

**PRACTICES AND CHALLENGES OF SCHOOL LEADERSHIP IN  
IMPROVING TEACHING-LEARNING PROCESS IN SECONDARY  
SCHOOLS OF OROMIA SPECIAL ZONE SURROUNDING FINFINNE,  
OROMIA REGIONAL STATE**

**MA THESIS**

**LELISA DEGU**

**NOVEMBER 2017**

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY, HARAMAYA**

**Practices and Challenges of School Leadership in Improving Teaching-  
Learning Process in Secondary Schools of Oromia Special Zone  
Surrounding Finfinne, Oromia Regional State**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of Educational Planning and  
Management, Postgraduate Program Directorate**

**HARAMYA UNIVERSITY**

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
MASTER OF ARTS IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP**

**Lelisa Degu**

**November 2017**

**Haramaya University, Haramaya**

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY**  
**POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE**

We hereby certify that We have read and evaluated this Thesis entitled “Practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in secondary schools of Oromia Special Zone surrounding Finfinne, Oromia regional state” prepared under our guidance by Lelisa Degu. We recommend that it be submitted as fulfilling the thesis requirement

Dr. Dawit Negassa

Major Advisor

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

Dr. Garkebo Basha

Co-Advisor

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

As a member of the Board of Examiners of the MA Thesis Open Defense Examination, We certify that we have read and evaluated the Thesis prepared by Lelisa Degu and examined the candidate. We recommend that the thesis be accepted as fulfilling the Thesis requirements for the degree of Master of Art in school leadership.

\_\_\_\_\_

Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

Internal examiner

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

External examiner

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

Final approval and acceptance of the Thesis is contingent up on the submission of its final copy to the postgraduate program directorate (PGPD) through the candidate’s department or school graduate committee (DGC or SGC).

## **DEDICATION**

I dedicate this thesis manuscript to my aunt w/o Danse Erkisa and my wife Tike Dachesa for their support in the success of this Thesis.

## STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR

By my signature below, I declare and affirm that this Thesis is my own work. I have followed all ethical and technical principles of scholarship in the preparation, data collection, data analysis and compilation of this Thesis. Any scholarly matter that is included in the Thesis has been given recognition through citation.

This Thesis is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for MA degree at the Haramaya University. The Thesis is deposited in the Haramaya University Library and is made available to borrowers under the rules of the Library. I solemnly declare that this Thesis has not been submitted to any other institution anywhere for the award of any academic degree, diploma or certificate.

Brief quotations from this Thesis may be made without special permission provided that accurate and complete acknowledgment of the source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotations from or reproduction of this Thesis in whole or in part may be granted by the Head of the school or department when in his or her judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interest of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author of the Thesis.

Name: Lelisa Degu

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: November 2017

School/ Department: Educational Planning and Management

## **BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR**

The author was born in January 1982 at Worka Kote Ambo Woreda, West Shewa Zone of Oromia Regional State. He attended primary School at Worka Kote from grade 1-6 in 1989-1994 and Meti primary school from grade 7-8 in 1995-1996. Again he attended grade 9-12 in Ginchi secondary school since 1997-2001. Then he joined in 2002 Kotobe college of teachers education and graduated in 2004 with Diploma in Chemistry and in 2005 he joined Jimma university and graduated with BED with major in Chemistry and minor of mathematics in 2008 in summer program.

He then served for five and half years teaching chemistry subject at Awash Melka secondary school in Sebeta Awas Woreda. Then after he served for five and half years in teaching he is working as Tefki secondary school principal up to now. While working in this area he got opportunity to join Haramaya University Postgraduate Program Directorate in 2015, to pursue his MA study in School Leadership.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to express my deepest and heartfelt gratitude to my major advisor, Dr. Dawit Negassa for his insightful and constructive comments and unreserved guidance. His comments were valuable not only for this study but also in my future career as well.

I would also like to express my special appreciation to my co-advisor, Dr. Garkebo Basha for his guidance and professional expertise.

I am particularly grateful to my aunt Danse Erkisa, my wife Tike Dachesa and my daughter Yerosan Lelisa for their continuous encouragement and support in all my education life. They have been a constant source of energy to help me pursue my studies all the way through.

Finally, I am very much obliged to express my indebtedness to supervisors, principals, teachers and department heads of Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne secondary schools, who took part in the interview and filling out the questionnaire by taking their time. Would also like to thank my friends, Jemal Haji and Abera Dinka for their genuine assistance, moral support and encouragement during my graduate study with all their kindness and affection.

## **ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

CPD	Continuous Professional Development
ESDP	Education Sector Development Program
ETP	Education and Training Policy
MoE	Ministry of Education
OREB	Oromia Regional Education Bureau
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Sciences
ZEDAR	Zone Education Department Annual Report

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>DEDICATION</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>xii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>xiii</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	3
1.3. Research Questions	4
1.4. Objectives of the Study	5
1.4.1. General objective	5
1.4.2. Specific objectives	5
1.5. Significances of the Study	5
1.6. Delimitation of the Study	6
1.7. Limitations of the Study	7
1.8. Definition of Key Terms	7
1.9. Organization of the Study	7
<b>2. RELATED LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1. Concept of School Leadership	9
2.2. Practices and Challenges of School Leadership	10

*Continoues...*

2.2.1. Practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process	10
2.2.2. Challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process	15
2.3. Roles and Responsibilities of School Leadership and Teachers	17
2.3.1. Roles and responsibilities of principals in improving teaching-learning	17
2.3.2. Roles and responsibilities of teachers in improving teaching-learning	18
2.3.3. Roles and responsibilities of department heads	19
2.3.4. Roles and responsibilities of supervisors in improving teaching-learning	19
2.4. Summary on Review of Related Literature	22
<b>3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>23</b>
3.1. Description of the Study Area	23
3.3. Sources of Data	24
3.3.1. Primary sources of data	24
3.3.2. Secondary sources of data	24
3.4. Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques	24
3.5. Instruments of Data Collection	27
3.5.1. Questionnaire	27
3.5.2. Interview guide	27
3.5.3. Documents analysis	28
3.6. Procedures of Data Collection	28
3.7. Methods of Data Analysis	30
3.8. Ethical Considerations	31
<b>4. RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS</b>	<b>33</b>
4.1. Characteristics of the Respondents	33
4.2. Analysis of the Practices and Challenges of School Leadership	36

