CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE STUDIES

5.1. SUMMARY

The major purpose of this study was to investigate the instructional leadership roles of principals in secondary schools of Gedeo and Sidama zones in SNNPR and find out the strength of their relationships with school improvement. To this end, the investigator focused on three different but interrelated areas in order to achieve the objectives of the study.

Accordingly, the first part of the study spotlighted on the instructional leadership roles played by principals in the sampled schools. In order to assess this, the five instructional leadership dimensions, which were considered the major activities of an instructional leader, were taken. Statistical techniques like mean, standard deviation, and One-way ANOVA tests were employed to see the extent of the principals’ role in exercising instructional leadership. In addition, qualitative sources were used to support information obtained from quantitative data.

The second part of the study focused on school improvement. Before examining the association of the instructional leadership roles of principals with school improvement, the investigator found useful to pinpoint what school improvement itself is and find out if the sampled schools are implementing school improvement programs in their respective schools. To assess this, four school improvement domains, which are set as criteria by the Ethiopian government to evaluate secondary schools were taken. Mean, standard deviation, and One-way ANOVA tests were computed to see the status of
school improvement in secondary schools. The qualitative data for school improvement were obtained from interview and FGD.

In the third part of the study, the correlation between instructional leadership and school improvement was computed using Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficient. Stated differently, instructional leadership was compared with school improvement to see if strong relationship existed between the two variables (instructional leadership and school improvement). Generally, the study attempted to answer the following basic questions:

I. To scrutinize the attempts made so far by the school principals in promoting teachers’ continuous professional development,

II. To find out if proper supervision of teachers has been practiced by principals in the sampled secondary schools,

III. To probe the extent to which the school principals define and communicate clear goals to different stakeholders,

IV. To examine the actions taken by principals in promoting school climate,

V. To look at the resource allotment practices followed by school principals,

VI. To investigate the aspect of the principals’ job that has got more emphasis by the school principals,

VII. To assess the activities done so far in the area of school improvement

VIII. To scrutinize the strength of the relationship between the instructional leadership roles of principals and school improvement practices.
In line with the above-mentioned objectives, the following basic questions were raised:

1. Have the school principals attempted to promote teachers’ continuous professional development (CPD)?
2. Are there proper supervisory services in the sampled secondary schools?
3. To what extent do school principals define and communicate school goals to different stakeholders?
4. What were the actions taken by principals in promoting school climate?
5. Are there proper resource allotment practices by the school principals?
6. To which aspect of their job do principals give more emphasis, instructional or non-instructional?
7. What activities have been done so far by secondary schools in the area of school improvement?
8. Is there any association between the instructional leadership roles of principals and school improvement?

To serve the purpose of the study, descriptive survey research method was employed considering that it could help to get reliable and genuine information on the topic studied. The descriptive survey method is also preferred for its convenience in soliciting data on opinion of people and addressing current issues.

The study was conducted in five sampled secondary schools of Gedeo and Sidama zones, SNNPR. The subjects of the study were 317 students, 231 senior teachers, five principals of the sampled schools, and 12 PTA members, drawn from the five sampled
schools. Further, the two zonal staff members were also among the sampled respondents.

As far as the sources of data are concerned, both primary and secondary sources were employed to gather the required information. As detailed in chapter three, the primary source of data were senior teachers, preparatory students, zonal education Department staff members, school principals, and PTA members. The investigator gathered the data from the former two using questionnaires while the interview was employed to obtain information from the latter two groups of respondents. Information from PTA was solicited using FGD.

The second hand data for the study were document sources, books, journals, internet, and information obtained from other published and unpublished sources. As a final point, the quantitative data were analyzed by employing appropriate statistical methods, and were validated by qualitative data. Following this, the findings of the analysis of both data were summarized and finalized by conclusions and recommendations.

Out of 12 secondary schools in Gedeo and Sidama zones of SNNPR, five were selected for this study. There were population of 275 senior teachers and 2433 preparatory (grades 11 and 12) students in the sampled schools. The samples for the quantitative data were elicited from all (275) senior teachers and 365 preparatory students in those schools.

With regard to the method of sampling, the investigator employed multistage sampling techniques. Accordingly, at the first stage, the two study zones and zonal education
Department staff members were selected using purposive sampling technique (see chapter three).

The investigator selected five schools out of the 12 secondary schools and two to three representatives of PTA from each school in Sidama and Gedeo zones at the second stage. To select these two groups of respondents, random sampling techniques were applied. This was to allow all schools have an equal chance of being included in the sample.

At the third stage, deliberate/purposive sampling technique was employed to choose school principals. Since principals are the major target in this study, the investigator purposefully selected and included them in the samples.

All senior teachers were chosen at the fourth stage using criterion-sampling technique. They were selected based on their teaching services. That is, the investigator set seniority of teachers as a criterion. Teachers at this level have nine or above years of experience in teaching and can provide reliable data compared to the less experienced ones.

