance, which can be expressed as “the output of the school which in turn is measured regarding the average achievement of the learners at the end of a period of schooling” (Scheerens, 2000:20). Various leadership behaviors or approaches, if carefully selected and systematically applied, are believed to have potential value to enhance the professional development of the staff and hence, would bring efficacy to the organisation (Muijs, 2011:20). “The effectiveness of leadership style is tested by the success of the organisation in achieving its goals” (USAID, 2012:10).

James, Connolly, Dunning, & Elliott (2006:ix), argue that “at the core of a successful school, there is effective leadership which focuses on particular values of involvement and high expectation of achievement that helps to construct a creative and participatory culture supporting, passionate norms and beliefs, success and attainment of learning”. Effective schools, according to James et al. (2006:14), are “institutions in which teachers are involved in making decisions about curriculum matters and have a significant role in developing both the scheme of work and guidelines on teaching and learning. They are also consulted about finance and policy decisions”. In such schools, James et al. (2006:14) further state that “teachers encourage learners to be active co-constructors of the school by using a variety of formal and informal channels to make their voice heard constructively. The mind-sets of people in these schools are said to be empowered, pro-active and optimistic in tackling problems they face to improve instruction.” Furthermore, studies have consistently acknowledged the importance of principals in building effective schools and enhancing student achievement (Hallinger & Heck, 1998:158; Leithwood et al., 2004:15; Muijs, 2011:52).

In sum, what all the above studies and review resulted was that successful school leaders are not just managers but are instructional leaders, in other words, their work is highly focused on the core process of teaching and learning to improve learners achievement in particular and school effectiveness in general.

III. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The main purpose of the study was to explore the implementation of instructional leadership style and to examine whether, and to what extent principals are able to exert influence to improve school effectiveness; and the challenges principals are facing to be effective and make their schools effective; and develop strategies that might enhance the implementation of instructional leadership style of principals and increase school effectiveness in Kambata-Tembaro Zone primary schools.

The result of this study lays a foundation to policy development or amendment, and therefore, may be used as the basis for capacity building for principals, teachers and other actors of the school in increasing the effectiveness of schools. It is expected to contribute towards raising understanding on the current practices and challenges of implementing instructional leadership style and school effectiveness to all stakeholders (teachers, principals, education bureau officials and officers and policy makers) as to how best they can assist the schools to ensure effectiveness.

IV. RESEARCH METHODS AND DESIGN

4.1 The research design

A mixed method research design was employed for the study. According to White (2005:89),” the use of mixed methods research approach provides a means whereby the researcher can combine the strengths of both approaches and increase the validity and reliability in her/his research findings”. The research paradigm used was pragmatism. Pragmatism, as a philosophical paradigm, has elements of both positivism and constructivism. As this philosophy asserts, researchers are free to choose the methods, techniques and procedures of research that can best meet their needs and purposes (Creswell, 2014).

4.2 Population and sampling

The research population in this study comprised all 84 primary schools with first and second cycles (Grades 1-8) in Kambata-Tembaro Zone, Ethiopia. To make the study manageable and due to low performance, only one Zone, Kambata-Tembaro, from Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Regional State (SNNPRS) was selected. The selection of this Zone was on a purposive basis and the main reason for the selection was that although this zone is located in a central and advantageous area than other destitute Zones in the Region in terms of access, school facilities, human power, road and transportation and more, its school performance in the last three consecutive years 2012-2014 (2003-2005 E.C) Regional Grade eight Examination results was worst of all Zones in the region (see Annex 1). The sampled schools were selected from this Zone by using the simple random sampling technique. Twelve government schools (about 15%) of the full primary (Grades 1-8) schools were randomly selected for this investigation. At each school, twenty-five percent (25%) of teachers were selected by using simple random sampling technique since they have similar characteristics (Huck, 2012) and each teacher in the population had an equal probability for selection (Blumberg, Cooper & Schindler, 2008). Simple random sampling technique was also employed to include principals and vice principals for the quantitative part of the study because “they possessed adequate knowledge on how instructional leadership style is implemented” (Briggs & Coleman, 2007:135).