*Continoues...*

4.2.1. Analysis of the practices of school leadership	36
4.2.2. Analysis of the major challenges of school leadership	53
<b>5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>59</b>
5.1. Summary	59
5.2. Conclusions	62
5.3. Recommendations	64
<b>6. REFERENCES</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>7. APPENDICES</b>	<b>73</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table</b>	<b>Page</b>
1. The Sample Size of Teachers in Each Secondary School	26
2. Summary of Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques	26
3. Reliability test results with Cronbach's alpha	29
4. Responses on Characteristics of the Respondents	34
5. Practices of School Leadership in Developing and Achieving School Vision and Mission	37
6. Practices of Curriculum Management by the School Leadership	43
7. Practices in Creating Conducive School Environment by School Leadership	49
8. Major Challenges of School Leadership Practices	55

# **Practices and Challenges of School Leadership in Improving Teaching-Learning Process in Secondary Schools of Oromia Special Zone Surrounding Finfinne**

**Lelisa Degu**

## **ABSTRACT**

*The purpose of this study was to investigate the practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in the secondary schools of Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne. The study employed a descriptive survey research design using both quantitative and qualitative research methods. The quantitative data were collected using a questionnaire from teachers and school leadership by using stratified and availability random sampling techniques respectively. The qualitative data were collected using semi-structured interview and document analyses. Seven secondary schools in the selected woredas were included in the study by using availability sampling method. The quantitative data collected were analyzed by using percentages, means and an independent sample t-test to see if there is statistically significant mean difference between the opinions of respondents in rating the items. SPSS version 20 was employed to analyze quantitative data while the qualitative data obtained from open ended questions, interviews and document analyses were analyzed using narration and description to supplement the quantitative data. The findings of the study revealed that majority of school leadership become school leaders without having the necessary training in relation to school leadership. The major reasons for the poor practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process identified were: lack of adequate knowledge regarding to school leadership, lack of professional training in line with school leadership and lack of support from educational bureau at different levels. The major challenges of school leadership practices in improving teaching-learning process identified in the findings; lack of school leadership cooperation with stakeholders, lack of timely allocation of resources, lack of planning skills in line with the school needs and lack of organizing school community in order to improve teaching-learning process. From the result of the findings, it is possible to conclude that, the practices of school leadership lacked self-confidence, consistency and decision making in improving teaching-learning process. Based on the finding, it was recommended that educational leadership at different levels like woreda, zonal and regional level should provide technical support, prepare short and long term training and facilitate experience sharing in order to strengthen the practices of school leadership and minimize challenges that hinders their practices in improving teaching-learning process. As the findings showed that, lack of resource hinders the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process. To solve such problem the researcher recommended that secondary school leadership should create and operate strategies like community mobilizing and preparing project proposal by communicating with local NGO's.*

# 1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the background of the study, statement of the problem, basic research questions, objectives of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study, operational definition and organization of the study were treated in this part of the study.

## 1.1. Background of the Study

The term school leadership has been prevalent in educational leadership literature for the past two to three decades Goddard and Miller (201). During this period school leadership theorists have developed different frame works that guide the functions of educational leaders as school leadership. Hallinger and Murphy (1985), for example, developed a framework consisting of three elements: defining the school mission, managing the teaching-learning program and creating a positive school climate. According to the above idea, school leadership was required to frame school goals, communicate, supervise and coordinate curriculum, monitor progress, and support the teaching-learning culture in order to make their schools effective.

Hopkins (2001), on the other hand, emphasizes on the collective practices of school leadership while defining the term and suggesting his framework. Based on the above idea, school leadership is the collegial practice of working together with teachers and others stakeholders in order to improve the teaching-learning process in schools. The other theorist, Snyder (1983), for instance, conceptualized school leadership in terms of planning, staff and program development and evaluation. This framework relates the tasks of school leadership with administrative responsibilities in improving teaching-learning process. Unlike Snyder, Day et al. (2007) developed a conceptual framework much focuses on teaching-learning process. According to them, setting directions, developing people, engaging in collaboration, and using data and research are primary practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process.

In supporting the above idea, some key practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process were described by Day et al. (2010) as follows: direct assistance, focusing on providing professional skill development, the ability to manage and support teaching and

learning programs, curriculum management, creating conducive and healthy school environment, developing school community relationships, the skill of adaptation to changing environment and evaluation of performance. However, the major challenges that hinder the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process mentioned by McLaughlin and Talbert (2007) were: lack of school leadership commitment, lack of community participation in resource mobilization and lack of will and courage.

Although the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process vary according to the country, the conceptual frameworks developed by different leadership theorists can be implemented in different countries with different rate. In Ethiopia, especially, after the downfall of the Derg regime, education has been given due attention and direction with an education and training policy declared during transitional government of Ethiopia (TGE, 1994). As clearly stated in the ETP document (1994), educational leadership would be decentralized specially at institutional level and schools become autonomous in their internal administration. This means that the practices of leading the schools and teaching-learning process carried out in schools distributed to all individuals involving in school activity, not limited only to principals.

As result, different strategies were designed by the government and MoE in line with the policy. Among these strategies some include the education system was decentralized, different individuals were allowed to involve in the education decision making affairs and leadership and managerial trainings were provided to those on leadership positions and others in improving teaching-learning process. Still the practices of school leadership were focused on the system as indicated in the MoE (as cited in ESDP V, 2015).

At regional level, as the information obtained from the Oromia regional education bureau (2016), the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process were explained as follows; updating themselves by identifying their skill gaps through CPD programs and supervising the school activities like teaching-learning process. Since it was one component of the region, the trend in Oromia special zone surrounding Finfinne was quite similar with the other zones in the region. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to investigate the practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in secondary schools of Oromia Special Zone Surrounding Finfinne.

## 1.2. Statement of the Problem

Practice of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process were characterized by setting vision and defining the school mission, curriculum management and instruction, supervising and evaluating teaching-learning process, providing professional skill development, and creating conducive and healthy school environment (Murphy,1990).

However, Research by Price (2007) indicates that, although the economic, political, social or technological variations, the following are the major problems of school leadership practices in improving teaching-learning process like; lack of consistently good teaching and learning; lack of basic knowledge and skills of the curriculum; lack of strategically managing resources and the environment; lack of building the school professional learning community and lack of developing partnership to encourage parental support for learning and new learning opportunities.

As described by the MoE (as cited in ESDP V, 2015) the problems faced practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process were identified lack of school leadership: commitment, technical management, building school culture and attractive school compound, participatory decision making and school management for teachers and students, creating orderly school environment by clarifying duties and responsibilities, being skillful in human relations and communicating with different stake holders.