In the fifth stage the selection of preparatory students was made based on stratified random sampling (a part of probability sampling) technique. To this end, the students were categorized into two different groups in each school (11th and 12th grades). Following this, the investigator calculated 15% of the student population from each stratum and then selected them using a systematic random sampling technique.
A mixed method procedures of Sequential Explanatory Strategies were used to analyze the quantitative and qualitative data and arrive at some findings. The purpose of this research design typically is to use qualitative results to assist in explaining and interpreting the findings of a primarily quantitative study.

In order to analyze the quantitative data, different statistical techniques were employed. For instance, descriptive statistics such as percentages, mean, and standard deviation were applied to explain the respondents’ demographic characteristics and to compare teachers and students’ responses on instructional leadership dimensions and school improvement domains.

In addition, different techniques of inferential statistics were used to analyze the collected data. Accordingly, Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficient was used to see the association of each dimension of instructional leadership with school improvement domains. Likewise, the significance of mean differences among schools on issues of instructional leadership and school improvement were tested using one-way ANOVA. All the quantitative data were analyzed using statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) version -16 for windows. Generally, the following are a summary of the major findings:

i. Instructional Leadership Roles of Principals

A. Attempts to Promote Teachers’ Continuous Professional Development (CPD)

As revealed by the rating results of teachers and students, principals’ attempts to promote CPD in some schools were found to be relatively minimal compared to other schools. As per the interview results with principals and discussions made with PTA members, the major reasons of low CPD in some schools were lack of stability on the
part of school principals and lack of initiative to take part in CPD on the part of teachers.

There was disparity among schools concerning principals’ CPD practices, which were high in some schools and low in the others. Hence, a highly significant difference was observed among the mean computational results of teachers, which was confirmed by One-way ANOVA test (P-value=0.000<0.05). However, the overall mean computational results among the sampled school ($\bar{X}=3.44$) showed that there were high CPD practices by school principals in the sampled schools.

The Interviewee and the FGD participants confirmed that in schools where principals’ CPD roles were relatively found to be minimal, teachers were not actively taking part in the CPD program, in spite of different schedules arranged for them. The reason raised for this was that teachers attached minimum or no value to the CPD program. For instance, had the CPD been synchronized with any of the teachers’ benefits (like career development, TPA), teachers would have actively participated in the programs.

**B. Practices of Instructional Supervision**

The findings of this study revealed that, respondents rated the supervisory practices by principals / instructional leaders to be moderate. Nevertheless, when putting in a relative term, supervision was rated low, compared to the remaining four instructional leadership dimensions. Again, as far as this dimension is concerned, students’ overall rating ($\bar{X}=2.80$) was found to be less than that of teachers ($\bar{X}=3.13$). There are two major assumptions by the investigator for students’ ratings of school supervision to be lower.
Firstly, according to their responses to an open-ended question, students explained that they are not made involved in school supervision. They confirmed that school principals have not designed any strategy that allowed them to take part in school supervision. As a result, they understand school supervision as the practice that occasionally takes place in school when school principals and Department heads inter class and observe/supervise teachers. This could be one of the reasons for students’ low ratings of school supervision.

Secondly, students’ knowledge of supervision by itself is limited compared to teachers. To have a positive or negative attitude towards supervision, they need to know the service first. As long as they are not properly aware of the supervisory practices going on in their schools, they are likely to be lenient in their ratings.

In addition to the aforementioned concept, in their responses to an open-ended question, the majority of teachers on their part replied that the status of supervision in their school was “neither good nor bad.” They particularly projected the problem of supervision in their schools to wereda/district educational offices, which were entitled to render external supervision to schools. Teachers confirmed that the support given by wereda supervisors (external supervision) was minimal and even supervisors’ occasional visits were accompanied by criticism and faultfinding.

In discussion with the investigator, zonal interviewees confirmed that supervisory practices in secondary schools are not said to be effective, in spite of the repeated training given to wereda supervisors by the zone. Therefore, the interviewee links the problem not only to schools implementing it but also to supervisors at the
district/wereda level, who were trained and mobilized to give technical and professional support to teachers and principals at school level. The FGD participants also confirmed that the external supervision support coming from weredas were minimal, and almost inexistent. In spite of the training given to them, wereda supervisors have almost not taken over the responsibility of empowering school supervision. This manifested itself as a factor for minimum practices of school supervision by instructional leaders.

To wind up, when the overall rating of the respondents is considered, it was supervision, which was given a minimum rating (\( \bar{X} = 2.94 \)), compared to the remaining four dimensions, indicating the practice of inadequate supervisory services in the sampled schools.

C. Principals’ Roles in Communicating School Goals to Different Stakeholders

It was evident from the results of the study that respondents rated principals effectiveness in goal communication to be medium, as shown by the overall mean (\( \bar{X} = 3.28 \)). However, when relatively comparing individual schools, there was variation from school to school, ranging from as low as Yirgachefe (\( \bar{X} = 2.78 \)) to as high as Yirgalem (\( \bar{X} = 3.94 \)).