The total number of participants used was 180 teachers and 36 school leaders (principals and deputy principals). Out of 180 selected teachers 134 (79%), and out of 36 principals, 34(94%) completed and returned the questionnaires. For the interviews, the researcher selected two cluster supervisors from each woreda purposely and purposive sampling was used to select PTAs and SMB members for focus group discussion because they are considered to be rich in information on how instructional leadership style is implemented and how schools are effectively managed (Patton, 2002).

4.3 Research instruments

In the quantitative approach, the researcher intended to use 216 questionnaires to be completed by the respondents (principals and teachers) selected for the study. Structured questionnaires made up of Likert-type rating scaled questions were used. The questionnaire comprised of three sections containing the following: Section 1 related to respondents’ demographical data. Section 2 attempted to elicit the respondents’ understanding and perceptions regarding the extent of implementation of the instructional leadership practices by principals of primary schools using Likert-type rating scaled (1= never- to- 5= always), and Section 3 had open-ended questions for the respondents to list out the challenges principals are facing to be effective and enhance school effectiveness in primary schools. On the other hand, in the qualitative part, similar open-ended interview and focus group discussion guides were used. The researcher conducted the interview and focus group discussion face-to-face and recorded the interviews and focus group discussions. “The questions were asked in an open-ended manner so that participants could respond in their own words” (Patton, 2002:257).

V. ETHICAL CONSIDERATION

The participants were recruited purposefully; no one was forced to take part in the study. No incentives were given to any participant for the time they devoted to the study. At no stage was any incentive used to bribe the participants so that their actions would advantage the researcher. The participants were informed at an official meeting about the research purpose and procedures; and thus consent was sought from them (Best & Kahn, 2003).

VI. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Under these heading, the data collected through questionnaires, interview, and focus group discussion were presented and discussed in mixed method inquiry.

The quantitative data were interpreted by using descriptive statistics that transform a set of numbers into indices that describe or characterise the data. The data were presented in tables and were numbered numerically in the order they appear in the text. The qualitative data obtained from the open-ended questionnaire, interviews and focus group discussions were interpreted by a systematic process of coding, categorising, comparing, synthesising and interpreting to provide an explanation of the phenomenon being studied (McMillan & Schumacher 2010).

Part II of the questionnaire contained 135 items, each of five-point Likert-type rating scale. A factor analysis on Likert-type survey item was used as a data reduction tool as indicated in chapter 4, section 4.10. The analysis involved KMO (Kasier-Mayor-Olkin) test and Varimax rotation which helped to determine the factors (major practices) of principal instructional leadership. With the Varimax rotation, the factors were orthogonal (uncorrelated) and independent from one another. The KMO index ranges from 0 to 1, with 0.6 suggested as the minimum value for an excellent factor analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007:625). These writers conclude that for factor analysis a smaller sample size about 150 should be sufficient if solutions have several high loading marker variables (above 0.80). With a sample size greater than 100, loading of at least 0.40 was considered necessary and was used to determine which variables were included in a factor (Khan, Saced & Fatima, 2009:772). The factor analysis produced fourteen conceptual factors. Besides factor,wise analysis item rational analysis was also carried out to view the picture of the articles on each major aspect as a whole. Both factor-wise and item-wise analysis was made regarding mean, standard deviation and t-test sig. 2-tailed.

6.1 Major aspects of principals’ instructional leadership practices

Table 1: Descriptive statistics on major aspects of principals’ instructional leadership practices

Components	Items	Mean	SD	Rank	Cronbach’s Alpha
1: Developing common vision and expectations	10	4.03	0.89	6	0.93
2: Setting and communicating goals	8	4.15	0.92	1	0.94
3: Promoting continuous professional development (CPD)	10	3.86	1.04	11	0.93
4: Providing resources	8	3.84	1.10	12	0.95
5: Providing support	10	4.08	0.97	4	0.95
6: Supervising curriculum and instruction	14	4.07	0.95	5	0.95
7: Establishing trusting relationships	10	4.14	0.94	2	0.66
8: Providing incentives for teachers	7	3.74	1.19	14	0.94
9: Involving parents and community	10	4.09	0.89	3	0.94
10: Involving teachers in decision making	10	3.94	1.04	10	0.96
11: Distributing leadership responsibilities	10	3.99	1.04	7	0.65
12: Creating collaborative learning and instructional environment/climate	12	3.95	1.03	9	0.97
13: Fostering collegiality among teachers	6	3.97	0.99	8	0.95
14: Time management practice	10	3.79	1.00	13	0.89
Over all	135	3.98	1.00		0.90