In line with this, there are some other evidences that verify the practices of school leadership were not effective in improving teaching-learning process. Various studies (e.g. Alemu, 2014; Yonas, 2015) have been conducted nationally on issues related to the roles of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process. For example, a study by Alemu (2014) entitled “the roles of school leadership in building organizational climate in improving teaching-learning process in secondary schools of Bale Zone, Oromia Regional State ” and by Yonas (2015) entitled “a comparative study of school leadership roles in improving teaching-learning process in some selected government secondary schools in Addis Ababa City Administration.” The two researchers indicated above generally identified the following four factors, namely lack of teaching-learning process feedback, lack of staff commitment,

teachers resistance to change and lack of school leadership commitment in improving teaching-learning process in the secondary schools.

The above studies had some gaps and different from this study in three different ways:

Firstly, they focused on the role of school leadership but they did not say anything about the practice and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process. Secondly, the methodology they emphasized was quantitative, whereas, this study was both qualitative and quantitative in order to triangulate the data collected through questionnaire with interviews and document analysis. Thirdly, the participants they included were; principals, vice principals and supervisors but they excluded the teachers who were influential in improving teaching-learning process, whereas, this study included them.

Another point that initiated the researcher to conduct this study was no studies undertaken regarding to the practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in secondary schools according to the annual report of Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne Educational Desk (2016) and seriousness of the problem in related to the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in secondary schools of Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne. In the process of the study the researcher was raised the following basic questions:

### **1.3. Research Questions**

The study attempts to answer the following basic research questions:

1. What are the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in the secondary schools of Oromia special zone surrounding Finfinne?
2. What is the extent of curriculum management by the school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in secondary schools of Oromia special zone surrounding Finfinne?
3. What is the extent of creating conducive school environment by the school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in the secondary schools of Oromia special zone surrounding Finfinne?
4. What are the major challenges faced by the school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in the secondary schools of Oromia special zone surrounding Finfinne?

## **1.4. Objectives of the Study**

### **1.4.1. General objective**

The general objective of this study was to assess the practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in secondary schools of Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne.

### **1.4.2. Specific objectives**

The specific objectives of the study were to:

1. Assess the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in the secondary schools of Oromia special zone surrounding Finfinne.
2. Investigate the extent to which curriculum management by the school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in the secondary schools of Oromia special zone surrounding Finfinne.
3. Examine the extent to which creating conducive school environment by the school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in the secondary schools of Oromia special zone surrounding Finfinne.
4. Identify the major challenges that faced the school leadership practices in improving teaching-learning in the secondary schools of Oromia special zone surrounding Finfinne.

## **1.5. Significances of the Study**

The finding of the study may provide information for regional, zonal and woreda educational bureau to identify the gaps that exists in relation to the practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process and address the problems in the future. It may help the school leadership regarding how to solve the challenges that hinder their practices in improving teaching-learning process based on the findings result recommended by researcher like experience sharing with surrounding schools. The result of the study will create awareness among school leadership regarding effective practices such as planning skills, developing and achieving the school vision and mission in improving teaching-learning

process in their own schools and it may serve as a starting point for other researchers who are interested to conduct further research in this area.

### **1.6. Delimitation of the Study**

The research could be more comprehensive and reliable, if it could have included all secondary schools, school leadership and teachers of secondary schools (9-10) in Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne. However, due to shortage of finance and time resources, the research geographically was delimited to Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne in three woredas and seven secondary schools. The selection of the zone as a setting for the study was based on the researcher experience as a teacher, department head and a principal in the zone that helped him to sense the problem and no studies conducted related to practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process due to the Zone was established recently. The practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process deals with diversified and including all are beyond the researchers' resources capacity.

Therefore, the scope of the study was content wise, delimited to the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process variables such as, developing and achieving the vision and mission of the schools, curriculum management, creating conducive school environment and the major challenges of school leadership practices in improving teaching-learning process variables such as, lack of in-service training, lack of cooperation with stakeholders, lack of planning skills, lack of resources, lack of adequate knowledge in line with school leadership, lack of organizing the school community and unwillingness to devote more time in improving teaching-learning process. Methodologically was delimited to descriptive survey method and also qualitative and quantitative data. The tools of data collection were delimited to questionnaire, semi-structured interviews, document analysis, analysis of research data were delimited to descriptive statistical analysis and an independent sample t-test and measurement of scales were delimited to five Likert scales measurement. The participants of the studies were delimited to secondary schools teachers, principals, vice principals, department heads and supervisors.

## 1.7. Limitations of the Study

The first important limitation was lack of relevant local review literature related to the practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process. The researcher feels that, had it been possible to access these literatures. It would have been possible to substantiate the practice and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process more and come up with better work. The second limitation was lack of the research limited to only seven secondary schools as the result it may affect generalization of the findings to all schools in the Zone. Other important constraints of this study were time constraint, uncooperativeness of respondents in filling the questionnaires and returning on time. Due to several meetings, most school supervisors were not available to conduct interview in their office. However, the researcher used maximum effort to overcome this challenge.

## 1.8. Definition of Key Terms

**Curriculum Management** –The process of directing and evaluating curriculum by the school leadership in order to improving teaching-learning process.

**Leadership** - Refers to principals, vice principals, secondary school supervisors and department heads that influences the activities of an individual or group towards the improvement of teaching-learning process.

**Practice** - Activities which are carried out by the school leadership in improve teaching-learning process.

**School leadership** - School principals, vice-principals, department heads and secondary school supervisors who coordinate various activities in the school in improving teaching-learning process.

**Secondary School** - In the study context defined as structure of educational system that includes secondary schools (grade 9-10).

**Teaching-Learning** – Delivery of teaching-learning process in a collaborative effort between teacher and school leadership in order to raise students' academic achievement.

## 1.9. Organization of the Study

This study was organized in to five chapters. Chapter one deals with the introductory part that includes background and statement of the problem, basic research question, objectives, significance of the study, delimitation, limitation of the study and operational definition of key terms. It was provide with an overview of the study and offer rationale around the topic, particularly the reasons why the topic is worth exploring. Chapter two is about review of related literature, in this chapter the research questions begin to clarify, using literature review as the vehicle. It was assisted in giving a clear picture of what to expect in the investigation. Therefore, the purpose of this chapter is to give a clear understanding of the nature of the problem being investigated which is practice and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in selected secondary schools. Whereas chapter three discuss the design and methodology under which, design of the study, the research method, data sources, sample population and sampling techniques; the type of instrument and data analysis techniques used were discussed. Chapter four provides data presentation, analysis and interpretation by discussing the sample population and its characteristics in order to understand the nature of the research findings. It is also relevant to show the significance and/or conclusions that relate to the literature in this instance and describe the main data obtained from the empirical investigation. In the last chapter the whole research project is considered. In this regard the researcher gives the summaries, conclusions and recommendation of the study. Finally, lists of reference materials used in the study, questionnaires, interview and document analysis guides were attached to the research document.