There was also a significant difference between student and teacher respondents, as shown by One-way ANOVA result of \( p\)-value=0.003. The aggregate rating of students and teachers for all schools implied that principals’ effectiveness in communicating goals was at the moderate level as also confirmed by the 95% CI that ranges from 3.20 to 3.35.
The result of the interview conducted with the principals of the five schools was also in agreement with the above finding. That is, there was a disparity among respondents over principals’ communication of school goals to stakeholders (to teachers, parents, and the community). Yirgachefe secondary school, where principals’ turnover was observed and Dilla secondary school, which comprised relatively less experienced teachers made minimum attempt in communicating school goals to the school community, parents, and the surrounding community.

To sum up, there were disparities among schools concerning goal communication by the principals that in some schools (Yirgalem) more attempts were made to communicate goals. In others, (Aletawondo and Leku secondary schools) the attempts made by the principals were rated to be medium. Still others (Dilla and Yirgachefe) exhibited relatively minimum results in this area. Nonetheless, aggregating students’ and teachers’ responses for all schools, principals’ effectiveness in communicating goals was on the moderate/medium level.

As mentioned above, the overall average rating of both groups of respondents (students and teachers) of the five schools was found to be medium ($\bar{X}=3.28$). The One-way ANOVA result ($P=0.000$) indicates that there is highly significant difference between the mean computational results of students and teachers among the five sampled schools.

**D. Principals’ Roles/ Efforts in Keeping School Climate**

The results of the study revealed that both students and teachers have above a moderate level of agreement that Principals are keeping better school climate. Accordingly, when considering all the schools, the average rating by students’ ranges from the 95% CI of
3.23 to 3.44, while teachers, rating ranges from 3.33 to 3.58. The overlap of the respective 95% CIs of students and teachers indicate that both groups have above a moderate level of agreement that Principals are keeping better school climate.

The aggregate mean computational result of the two groups of respondents (\( \bar{X} = 3.39 \)) also reveals principals practices/actions in promoting school climate to be at the moderate/medium level. However, alike the previous findings, there were variations among the mean computational results of respondents, ranging from as minimum as \( \bar{X} = 2.62 \) for Yirgachefe to as high as \( \bar{X} = 4.03 \) for Yirgalem secondary schools. This variation was shown by a one-way ANOVA test (p-value= 0.000<0.05), indicating a highly significant difference among the ratings of the sampled schools. As per the FGD, schools who exhibited better results in promoting school climate had taken different measures to do so (see the discussion part).

**E. Principals’ Resource Allotment Practices**

It was pointed out by the study that, the aggregate rating by students and teachers regarding principals’ resource allotment practice was found to be above average, with the mean computational result \( \bar{X} = 3.40 \). This reveals high resource allotment practices on the part of the school principals in the sampled schools. This dimension got the second highest rating by the respondents next to CPD.

Teachers rated this item higher than the students did. Consequently, significant difference was observed between these groups of respondents (teachers and students), as depicted by the One-way ANOVA test (0.000<0.05).
In summary, the aggregate rating of principals by both groups with above average mean computational result (\( \bar{X} = 3.40 \)) revealed high resources allotment being practiced by principals in the sampled schools. That is, there were proper resource allotment practices by the principals.

On the other hand, information from document sources revealed that having big finance in school alone does not guarantee the allotment of more finance to the instructional activities. Because as per the information obtained, schools who had strong financial basis allotted minimum portion of their budget to the instructional program. Conversely, some of those, which had minimum finance at hand were found to allot large portion of their budget to run instructional activities. However, the overall rating showed that there were high resource allotment practices by school principals.

When comparing the aforementioned instructional leadership roles of principals, CPD was the top most dimension implemented by principals, while supervision was the least rated dimension.

**The Emphasized Part of School Principals’ Job**

In the quantitative study result, principals instructional leadership role was rated above average (\( \bar{X} = 3.25 \)). The interview result with principals also showed that all the school principals claimed to have stressed the instructional aspect of their job more compared to the non-instructional one. The reason they raised for this was that instruction is their primary job, while other activities are supportive. Nonetheless, there was a disparity among schools concerning this, as per the responses of the interviewee. For instance, two out of the five school principals replied that, activities done in the area of instructional leadership were not adequate, though they claimed that they emphasized
the instruction part of their job. On the other hand, principals in the remaining three schools confirmed that they surely emphasized the instructional aspect of their job.

Information from documentary sources also pointed out that, in spite of variations observed among schools, most of the activities included in the schools’ action plans (52%) were instructional compared to the non-instructional (48%). However, when observing the five sampled schools, the percentage of the overall budget allotted to the instructional program (40%) by the schools was found to be minimum/below average. On top of that, principals were not engaged in classroom teaching learning and carried no any load with regard to this. They were merely based on their distant memories to supervise and evaluate teachers.