Note: n=172; Overall=Grand mean

The analysis indicates that the mean score of six of the fourteen major aspects of principals instructional leadership practices met the grand mean score of 3.98. The ranking by mean score shows that respondents had a more positive opinion about the aspects of “setting and communicating goals” and they had a least favourable opinion regarding “providing incentives for teachers”. The other aspects were lying somewhere in the middle (see Table 1):

- Establishing trusting relationships at rank 2;
- Involving parents and community at rank 3;
- Providing support for teachers at rank 4;
- Supervising curriculum and instruction at rank 5;
- Developing a shared vision and expectations at rank 6;
- Distributing leadership responsibilities at rank 7;
- Fostering collegiality among teachers at rank 8;
- Creating conducive and safe learning/instructional environment/climate at rank 9;

- Involving teachers in decision making at rank 10;
- Promoting continuous professional development (CPD) at rank 11;
- Providing resources for teachers at rank 12; and
- Time management skills at rank 13.

It is evident from the findings that six of the 14 major aspects of the principals’ instructional leadership practices, the most implemented or performed included:

- setting and communicating goals (mean=4.15);
- establishing trusting relationships (mean=4.14);
- involving parents and community (mean=4.09); providing support for teachers (mean=4.08); and
- supervising curriculum and instruction (mean=4.07); and developing common school vision and expectations (mean=4.03).

On the other hand, the least performed aspects of instructional leadership practices were: distributing leadership responsibilities; promoting continuous professional development (CPD); providing resources for teachers; involving teachers in decision making; creating collaborative learning and instructional environment/climate; fostering collegiality among teachers; time management; and providing incentives for teachers.

6.2 Overall comparison of teachers and principals’ perceptions

Table 2: Comparison of the teachers’ and principals’ opinion about the major instructional leadership practices of principals’ using t-test

Major aspects of principals’ instructional leadership practices	Principals (n=34)		Teachers (n=138)		t-test *Sig (2-tailed)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1: Developing vision and expectations	4.37	0.77	3.95	1.02	0.048*
2: Setting and communicating goals	4.47	0.54	4.06	0.82	0.005**
3: Promoting continuous professional development (CPD)	4.13	0.95	3.80	1.06	0.047*
4: Providing resources	4.07	0.98	3.79	1.13	0.119
5: Providing support	4.28	0.89	4.03	0.99	0.119
6: Supervising curriculum and instruction	4.19	0.96	4.05	0.92	0.347
7: Establishing trusting relationships	4.45	0.75	4.06	0.97	0.011**
8: Providing incentives for teachers	3.91	1.05	3.70	1.21	0.296
9: Involving parents and community	4.20	0.87	4.06	0.89	0.361
10: Involving teachers in decision making	4.22	0.90	3.87	1.06	0.042*
11: Distributing leadership responsibilities	4.21	0.99	3.94	1.04	0.120
12: Creating collaborative learning and instructional environment/climate	4.19	0.90	3.90	1.05	0.087
13: Fostering collegiality among teachers	4.14	0.91	3.92	1.01	0.217
14: Time managing Practices	4.36	0.84	4.22	0.82	0.387
Over all	4.36	0.56	3.94	0.82	0.005**

Note: ** significant at 1%, *significant at 5% level, n=172

One of the key concerns of this study was to investigate the difference in the perceptions and opinions of principals and their teachers regarding the 14 major aspects of principals’ instructional leadership practices. Independent sample t-test was used to observe the significant difference at 0.01 and 0.05 significance level. Table 2 above displays that the mean score of principals about all the major aspects of instructional leadership practices was greater than teaches’ mean score. It seems that principals had relatively over-estimated their contribution as compared to teachers. It is essential to note that these findings are in line with the research conducted by Mulford (2007:15), who mention that “head teachers could over-estimate their contribution as compared to teachers”.