## **2. RELATED LITERATURE REVIEW**

This chapter presents the available related literature reviewed on the concept of school leadership, the practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in worldwide Context, roles and responsibilities of principals, teachers, department heads and supervisors as school leadership in improving teaching-learning process, Overview of the practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning in Ethiopia context and summary on review of related literature.

### **2.1. Concept of School Leadership**

Fundamentally school leadership has no uniform definition that satisfies every one (Kruger, 2002). Different authors defined school leadership is perceived as the behaviors and actions taken by the school leader so as to improving teaching-learning process by enhancing learners achievement growth (Leithwood, 1999). These actions include the provision of resource, staff development and support, supervision and evaluation of teaching-learning, protection of instruction time and creation of an environment that is conducive for effective teaching and learning (Blasé and Blase, 2000 and Hopkins, 2001).

The above definition implies that school leadership means the behaviors of and actions taken by the school leadership towards ensuring effective teaching-learning process, as well as the development and achievement of all learners. In doing so, the school leadership make sure that the environment is conducive and positive for improved learner's achievement in the school. However, Conley (cited in Kruger, 2002) define school leadership as specific part of educational managers' function that is carried out by the school leadership to help and provide service to teachers both as individuals and group to improving teaching-learning. All those involved in improving teaching-learning for the purpose of promoting student achievement that can be assumed as the practices of school leadership.

The practices of school leadership has been twisted as teaching-learning leaders play a great role in giving direction, allocating resources, supporting teachers to improve school performance in the learning outcome rather than focusing on administrative issues (McEwen, 2001). Moreover, as Blasé(1999) indicated effective school leadership who possess both

managerial and school leadership qualities to create conducive learning environment; help teachers to improve classroom performance; maintain academic standards and stimulates students for higher academic achievements by improving teaching-learning.

Hoy and Miskel(2001) and Fullan (2001) extending the definition state that school leadership improving teaching-learning by emphasizes: goal and high students achievement; allocation of adequate resources; organization and coordination for effective and efficient students outcome and maintaining effective human relation to create collaboration and commitment among school members.

## **2.2. Practices and Challenges of School Leadership**

### **2.2.1. Practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process**

School leadership practices are associated with measurable improvements in student learning (Hallinger and Heck, 1998; Marzano et al., 2005; Robinson, 2007; Waters et al., 2003). This report identifies four major domains of practices as key tasks for school leadership in improving teaching-learning within their schools: supporting and developing teacher quality, defining goals and measuring progress, strategic resource management and collaboration with external partners.

While the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning vary across countries, it is clear that school leadership is generally expected to play a more active role in improving teaching-learning, monitoring and evaluating teacher performance, conducting and arranging for mentoring, coaching, planning teacher professional development and cooperative teaching-learning. In supporting the above idea, the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning generally characterized by developing and achieving the school vision and mission, managing curriculum and promoting a conducive school learning climate (Murphy, 1990).

#### **2.2.1.1. Developing the school vision**

A core practice of school leadership is to developing a common vision for improving teaching-learning process. Creating a learning organization requires a deep rethinking of the leadership

practices in improving teaching-learning. School leadership must see themselves as 'learning leaders' responsible for helping schools develop the capacity to carry out their vision. A crucial part of this practice of school leadership is cultivating and maintaining a shared vision which provides focus, generating questions that apply to everyone in the organization in improving teaching-learning. Improving teaching-learning becomes a collaborative, goal-oriented task rather than a generalized desire to 'stay current'(Peter, 1990).

Peter (1990) also notes that coherent vision specifies the particular values and beliefs that will guide policy and practice within the school in improving teaching-learning. Ideally, the practices of school leadership set a broad vision for all schools in the district and within that context and coordinates the process of arriving at a particular vision for each school in improving teaching-learning. The creation of a vision is not a static event, because the vision must change as culture changes.

Vision is increasingly regarded as an important component practice of school leadership in improving teaching-learning. There are different views about whether vision is an essential aspect of the practices of school leadership. Beare,et al. (1989), for example, say that “outstanding school leadership have a vision of their schools a mental picture of a preferred future which is shared with all in the school community”. However, Bennis and Nanus (1985), they articulate four emerging generalizations about the practices of leadership in improving teaching-learning, which relate directly to vision. These are: - outstanding school leadership has a vision for their organizations; vision must be communicated in a way which secures commitment among members of the organization; communication of vision requires communication of meaning and attention should be given to institutionalizing vision if the practices of school leadership are to be successful.

The practice of school leadership develops clear visions which focus on improving teaching-learning. Their practice inspires and leads new and challenging innovations. These leadership also establish clear goals and keep them in front of attention such leaders expect high performance with achievable goals and objectives through planning and organizing (Leith wood, et al., 2006). Accordingly, school leadership need to lead the teachers, students and community for creating excellent schools by collaborative establishing vision, developing trust, earning respect for school communities in improving teaching-learning. According to

Day, et al. (2010) the practices of school leadership have very strong and clear vision and set of values for their school, which heavily influenced their actions and the actions of others in order to improving teaching-learning. These were shared widely, clearly understood and supported by all staff. They were a touchstone against which all new developments, policies or initiatives were tested.

#### **2.2.1.2. Achieving the school mission**

Mission is what the school desires and tries to accomplish. It guides and controls the school's activities that it values. Krug (1992) emphasized the importance of mission for the practices of the school leadership and the school when he suggested "operating without a clear sense of mission is like beginning a journey without having a destination in mind." Recent literatures on effective schools and the practices of school leadership also placed the act of defining a school's mission as the primary task of school leadership (Clayton, 1994; Hoyel, 1988 and Bell, 1992). This refers to the practices of school leadership in framing school-wide goals to which the school will focus its resources during a given school year (Mulfold, 2008).

Despite the existence of many more goals that pursue school resources, instructionally effective schools generally have a clearly defined mission or sets of goals which focus on the improvement of teaching-learning (Walker and Murphy, 1986; Lockheed and Verspoor, 1991). Such goals may be stated as: "taking students to their fullest intellectual potential" (Mulfold, 2008: 13) or "the provision of thorough and systematic intellectual training in the fundamental disciplines." (Latip, 2006). Such emphasis on fewer goals to which staff energy and other school resources are mobilized and increase the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process.