**I. Activities Done in the Area of School Improvement**

**i. Assessment Against the Four School Improvement Domains**

**Learning and Teaching**

The results of the study confirmed that, in all the target schools, respondents rated the implementation of learning and teaching to be high/above average. Respondents’ agreement with the above domain of school improvement shows great endeavor by the school community to envisage the implementation of learning and teaching in their schools. The overall mean computational result of the respondents (\( \bar{X} = 3.66 \)) indicated the smooth learning and teaching going on in the sampled schools. The confidence interval ranging from 3.61 to 3.72 also pointed out the presence of effective learning and teaching in the sampled schools.
Principals also confirmed in their interview that there was smooth learning and teaching in their schools. They explained that learning and teaching has been given due emphasis as an element of school improvement. Further, interviewees from the Zonal Education Department also stressed that they had been giving training to schools in cooperation with school academic affairs regarding the improvement of learning and teaching practices in schools. According to them, this also contributed its own share in promoting the learning and teaching activities in secondary schools.

**Leadership and Management**

As per the mean computational results of teacher respondents, the overall rating ($\bar{X} = 3.66$) indicated that leadership and management practices were well-implemented in the target schools. Nonetheless, there were slight variations among schools concerning the ratings of this item. Accordingly, these variations were observed by categorizing them into three areas.

Firstly, it was evident from respondents’ mean computational results that Dilla and Yirgachefe rated the practice of leadership and management in their schools to be moderate/medium, as implied by the mean computational results ($\bar{X} = 3.10$) and ($\bar{X} = 2.74$) respectively. Second, Aletawondo and Leku rated the practice of leadership and management in their schools to be high, as per their respective mean computational results, ($\bar{X} = 3.87$) and ($\bar{X} = 3.79$).

Finally, Yirgalem rated the implementation of this domain of school improvement to be very high ($\bar{X} = 4.36$). The corresponding 95% CIs of these schools were also in conformity with the above ratings. Yirgalem is at the pick high in the ratings of teacher respondents. Conversely, Yirgachefe was put at the tail end, while Dilla was rated a
little bit higher above Yirgachefe, with moderate mean computational result ($\bar{x} = 3.10$). However, the overall rating result ($\bar{x} = 3.66$) implied that leadership and management was highly practiced in the target secondary schools.

**Safe and Healthy School Environment**

The results of the study showed that there were efforts made by the target schools to keep safe and healthy environment as an element/domain of school improvement in the sampled schools. The overall mean computational result ($\bar{x} = 3.48$) indicates the highest practice of keeping safe and healthy school environment in the target schools. However, the degree of the efforts made varies from school to school. The highest practice was observed in Yirgalem, followed by Aletawondo, Leku, Dilla, and Yirgachefe. One-way ANOVA (p=0.000< 0.05) also tested the existence of highly significant difference among the mean computational results of schools.

In addition to this, during the interview session with the investigator of this study, school principals revealed that they have been working jointly with different bodies to keep the safety of their school environment. They underlined that they have been doing many activities like building separate toilets for girls and boys, minimizing student teacher ratio, keeping the beauty of school campus, strengthening fences, etc in order to improve the safety of their schools’ environment. Nevertheless, the efforts made vary from school to school.

**Community Involvement**

It was disclosed by the findings of this study that community participation in school improvement was at the moderate level. In some schools (like Yirgalem), better practices were observed, while in others (for instance, Yirgachefe ) the efforts made in
this regard were relatively minimal. Community involvement was the least rated domain by respondents, out of the four domains.

**ii. Assessment against Students’ Results/Achievement**

As per the information obtained from document sources, the five sampled schools exhibited good result (above average) by promoting 75% of 12th grade student to higher institutions. However, when looking into grade 12 students’ three consecutive years (2010-2012) entrance exam results, variations were observed among schools. This disparity ranges from the lowest student promotion to higher institution at Yirgachefe (59%) to the highest promotion in Yirgalem (82%).

When comparing all schools in relation to 12th grade students’ three consecutive years’ achievement, Yirgalem, Leku and Aletawondo were high achievers, while Yirgachefe secondary school exhibited minimum result. The overall student achievement in the five sampled schools entails that, out of 3630 students that sat for entrance exam from 2010-2012 academic years, 75% were promoted to higher institutions.

**iii. The Relationship between Principals’ Instructional Leadership Roles and School Improvement**

**a) Comparison of Learning and Teaching Vs CPD and Supervision**

It was found out by the study that there is a significant positive correlation between CPD and learning and teaching in the entire target schools, as far as the overall correlation result is concerned. That is, the more school principals implement the CPD program in their schools, the better the learning and teaching and vice versa. However, variations were there among schools ranging from very weak correlation in Yirgachefe
to strong significant correlation in Yirgalem, though the overall result indicates a strong significant relationship between CPD and learning and teaching (r=.507).