The independent sample t-test value 0.005 in overall comparison indicates that the mean difference between the two groups (principals and teachers) was statistically significant at the 1% level. As has been seen from the data in the table, principals and teachers had varying opinions on five of the 14 major components of instructional leadership, that is, developing common school vision and expectations, setting and communicating goals, promoting continuous professional development (CPD), establishing trusting relationships among the staff, and involving teachers in decision making, having significant values 0.048 (at 5% level), 0.005 (at 1% level), 0.047(at 5% level), 0.011(at 1% level), and 0.042 (at 5% level) respectively.

However, in the rest nine components such as providing resources for teachers, providing support, supervising curriculum and instruction, offering incentives for teachers, involving parents and community,

creating collaborative learning and instructional environment, fostering collegiality among teachers, and time management skills principals and teachers have similar opinions.

6.3 Qualitative data analysis

The potential interviewees in the study were cluster school supervisors and the focus groups were PTAs, and SMBs who work in close collaboration with principals who can provide a comprehensive picture of the implementation of instructional leadership style by principals. With the help of principals interviews with supervisors and focus groups were held face-to-face.

Tesch's 1990 (cited in Creswell, 2012:291) open coding method was used to guide the analysis of the collected data. In this part, open coding was used to identify categories or themes and sub-themes emerging from responses. The themes are identified on the basis of the concern related to the research objectives and sub-questions as expressed by the respondents, then interpreting the data to provide answers to the research question (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). The responses represent the lived experiences of the respondents, since direct quotations were utilized in this part.

6.4. Findings/Results

Findings of the study revealed that instructional leadership roles of principals are the most influential figures that make the difference in the school effectiveness and improvement initiatives. Poor instructional leadership by principals serves as the major impediment to a healthy culture of teaching and learning. In the study, principals as instructional leaders demonstrated better performance and were strong in setting clear goals for their schools and communicate these goals to influence their actions and the actions of others. This included developing a clear vision and sense of direction and purpose for the school; in placing high priority and consistent emphasis on curriculum and instruction; and in providing support for teaching.

On the contrary, they demonstrated relatively poor performance or weaknesses in distributing leadership responsibilities, in fostering collegiality among the staff. Also in creating collaborative and safe school environment conducive to student learning, in involving teachers and other actors in decision making and promoting the continuous professional growth of teachers, provision of resources, time management and in providing incentives for teachers.

It was also revealed that the mere implementation of instructional leadership style could not ensure school effectiveness. This research implies that the combination of several leadership styles may enhance leadership effectiveness and thereby improve school effectiveness. The results show that principals' instructional leadership had both direct and indirect effects on student achievement and school effectiveness.

It was also confirmed that principals' instructional leadership roles were challenged by both external and internal factors. The internal factors were principal, teacher and student related, while external factors were associated with contextual issues, community and parental involvement and support, budget constraints, less support from government officials (WEOs, ZED, etc.) and other stakeholders.

VII. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The main purpose of the study was to explore how implementing instructional leadership style affects school effectiveness in Kambata-Tembaro Zone. The study findings revealed that the poor implementation of instructional leadership style could not ensure school effectiveness. This research implies that the combination of several leadership styles may enhance leadership effectiveness and thereby improve school effectiveness. Thus, the results of this study indicated that school leaders (principals and deputy principals) should employ a combination of leadership (instructional, participatory, distributed and transformational) styles that may foster effective collaboration among the various categories of staff and other actors. When leaders practice a combination of leadership styles, they may foster effective collaboration among the various categories of staff and learners.

Moreover, this study provides an integrated conceptual framework for studying principal instructional leadership variables (practices or roles) and their impact on instructional activities and school effectiveness. The results show that principals' instructional leadership had both direct and indirect effect on student achievement and school effectiveness.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Hallinger, P. 2011a. A review of 3 decades of doctoral studies, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 47(2):271-306.
- [2]. Quinn, D.M. 2002. The impact of principal leadership behaviours on instructional practice and student engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40(4):447.467.
- [3]. MoE. 2006. *Decentralized Management of Education in Ethiopia: A Reference Manual*. Addis Ababa: EMPDA.