For the practicality of school goals, the practices of school leadership along with the staff members need to assess the past and present status in improving teaching-learning process (Adeolu, 2012). Adjacently, the practices of school leadership frame the school goals in terms of staff and student responsibilities to ensure the improvement of teaching-learning process (Hallinger, 1985).

After defining the school goals, school leadership are expected to build understanding of and commitment to those goals by communicating them widely and systematically to teachers, students and parents (Walker and Murphy, 1986; Day 2007). To this end, the school leadership discusses and revises the goals with staff on a regular basis during the school year, especially in improvement of teaching-learning, curricular and budgetary decisions (Hallinger, 1985). Both formal communication channels (eg. displaying on notice board, placing up over the entrance of the school, the school handbook, assemblies) and informal ones (eg. parent conferences, teacher conferences, curricular meetings, other discussions with staff) can be used to communicate the schools primary purpose (Day, 2007).

According to Weber (1996) the school mission as a dynamic process that tells the purpose or reason for the schools existence. The school mission serves as a basis for assessing setting the priorities, strategies, and plans of the organization with binding the staff, the students and parents to common vision in improving teaching-learning. It is the practices of school leadership to develop the mission statement in partnership with the school community which describes who, what and where of the school in improving teaching-learning (Murpy, 1990). In general, the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning work to develop a clear statement of mission where their schools are going and understand how to build commitment to that mission.

### **2.2.1.3. Curriculum management**

Curriculum is components of schooling to which school leadership should pay attention (Mc Ewen, 2003). In managing curriculum; school leadership need not be specialists in all areas of subjects. Their great responsibility lies on the provision of necessary conditions that make teaching possible (Chisolm and Vally, 1996). The school leadership repertoire of teaching-learning practices and classroom supervision offers teachers the needed resources to provide students with opportunities to be successful. The school leadership helps teachers to use the best practices and strategies to reach school goals in improving learning. Managing the teaching-learning program involves working directly with teachers in area related to curriculum and instruction (Hollinger and Murphy 1985). Therefore, the practices of school leadership conducting teaching conferences and evaluating, visiting classroom, providing specific suggestions and feedback in improving teaching-learning process.

#### **2.2.1.4. Creating conducive school environment**

The practice of school leadership ability to select their teaching staff is central to their ability to establish a school culture and capacity conducive in improving teaching-learning. Lack of school leadership involvement in recruiting and dismissing teachers may reduce their capacity to respond and it is difficult to hold school leadership accountable in improving teaching-learning when they have no say in selecting their staff (Weber et al., 1996).

A growing number of educators are focusing their efforts on improving the work environment of teaching-learning process. In place of the typical school's norms and practices that isolate teachers from one another, some schools are initiating new norms and practices that encourage teachers to cooperate with one another and with administrators on school improvement. The primary goal of these collaborative practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process.

School leadership can promote collaboration by such simple expedients as involving school members in setting the agenda for school meetings, giving school committees a meaningful role in matters of curriculum and instruction and helping teachers to coordinate their schedules so that they have time to observe each other teach and provide each other with feedback on their observations. A number of studies have shown that the practices of school leadership in collaborative schools are more actively involved in observing and evaluating teachers and in working with teachers on curriculum and scheduling in improving teaching-learning process (Wudu, 2003).

According to Weber (1996), healthy school environment for teaching-learning process reflect confidence, trust and mutual respect for cooperation between staff, students, governments, parents and wider community is essential for purposeful effort and achievement. The practices of school leadership encourage good working relationship and overcome the worst effects by contrasting on developing positive environment, high achievement and progress in improving teaching-learning. Murphy, (1990) indicated that the practices of school leadership advocate, nurture and sustain school environment conducive in improving teaching-learning. In schools with such atmosphere the practices of school leadership treat all individuals with dignity and respect; make decisions based on data from stockholders, skilled on problem solving and

conflict resolution, finally flexible in dealing with students in order to improving teaching-learning process.

Townsend (1997) conducted a comparative study between America and Australian schools on factors which mostly help the schools to be effective and concludes that an effective schools primarily characterized by good school leadership and staff, good policies and a safe and/or supportive atmosphere in which staff, parents and students are encouraged to work as teams toward the improvement of teaching-learning. Purkey and Smith (1985) have identified school leadership as one of the major factors practices in improving teaching-learning. They clarify that this factors emphasize strong leadership from administrator, teachers or integrated teams are important in initiating and maintaining the improvement of teaching-learning process.

The good practices of school leadership being implemented in improving teaching-learning process were designed by the MoE (2006) was educational packages program. Those are; SIP program, CPD/TDP program, curriculum improvement program, civic and ethical education, ICT program, leadership and management program. Therefore, the practices were expected from school leadership is implementing the good practices introduced by the MoE in order to improve teaching-learning process. As described in ETP document (1994) the practices of school leadership was decentralized especially at schools level become autonomous in their internal administration in improving teaching-learning. This means that the practices of leading the schools carried out in schools distributed to all individuals involving in school activity, not limited only to school leadership in order to improving teaching-learning process.

In supporting the above idea, the MoE (2006) parents can be involved in improving teaching-learning process, including the classrooms, the sports field, the tree plantations, the vegetable gardens, the nursery, etc. this can be particularly important if parents feel that their contributions of knowledge, contribute to a building fund, to enable schools to increase their classrooms.

### **2.2.2. Challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process**

Disconnected departmental subcultures; a resistance to school wide interventions, norms for teacher autonomy and teacher tracking and a lack of training on and support for engaging

disconnected adolescents who have significant learning gaps (McLaughlin & Talbert, 2007). Although the economic, political, social or technological variations, the following were cited as challenges to the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning: lack of in-service training, lack of cooperation and commitment with stakeholder, lack of planning skill, lack of resources, lack of adequate knowledge about school leadership, lack of organizing the school community and unwillingness to devote more time in improving teaching-learning.

**Lack of in-service training:** As Sergiovanni (2001) stated that, on-job training and off-job training technical, human and educational skills, abilities and knowledge are essential properties that school leadership has to possess in improving teaching-learning. School leadership without adequate training in the area of leadership and professional development can do little or no for the improvement of teaching and learning (West-Burnham, 1998).

**Lack of cooperation and commitment with stakeholder:** school leadership cooperation and commitment with stakeholders essential for effective improvement of teaching-learning. The cooperation and commitment of teachers, principals, supervisors and parents could be available in school climate where the school leadership practices democratic leadership in improving teaching-learning (Bush and Bell, 2003).