It was evident from the results of the study that when the overall correlation analysis of both teachers and students is considered, there was a moderately significant positive correlation between supervision and learning and teaching, as shown by the correlation coefficient of (r=.361). When considering individual schools, small relationship was observed at Dilla Yirgachefe, and Yirgalem. However, in Aletawondo and Leku, there was a significant medium correlation between supervision and learning and teaching, as shown by r= .410 and r= .377 respectively.

Responses to an open-ended question and FGD result implied that supervision was relatively rated low, out of the five leadership dimensions. The major reason cited for this was a lack of initiative by principals to participate teachers, students, and the community in school supervisory activities. This was disclosed by students’ responses to an open-ended question and by PTA members during the focus group discussion (FGD).

\[ b) \text{ Learning and Teaching Vs Goal Communication, Resource Allotment, and School Climate} \]

The other dimensions of instructional leadership associated with a domain of school improvement (learning and teaching) were principals’ practices of communicating school goals, allocating resources, and keeping the safe school climate.

Accordingly, the findings of the study revealed that in spite of minor differences observed among schools, the overall correlation coefficient (r=.490) indicates the
existence of a significant moderate relationship between goal communication and learning and teaching. That is, the more principals clarify school goals to different stakeholders, the better will be the learning and teaching activities of the schools.

It was also proved by the study that the overall correlation coefficient confirms strong significant correlation between principals’ resource allotment practices and learning and teaching. The more school principals are inclined towards allotting more resources to the instructional program, the better they achieve the objectives of teaching and learning. There are disparities among schools ranging from small significant correlation to strong significant correlations. However, the overall correlation coefficient (r=.540) implies the existence of strong positive correlation between principals’ roles in allotting resources and effectiveness of teaching and learning.

It was confirmed by the study that school climate was strongly correlated with learning and teaching in all the five schools, leaving only minor disparity. Put differently, out of the five instructional leadership dimensions, school climate was the dimension that best correlated with school improvement. The overall correlation result (r=.589) also proves the existence of strong positive correlation between school climate and learning and teaching in all the five target schools.

c) Leadership and Management Vs the five instructional Leadership Dimensions

The study has also confirmed that the more a school principal plays instructional leadership role, the more leadership and management activities are exercised in his/her school. The results of Pearson Product-moment Correlation showed that almost all
instructional leadership dimensions had strong significant correlation with the leadership and management sought in the schools.

Accordingly, when the overall comparison is taken, the following are correlation results between leadership and management and the five instructional leadership dimensions:

- Leadership and management Vs CPD: \( r = .716 \)
- Leadership and management Vs supervision: \( r = .607 \)
- Leadership and management Vs goal communication: \( r = .781 \)
- Leadership and management Vs resource allotment: \( r = .831 \)
- Leadership and management Vs school climate: \( r = .857 \)

Overall, there was a strong positive correlation between all instructional leadership dimensions and leadership and management.

d) The Relationship of School Environment with CPD and Supervision

As per the findings of the study, there was a strong positive correlation between CPD and safe school environment in all the five sampled schools. The overall correlation result (\( r = .723 \)) also shows the degree of strength of relationship between the two. In short, CPD was strongly correlated with the school environment in all the sampled schools.

The study showed that there was a moderately significant relationship between supervision and safe environment, as indicated by the overall correlation result of respondents (\( r = .443 \)). Disparities were observed among school regarding the relationship between the two. Compared to supervision, the relationship between the school environment and CPD was stronger.
e) The Relationship between Safe Environment and three Dimensions of Leadership (goal, resource, school climate)

The study revealed that there was a strong positive correlation between safe environment and the three dimensions of instructional leadership (goal, resource, and school climate). According to the findings from the correlation table, Goal, resource, and school climate are all strongly associated with the school environment in all the target schools. These were indicated by Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients of $r=.707$, $r=.763$, and $r=.757$ respectively. Resource allocation was the topmost factor correlated with safe school environment.

f) Association of Community Involvement with CPD and Supervision

The results from correlation table indicated that there was a strong positive correlation between CPD and community involvement in all the schools, except Yirgachefe and Aletawondo. This was shown by the results at Dilla ($r=.651$), Yirgachefe ($r=.414$), Aletawondo ($r=.458$), Leku ($r=.541$), and Yirgalem ($r=.708$). Slight differences were observed among schools ranging from correlation coefficient of $r=.414$ for Yirgachefe to $r=.708$ for Yirgalem. Nevertheless, the overall results of the relationship between CPD and community involvement in schools implies a strong significant relationship ($r=.615$).