- [4]. MoE. 2009. *General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP) Public Awareness Raising Manual*. Addis Ababa: EMPDA.
- [5]. Hallinger, P. 2005. Instructional leadership and the school principal: a passing fancy that refuse to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4(3):1-20.
- [6]. Muijs, D. 2011. Leadership and organisational performance: From research to prescription? *International Journal of Educational Management*, 25(1):45-60.
- [7]. Leithwood, K. 1994. "Leadership for school restructuring", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30(4):498-518.
- [8]. Supovitz, J., Sirinides, P. and May, H. 2009. How the principal and peers influence teaching and learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(1):31-56.
- [9]. Neumerski, C.M. 2012. Rethinking instructional leadership, a review: what do we know about Principal, teacher, and coach instructional leadership, and where should we go from Here? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49(2):310-346.
- [10]. Marks, H.M., & Printy, S.M. 2003. Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3):370-397.
- [11]. Spillane, J.P., and Diamond, J. B. 2007. Taking a distributive perspective. In J.P. Spillane & J.B. Diamond (Eds), *Distributive leadership in practice* (pp.1-150. New York NY: Teachers College Press.
- [12]. Robinson, V., Lloyd, C., and Rowe, K. 2008. The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44,635-674. doi:10.1177/0013161X08321509.
- [13]. Leithwood, K., Louis, K., Anderson, S. and Wahlstrom, K. 2004. *How Leadership Influence student Learning*. New York, NY: Wallace Foundation.
- [14]. Chell, J. 2007. *Introducing Principals' to the Role of Instructional Leadership*. SSTA Research Centre, Nottingham.
- [15]. Sammons, P., Hillman, J. , and Mortimore, P. 1995. Key characteristics of effective schools: A review of school effectiveness research. London, UK: *International School Effectiveness and Improvement center, Institute of Education*.
- [16]. Scheerens, J. 2000. *Improving School Effectiveness*. Paris, France: UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning.
- [17]. James, C., Connolly, M., Dunning, G. and Elliott, J. 2006. *How Very Effective Primary Schools Work*. London: SAGE Publications Company.
- [18]. Hallinger, P., and Heck, R. 1998. Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9: 157-191.
- [19]. White, C. J. 2005. *Research: A practical guide*. Pretoria: Ithuthuko Investment
- [20]. Creswell, J.W. 2014. *Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approach (5th Ed.)*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- [21]. Huck, S. W. 2012. *Reading statistics and research*. (6th ed.) Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- [22]. Blumberg, D., Cooper, D. R. & Schindler, P. S. 2008. *Business research methods*.(3rd ed.). London: McGraw-Hill Education.
- [23]. Briggs, A.R.J. & Coleman, M. 2007. *Research methods in educational leadership and management*. London: Sage Publications.
- [24]. Patton, M. Q. 2002. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. (3rd Ed.) Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- [25]. McMillan, J.H. & Schumacher, S. 2010. *Research in education*. (7th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- [26]. Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. 2007. *Using multivariate statistics*. (5th ed.) Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- [27]. Khan, S.H., Saced, M. and Fatima, K. 2009. Assessing the performance of secondary school headteachers: a survey study based on teachers' views in Punjab. *Educational management, Administration & Leadership*, 37(6):766-83.
- [28]. Mulford, B. 2007. Successful school leadership: What and who decides? *Australian Journal of Education*, 51(3):228-46.
- [29]. Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. 2003. *Research in education*.(9th ed.). New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- [30]. Ministry of Education, Ethiopia (MoE). 1994 Education and Training Policy. Addis Ababa: EMPDA.
- [31]. Spillane, J.P., Diamond, J.B., & Jita, L. 2003. Leading instruction: the distribution of leadership for instruction. *Journal of curriculum studies* 35, 533-543.
- [32]. Tekeste, N. 1996. *Re-thinking Education in Ethiopia*. Uppsala: ReprocentralenHSC.
- [33]. USAID, 2012. *Instructional Leadership: A Training Module for Principals, Supervisors and Education Officers*. Addis Ababa: Bole Printing Press.
- [34]. Wing, S. N. 2013. Equipping the aspiring principal for principalship in Hong Kong. *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership*, 41(3):272-288.