**Lack of planning skills:** School leadership has multiple planning skills they have practicing in order to improving teaching-learning. For instance daily planning, weekly planning, monthly planning, quarterly planning, annual planning and strategic planning. Therefore school leadership has the practices of planning skills in improving teaching-learning and teacher development to achieve the goals of the schools (Harris and Muijs, 2003).

**Lack of resources:** Lack of resources of all type and support from central offices discourages the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning. Bureaucratic management that hampers timely assignment human, financial and materials resources required can be restricted the success of teaching-learning (Dimmock, 2000).

**Lack of Vision, Will and Courage:** Nothing can affect teaching-learning improvement more than lack of the practices of school leadership will. The practices of school leadership have to spend more time in improving teaching-learning, initiating changes and encouraging others to

achieve educational goals. However lack of vision, will and courage could hinder the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning (Sergiovanni, 2001). Generally the barriers of school leadership hinder the leadership practices and finally bring a serious problem in improving teaching-learning.

Regarding to, MoE (2010) was identified the major challenges of school leadership practices faced during in improving teaching-learning process were lack of school leadership: commitment, technical management, building school culture and attractive school compound, participatory decision making and school management for teachers and students, creating orderly school environment by clarifying duties and responsibilities, being skillful in human relations and communicating with different stake holders.

In addition, the practices of school leadership are often faced with a number of roadblocks in improving teaching-learning: such as; incompetence in school leadership, lack of incentive for teachers, problems related with teachers promotions, lack of administrative skills and commitment of those assigned as school leadership, shortage of educational materials, or finance are among problems frequently cited as factors that hinder the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning (MoE, 2004).

## **2.3. Roles and Responsibilities of School Leadership and Teachers**

### **2.3.1. Roles and responsibilities of principals in improving teaching-learning**

As school leadership, the principal is the pivotal point within the school who affects the quality of individual teacher teaching-learning, the height of student achievement, and the degree of efficiency in school functioning. Responsibility and accountability for effective teaching-learning outcome calls leaders to design better ways those students can learn and highest school outcome could be produced the role of the principal as school leadership through complex, over loaded and unclear in the past, now it is in the way of transition towards transformational leadership (Chell, 1991). The role of principals as school leadership is still in the state of transition from administrative emphasis to more teaching and learning, democratic and participatory leadership (Marks and Printy, 2003).

The pressure of globalization and social expectation is inducing principals take the lead in the teaching-learning activities such as setting goals, leading academic programs, examining and evaluating teachers' performance. According to, Heck (2006) "effective principals are expected to be effective school leadership . . . the principal must be knowledgeable about curriculum development, teacher and teaching-learning effectiveness, clinical supervision, staff development and teacher evaluation". Bryce (1983) and Fullan (1991) agree with this holistic view of the principal's role.

### **2.3.2. Roles and responsibilities of teachers in improving teaching-learning**

A number of different roles have been suggested for teacher leadership that further explains the distinctive nature of the leadership activity. Katzenmeyer and Moller (2001) indicated that the practices of teacher leadership as having three main aspects of improving teaching-learning process: these are; leadership of students or other teachers, leadership of operational tasks and leadership through decision making or partnership.

In connection to this, Gehrke (1991) also identifies quite similar functions of teacher leadership practices in improving teaching-learning roles such as continuously improving their own classroom teaching and learning; organizing and leading reviews of school practices in improving teaching-learning; providing curriculum development knowledge; participating in school decision making; giving in-service training to colleagues; and participating in the performance evaluation of teachers.

Furthermore, according to Ash and Persall (2000) teacher leadership practices in improving teaching-learning roles have been identified as curriculum developers, bid writers, leaders of a school improvement team, mentors of new or less experienced staff, action researchers with a strong link to the classroom and spend most of their time in the classroom but take on different leadership roles at different times, following the principles of formative leadership. In supporting the above idea, teachers' leadership is involving in many school activities like coordinating students in improving teaching-learning, giving training for school teams and mentors new employs teachers.

### **2.3.3. Roles and responsibilities of department heads**

It is increasingly the case that heads of departments, subject teachers and principals are expected to leadership practices in improving teaching-learning. Persall (2000) there has been a radical shift in the role and responsibilities of curriculum subject and departmental leadership in improving teaching-learning. The Subject Leader Standards represent a major redefinition of the role, expectations and performance of leaders at departmental and subject level. The standards highlight the importance of high-quality teaching and learning improved standards of achievement. They also acknowledge the importance of establishing high standards of teaching and learning in their subject as well as playing a major role in the development of school policy.

Team leadership has a powerful influence over classroom practices in improving teaching-learning and is important gatekeepers to change and development within their subject areas. The subject leader standards acknowledge the centrality of the subject leadership in contributing to whole-school policy and development. The overall purpose of the subject leadership practices role is to contribute to school improvement and increased standards of performance through the provision of high-quality teaching-learning within the subject area Glickman (2004). To achieve this, the subject leader has to lead and manage the curriculum and to respond to the internal and external demands for accountability and quality. All of these demands have to be met in the particular context of the individual school and the community it serves.

### **2.3.4. Roles and responsibilities of supervisors in improving teaching-learning**

Supervisors' roles vary from locality to locality and from country to country. They are defined by the superintendents to whom the supervisors are responsible and, as happens in most positions of leadership, by the supervisors themselves. A supervisor assists teachers in the improvement of teaching-learning, curriculum planning and improvement, and personal professional growth and development. According to Glickman (2004) some of the roles of supervisors in improving teaching-learning are as follow: coordinator, consultant, group leader, evaluators.

**As coordinator:** the supervisor serves as a coordinator of program, groups, materials and reports of teaching-learning. It is the supervisor who acts as a link between program and people and directs the actions of others to make the pieces bring together. As a director of the staff development, the supervisor plans with teachers, arranges, evaluates, and often conducts in-service programs for teachers (Gehrke, 1991).

**As consultant:** the supervisor serves in a consulting capacity as a specialist in curriculum, teaching-learning methodology, and staff development. Supervisor may simply furnish necessary information and suggestions. At other times, the supervisor may help teachers to define, set, and pursue goals. The supervisor should be a prime source of assistance to teachers wishing to improve either their generic or specialized teaching-learning skills. Though some will disagree with us, we believe the supervisor-consultant should be able to demonstrate a repertoire of teaching strategies (Bryce, 1983).