Supervision was found to be moderately correlated with community involvement, as shown by the overall correlation result $r=.390$. The variations of the correlation result ranges from very small relationship observed at Yirgachefe (0.108) to moderately significant correlation at Leku ($r=.477$). There was a strongly positive correlation between supervision and community involvement, as per the rating of teachers ($r=.525$). However, when considering students’ rating, small linkage was observed between the
two (r=280). That is, compared to teachers, students attached less value to school supervision services. However, the overall correlation result proved the existence of a moderately significant positive association between community involvement and school supervision.

g) The Link between Community Involvement and the three Leadership Dimensions (goal, resource, school climate)

It was depicted by the results of the study that there was a strong positive correlation in almost all the sampled schools between community involvement and goal communication. The overall correlation result (r=.620) also indicated a strong positive relationship between principals’ practice of goal communication and community members’ initiative to involve themselves in school activities. That is, the more school goals are made brief to the community, the better their involvement in schools and vice versa.

The findings of the study also revealed that there was strong positive correlation between community involvement and resource allotment practices of the instructional leaders/principals, with the overall correlation coefficient r= .626. However, some variations were observed among schools ranging from the moderate correlation observed at Yirgachefe (r=.387) to strong positive correlation at Leku (r=.698).

The study found out that there was a strong positive correlation between school climate and community involvement in all the five schools, except Yirgachefe, where moderately significant positive correlation was observed (r=.429). The more school principals make the school climate convenient, the better the involvement of community members. The overall result (r= .605) also shows the existence of positive, strong
significant correlation between school climate and community involvement in the sampled schools.

Generally, when comparing all the five components of instructional leadership with community involvement, supervision was found to be relatively the least dimension correlated with community involvement, while resource allotment had the strongest positive correlation with this domain.

There was a strong relationship between instructional leadership and school improvement, as indicated by the overall correlation result (r= 0.827). Accordingly, schools who were found to be relatively low in their instructional leadership practices (Dilla and Yirgachefe) also exhibited minimum result in school improvement. Likewise, schools whose instructional leadership ratings were at the moderate level (Aletawondo and Leku) were also rated to be medium in their school improvement activities. Yirgalem secondary school, which was rated top in instructional leadership roles of principal, got the highest rating in school improvement also.

iv. The Relationship between Instructional leadership, School improvement, and Student Achievement

The findings from the quantitative and qualitative data sources revealed that there was strong linkage among instructional leadership, school improvement, and student achievement. In other words, the more school principals play instructional leadership roles, the more improved their schools are, and the better student achievement they exhibit. The relationship of an instructional leader’s effort with students’ achievement was also found to be indirect rather than direct. Through strive for school improvement, instructional leaders were found to influence students’ results.
5.2. CONCLUSIONS

In view of the findings obtained, the following conclusions are drawn:

As the study revealed, overall, attempts were made by the school principals to promote Continuous Professional Development in their schools. Nevertheless, the degree of implementation was found to vary from schools to schools. In schools where principal/facilitator turnover was minimal and where different trainings were arranged for teachers, the CPD practices were found to be relatively better than those with principal stability problems and less initiatives on the side of teachers. Almost in all the schools, teachers were reported to show minimum participation in the CPD process. It was also mentioned that teachers’ CPD was not linked with any benefit that teachers expect (like career development and TPA) but was only meant to participate teachers to improve their professional and pedagogical skill.

It could be, therefore, safe to infer that failure to synchronize CPD with any of the benefit of teachers and lack of adequate school-based training resulted in less commitment on the side of teachers to take part in CPD, particularly in schools who were relatively rated to be low in their CPD activities. Principal’s turnover in one school also contributed to minimum practice of CPD.

According to the results of the study, out of the five instructional leadership dimensions, the role played by principals in promoting school supervision was relatively low. The support of external supervision was also found to be minimal. Both teachers and students rated the practices of supervision to be low, though students’ rating was lower than teachers’ were. Further, responses to an open-ended question showed that students’
were not made to be involved in school supervision. Teachers’ linkage with supervision was also confined to the evaluation/observation that occasionally takes place.

Thus, it can be presumed that the lack of active involvement of students, teachers, and the community in school supervision and inadequate support from external supervision contributed to low supervisory practices in secondary schools.

The study proved that there were disparities among schools concerning principals’ goal communication to different stakeholders. That is, in some schools high, in others, moderate and still in others low practices of goal communications were observed on the part of the school principals. However, the aggregate rating by students and teachers indicated that principals’ effectiveness in communicating goals was at the moderate/medium level ($\bar{X} = 3.28$), which was also confirmed by the 95% CI, ranging from 3.20 to 3.35. Schools who attempted to communicate goals to different stakeholders (teachers, students, parents, community) fixing schedules for this purpose were rated high, while those whose attempts were relatively minimal were rated to be low.

Therefore, when considering the overall result, it is possible to infer that principals’ effectiveness in communicating goals to stakeholders was at the moderate level. Those less achieved schools need to do more for the effectiveness of goal communication to be high in all schools.

It was found out by the study that, like goal communication, both students and teachers rated principals’ roles in keeping good school climate to be average/moderate. In schools where relatively high school climate practices were observed, different
activities were done, as per the information from FGD. Among these were separate and clean study places/libraries for girls and boys, better protection of instructional time, separate toilets for boys and girls, relatively neat school compounds, well-constructed fences, incentives for teachers and students, better commitment of students, etc, all of which are components of a good school climate.