**As group leadership:** supervisor works continuously to release the potential of groups seeking to improve the curriculum, teaching-learning, or themselves to perform this role the supervisor must be knowledgeable about group dynamics and demonstrate leadership skills. The supervisor assists groups in consensus building, in moving toward group goals, and in perfecting the democratic process. Finally as a group leader supervisor seeks, identifies, fosters leadership from within the group (Moller, 2001).

**As evaluator:** the supervisor provides assistance to teachers in evaluating teaching-learning and curriculum. The supervisor helps teachers find answers to curriculum and teaching-learning problems identify research studies that may have a bearing on their problems, and conduct limited research projects. Additionally, the supervisor helps teachers evaluate their classroom performance, asses their own strengths and weaknesses, and select means of overcoming their deficiencies of teaching-learning (Persall, 2000).

In supporting the above idea, George and Peter (2008) states that, the school leadership have to play the following important roles in the schools in improving teaching- learning. These roles of school leadership are as follows: program coordination, program evaluation, direct assistance, action research, curriculum development.

**Program coordination:** In the roles of program coordination school leadership coordinate program, groups, materials and reports in order to improving teaching-learning. Since it is assumed that the school leadership is knowledgeable about the details of the teaching and learning process to guide and direct teachers (Glickman, 2004). In order to promote the professional growth of the staff, the school leadership has to plan, organize, evaluate and conduct in service programs for teachers in consultation with the school management and teachers.

**Program evaluation:** In the roles of evaluator the school leadership helps teaching staff to address important issues of teaching and learning in the classroom and ensure the conditions for effective learning in the school. As evaluators, he/she helps teachers to identify, analyze, and solve learning problems, provide timely and constructive feedback, assessing teachers to identify strengths and weakness to guide them on the path for improvement (Hollinger and Murphy, 1985).

**Direct Assistance:** It can be used to gather classroom data on the extent to which moral principals are present in the classroom. Leaders can work with teachers to develop observational tools to describe classroom culture reflect on current conditions and engage in the classroom based improvement (McEwen, 2003). The leaders gradually can increase teachers decision making responsibility, empowering teachers and thus enhancing the teachers capacity to improving teaching-learning in order to raise students out comes.

**Action Research:** It helps to gather data to assess the gap between the community vision of the school and current reality, plan for change aimed at bridging the gap, integrate the task of leadership to bring about change, evaluate the good practices of school leadership and their challenges faced during improving teaching-learning, and revise action plan in the cycle of continuous improvement (Glickman, 2004).

**Curriculum Development:** It can involve teachers by infusing moral principles throughout the curriculum. Teachers can design a curriculum that educates the whole child, teacher's compassion and justices including, all children in significant learning. As to (Weber, 1996) teachers can develop curriculum that can integrate learning within the school and connects academic learning with community service. Finally teachers can develop the curriculum that

promote democratic community of learners in the present as well as in the future .Generally, the maintained above school leadership roles are used at the school level to improve teaching-learning, learning outcomes, teachers profession and produce a well-educated citizens at all levels.

#### **2.4. Summary on Review of Related Literature**

The chapter addressed the concept of school leadership, the practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in worldwide, Ethiopian context and roles and responsibilities of principals, teachers, department heads and supervisors in improving teaching-learning process. To this end the review related literature give direction and clarifications about the findings and basic question items raised under; the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process such as: developing and achieving the vision and mission of the school, curriculum management and creating conducive school environment and challenges that hinders the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process like: lack of in-service training, lack of cooperation and commitment with stakeholder, lack of planning skill, lack of resources, lack of adequate knowledge about school leadership, lack of organizing the school community and unwillingness to devote more time in improving teaching-learning. Thus, the reviewed literature helped the researcher to get the insight about the issues in detail.

### **3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY**

This chapter presents the description of the study area, research design, the sources of data, the study population, the sample size and sampling technique, the procedures of data collection, the data gathering tools and the methods of data analysis.

#### **3.1. Description of the Study Area**

The area of the population for this study is Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne in secondary schools of Oromia Regional State, which is located at the North, South, Western and Eastern part surrounding Finfinne. Oromia special Zone was created recently by composing cities and woredas surrounding Finfinne Oromia regional state. This zone is surrounding the capital city of Ethiopia and Oromia regional state, Addis Ababa, which is called Finfinne in the Oromo language.

The main reason for creating this special zone was to ease the co-operation and development of surrounding areas of Addis Ababa with the capital. This zone was created in 2008 by Oromia regional state. This special zone comprises six (6) woredas and one city administration found around Finfinne, namely, Sebeta Awas, Akaki, sululta, Walmera, Mulo, Barak woreda and Sandafa city administration which is the focus area of this study secondary school. The total numbers of primary, general secondary and preparatory schools in the zone are 320, 15 and 6 respectively and 3 technical vocational and educational training but no governmental or non-governmental college or university is found in the zone.

The number of teachers in the Zone is 1,412 in primary, 286 in secondary, 88 in preparatory schools and 18 in TVET school according to the current annual statistics of Oromia special zone surrounding Finfinne education desk office (2016). Majority of the people, who are living in this zone are agricultural society. It has also three agro-climatic zones which include cool type of thermal zone, moderately warm and cool temperature according to Oromia special zone surrounding Finfinne Communication Bureau (2016).

#### **3.2. Research Design**

Research design is the plan of action that links the philosophical assumptions to specific methods (Creswell and Planoclark, 2007). In this study descriptive survey design was used

because a descriptive survey is appropriate to investigate the actual status of practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in the selected secondary schools of Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne. The research method belongs to both quantitative and qualitative data. The purpose of using both quantitative and qualitative research method is to build strong relationship between quantitative and qualitative data collection methods and to fully understand the issue under investigation (Gay, Mills and Airasian, 2006).

### **3.3. Sources of Data**

Data for this research was collected from both primary and secondary sources.

#### **3.3.1. Primary sources of data**

The primary sources of data were school principals, vice principals, secondary school supervisors, department heads and teachers. The decision to use these subjects as a source of data was based on that they directly involved in the practices of schools leadership, have a better experience and information about the practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in secondary schools. Teachers were taken as source of information for the reason that they were direct beneficiaries of the service.

#### **3.3.2. Secondary sources of data**

The secondary source of data was obtained from SIP documents, manuals prepared for training purposes and minutes concerning the practices of school leadership support in the secondary schools in improving teaching-learning process to make the study valid.

### **3.4. Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques**

Total population of the study include 286 teachers, 15 principals, 10 vice principals, 6 supervisors and 60 department heads. The Oromia special zone surrounding Finfinne contains six woredas, one administrative town and 15 secondary schools. From these woredas, 3 (50%) of them were selected by using simple random sampling technique through lottery method because most of the woredas found in Oromia special zone surrounding Finfinne have

relatively similar in infrastructure, facility and availability of necessary human resources (both administrative and academic) and other, to provide independent and equal chance of being selected for the study.