The study revealed that resource allotment by the principals was the second dimension rated high by respondents, next to CPD. This is true when the overall rating of respondents is considered. Nonetheless, there were disparities among schools against rating this dimension. Thus, it is wise to deduce that there were effective resource allotment practices by principals, in spite of variations observed among schools.

As proved by the study, principals were rated to be above average in their instructional leadership roles. Likewise, the results of document sources implied that, out of the activities included in the school action plans, 52% (above average) were instruction-related activities. However, the budget allotted to the instructional activities was found to be less. Overall, school principals relatively emphasized the instructional aspect of their job, compared to the non-instructional ones. However, they need to do more in increasing financial allotment to the instructional program and test the practical aspect of teaching by carrying few loads.

The study unveiled that the sampled schools have done adequately in the area of school improvement, as far as the four school improvement domains are concerned. All school improvement domains, except community involvement, were rated to be high, while community involvement was moderately rated by the respondents. The total mean
computational result also proved that great emphasis has been given to school improvement. It could be, therefore, deduced that activities done so far by secondary schools in the area of school improvement were said to be adequate. Nonetheless, schools need to exert more efforts to lessen disparities observed among them for the betterment of school improvement.

Schools, which were found to be relatively low in their instructional leadership practices exhibited minimum result in school improvement also. Likewise, those which were rated moderate in their instructional leadership practices were also found to be moderate in school improvement ratings. Similarly, a secondary school which was rated top in instructional leadership practices was also rated high in the school improvement endeavor. It is, therefore, safe to presume that there is a strong relationship between principals’ instructional leadership roles/practices and school improvement.

To wind up, the role played by school principals in the area of instructional leadership was found to be average (neither low nor high). Likewise, the results of the study depicted that schools have been highly committed to achieve their school improvement objectives. Instructional leadership was also found to be strongly linked with school improvement. Most of the students who achieved their entrance exam results were from schools with better improvement. Those with more instructional-oriented principals achieved their improvement plan better than schools whose principals were relatively less instruction oriented.
5.3. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study reveals the following implications:

1. Attempting to meet school improvement target is unthinkable without the active participation of stakeholders, particularly teachers. As stated earlier, it is difficult to think of school progress in isolation of teachers’ development. A study by Hoque, Alam, and Abdullah (2010) found out significant impacts of teachers’ professional development activities on school improvement. The current study found out that, in spite of good CPD practices observed in the target schools, teachers were not actively involved in the CPD program. This was partly because of failing to attach it with any of their own benefits, and partly, due to lack of awareness on the benefits of CPD.

   Hence, the implication is that, arranging school-based training for teachers and synchronizing CPD with benefits of teachers (like TPA and career development) promotes school CPD.

2. The results of this study showed that the services of both inbuilt and external supervision were minimal compared to the other dimensions of instructional leadership. The involvement of teachers and students in school supervision was also found to be almost nil, as per the responses to the qualitative data. This has implication in enabling principals to involve teachers, students and the community members in school supervision for improved supervisory services and better instructional provision. Further, if wereda supervisors assess their activities in providing external supervision in secondary schools and prepare
themselves to strengthen school supervision, there is a tendency for the improvement of inbuilt and external supervision.

3. According to the results of the study, instability of principals or facilitators negatively affected the instructional leadership practices in a school. This in turn also had a negative effect on the school improvement program. The implication of this is that if school principals are allowed to stay in their positions for a considerable number of years, rather than transferring them to other organizations or letting them take over responsibilities in different political positions, they can better exercise instructional leadership roles and attain the required school improvement objectives.

4. The study has great implication on promoting the instructional leadership roles of principals and bringing about the required school improvement. Realizing the strong relationship between instructional leadership and school improvement, governments at different levels can arrange training on instructional leadership and school improvement.

Generally, the study indicated the strong relationship between instructional leadership and school improvement. The more emphasis principals give to the instructional aspect of their job, the better school improvement they exhibit. Therefore, it creates initiative on the part of principals in order to make instruction their top agenda and pursue the “instruction first” motto in order to build improved schools.
5.4. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the summary of the research findings and conclusions arrived at, the following suggestions, which are in line with basic questions and the research objectives, are made in order to improve instructional leadership practices in secondary schools and bring about the required school improvement.

The Ethiopian MoE (2009) puts that CPD should be linked to teachers’ career ladder and professional competencies. However, these were not made practical in the target secondary schools until the time of data collection for this study. Further, almost in all the sampled schools, there were no adequate school based trainings in relation to the implementation of CPD. It is therefore, suggested that CPD should be synchronized to any of the benefits of teachers. For instance, setting CPD as a requirement for teachers’ career development, including it in TPA criteria, setting it as a requirement to apply for further education, etc are few examples.

In addition, wereda education Offices ought to arrange training on CPD for teachers in collaboration with school principals and Wereda Education and Training Board. Further, weredas need to allow school principals to serve for some reasonable number of years in their positions once they are assigned because among the reasons for minimum practices of CPD was the principal’s stability problem. Zonal Education Departments should also follow up the proper implementation of CPD in schools in collaboration with Weredas. On the top of this, school principals need to do more in allotting budget to the instructional part of their job and carry few teaching loads to update themselves with the contemporary methods of teaching.
It was indicated that principals’ roles in promoting school supervision were relatively found to be minimal. The major reasons raised were that teachers, students, and the community were not made to be involved in the service. Besides, it was reported that the support of external supervision was almost nil. Therefore, it is suggested that school principals and supervisors should jointly work in involving teachers, students, and even parents in school supervision and raise their awareness in this area. Due to the decentralization of the Ethiopian education system, secondary schools are currently more accountable to wereda education offices compared to Zonal Education Departments. Hence, wereda supervisors should follow up the day-to-day activities of school supervision and empower the concerned bodies. Again based on the training they get from zonal education Departments, wereda supervisors should in turn arrange training programs for school supervisors and principals.

As the study showed, principals’ effectiveness in communicating goals to different stakeholders was found to be average. That means principals need to do more in order to communicate school goals effectively to teachers, student, parents and the community. If stakeholders are strange about a school’s goals and are ignorant of what is generally going on in the school, there is a tendency for them to desist from taking part in school activities. Even though the overall rating indicated goal communication to be moderate, there were disparities among schools where some were rated high, some moderate, and the others relatively low. Hence, Principals who relatively exhibited minimum result in the
area of goal communication ought to share experiences with those better-performing ones in order to improve their skills in goal communication.

Alike goal communication, principals’ roles in keeping good school climate was rated to be average by the respondents. Three out of five schools showed high performance in keeping school climate, while the remaining two relatively exhibited minimum results. Hence, school principals ought to arrange inter-visitation programs in which schools learn from one-another’s experiences and adapt the techniques and creativity they get from sister schools to their respective schools. It is also advisable that school principals raise awareness of the school community on keeping good school climate. Further, weredas need to appreciate and reward those schools keeping good climate.

Principals need to keep on the good resource allotment practices being practiced in their schools. However, in some schools, the share of the budget allotted to the instructional programs was relatively less than those allotted to the non-instructional programs. Therefore, when preparing school action plans, principals need to prioritize instructional activities in their budget allotment schemes.

Qualitative data from interview results and quantitative data from document sources indicated that school principals relatively gave more emphasis to the instructional aspect of their job. Nonetheless, according to the document sources, the shares of instructional and non-instructional activities were 52% and 48% respectively. Here it can be observed that the share of instructional activity was a little bit above average but should not be as such appreciated. It was rather an alarm bell awakes principals and wereda education officers to enable them
emphasis the instructional program. Thus, principals should assess their day-to-day activities in relation to the instructional program and take corrective measures that help them to emphasize instruction more.

The ratings by students and teachers indicated that activities done so far by the target schools concerning school improvement was high. The document sources also implied that 75% of students who sat for the entrance exam for the year 2010 to 2012 were promoted to higher institutions, which was an indicator for school improvement. However, some disparities were observed among schools in general. It is therefore suggested that, based on the sip assessment results, woredas should identify better performing schools and reward them. Likewise, schools need to arrange incentives for individuals who contributed to the betterment of school improvement. These may include teachers, representatives of students, and representatives of parents/community.

There was a strong relationship between instructional leadership and school improvement, as indicated by the overall correlation result (r= .827). Schools who did better in their instructional leadership practices were found to achieve better results in school improvement, and attained better student results/achievement. Likewise, those who performed less in instructional leadership attained relatively minimum results in their school improvement endeavor; consequently, they relatively exhibited minimum student results. Thus, Mechanisms in which school principals get training particularly on instructional leadership and school improvement should be designed. Because as has already been mentioned, in order to meet the goal of school improvement, principals
themselves need to be instruction-oriented leaders, for there is strong linkage between instructional leadership and school improvement. In fact, to the best knowledge of the investigator, the Federal Government and Regional Education Bureaus have been doing a lot now days in promoting the professional competence and qualification of secondary school principals. However, it is better to arrange more training on instructional leadership and supervision, if school improvement objectives are required to meet their targets.

5.5. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

Based on the findings of the current study and the relevant literature reviewed, further studies can be conducted on similar research topics. On this ground, the investigator suggests rigorous studies on the following areas:

1. Further investigation and search ought to be made to find out the current practices of school improvement and problems associated with it in Ethiopian secondary schools.

2. This study should be replicated to investigate more about the impact of instructional leadership on school improvement.

3. Additional studies out to be carried out to examine the status of supervisory services in Ethiopian secondary schools.

4. Further study should be carried out to investigate teachers’ participation in CPD program and challenges related to it.

5. It is also advisable if further studies are conducted on the practices and problems of external supervision in Ethiopia.