Accordingly, Mulo Woreda, Sebeta Awas Woreda and Sululta woreda were selected as the sample. There are seven secondary schools in the selected woredas. All the seven secondary schools were selected as the sample by using availability sampling technique because they were small in number and manageable. There are 7 principals, 4 vice principals, 3 secondary school supervisors, 28 department heads and 165 teachers in the selected secondary schools. Airasian (2006) define available sampling as one which involves selecting a sample based on the small number. Accordingly, 7 (100%) principals, 4 (100%) vice principals, 3 (100%) school supervisors and 28 (100%) department heads were included in the study using availability sampling because they were few in number and manageable. Gay and Airanian (2003) assert that it is most likely to obtain a representative sample of 10% to 20% of the target population in descriptive research. To represent equal proportion of sample teachers in each secondary school, Stratified Proportional allocation size formula of William (1977) was utilized.

$P_s = \frac{n}{N} \times \text{No of teachers in each school}$

#### Key

$P_s$  = Proportional allocation to size

$N$  = Total number of teachers in the seven selected secondary schools (165)

$n$  = Total teachers sample size ( $n = f \times N$ ),

$f$ , sample fraction,  $f=30\%$   $N=165$  then,  $n = 30 \times 165 / 100 = 49.5 \cong 50$ )

Therefore, the researcher selected 50 (30%) out of 165 teachers according to the number of teachers in a particular school using stratified random sampling techniques. The strata were based on teachers service years (1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20 and  $\geq 21$  years). From each school were taken 10 samples of teachers by using simple random sampling techniques lottery method. This was because; to give equal chance for sampled selected secondary schools of teachers.

Table 1. The Sample Size of Teachers in Each Secondary School

Name of the sample secondary school	Number of teachers in each selected schools	From each service Years sample selected					Total sample selected	Sampling techniques
		1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	>=21		
Awash Melka	27	1	4	1	1	1	8	Stratified random sampling
Chancho Aba Gada	49	2	6	4	1	2	15	
Derba	14	1	2	-	1	-	4	
Gorfu	12	1	1	1	1	-	4	
Kura kemele	12	1	1	1	-	1	4	
Sagno								
Gabiya	27	1	4	2	1	-	8	
Tefki	24	1	4	1	-	1	7	
Total	165	8	22	10	5	5	50	

Table 2. Summary of Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

No	Respondents	Total sample Population	Sample size	%	Sampling technique
1	Teachers	165	50	30	Stratified random sampling
2	Department Heads	28	28	100	availability sampling
3	Vice principals	4	4	100	availability sampling
4	Principals	7	7	100	availability sampling
5	supervisors	3	3	100	availability sampling
	Total	207	92	44	

Source: Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne Education Desk 2016/2017

### **3.5. Instruments of Data Collection**

The data gathering tools employed in this research were questionnaire, interview and document analysis.

#### **3.5.1. Questionnaire**

The first data collection instrument employed in the study was questionnaire. The researcher used questionnaire because it was convenient to conduct survey and acquire necessary information from a large number of study subjects within a short period of time, easiness in tabulation, objectivity and suitability to keep respondents on the subjects of discussion (Best and Khan, 2003). Accordingly, a total of 32 items self-developed closed-ended questionnaire was prepared and distributed to 50 sample teachers and 39 school leadership (7 principals, 4 vice principals and 28 department heads) who were selected by stratified random sampling and availability sampling techniques respectively as information sources. A total of 5 open ended question items were included because it gives respondents a freedom to give their extended views on the issue.

Responses from participants were taken by using a five point Likert Scale method of rating and the respondents were expected to express their degree of agreement on five point scale related to the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree specifically, Strongly agree=5, Agree=4, Undecided=3, Disagree=2, Strongly disagree=1 (Rosemary, 2003) and related to the major challenges of school leadership practices in improving teaching-learning process ranging from very high to very low such as; Very high=5, High= 4, Moderate=3, Low=2, Very low=1 (Fowler, 1996). Thus, questionnaire containing both open and close ended questions were carefully selected and presented to respondents under three subsequent sections: the cover page, background information of respondents and questions related to the practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process.

#### **3.5.2. Interview guide**

Interview was the second important data gathering instrument in this study. This data gathering instrument was selected with the belief that deeper information is obtained on issues

critical to the study underway. It is also being used to cross-check the responses obtained through questionnaire and it let the interviewee to express her/his feeling freely and knowledge of people in a program in depth (Rule and John, 2011). In order to obtain deeper information related to the practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in the study area, a semi structure interview were used in this study from three (3) secondary school supervisors in their cluster office on some 5 guiding items questions for half hour by researcher manually in the study area. These respondents were selected for interview in the ground that more information can possibly obtained from them due to their position in the school leadership and technical support the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process.

### **3.5.3. Documents analysis**

Different minutes related to the practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process like; curriculum committee minutes, SIP committee minutes, training minutes and regular check lists of the schools leadership used to improving teaching-learning process by using check list 4 guided questions for document analysis. It is believed that the data obtained in this method was used to validate and substantiate the information gathered by the questionnaire and semi-structured interview. According to Abiyi et al, (2009) document analysis is cheap and can give an expert understanding of the available data.

### **3.6. Procedures of Data Collection**

Checking the validity and reliability of data collection instruments before providing to the actual study subject pilot test was employed at Sebeta secondary school which was not included in the sample study. Based on this, 32 closed ended and 5 open ended questionnaires were administered to 1 school principal, 2 vice principals, 4 department heads and 23 teachers of the above stated secondary school was selected purposively. The pre-test provided an advance opportunity for the investigator to check the questionnaire and to minimize errors due to improper design elements, such as question, wording or sequence (Adams et al., 2007).

After the dispatched questionnaires' were returned, the reliability of the instrument was measured by using Cronbach alpha test. A reliability test is performed to check the

consistency and accuracy of the measurement scales. As Table 3 below shows, the results of Cronbach's coefficient alpha is satisfactory (between 0.73 and 0.97), indicating questions in each construct are measuring a similar concept. As suggested by Cronbach (as cited by Tech-Hong and Waheed, 2011), the reliability coefficients found between 0.73–0.97 which generally show that the items are found to be internally consistent.

Table-3. Reliability test results with Cronbach's alpha

No.	Description of the title of the questions	Number of items	Cronbach's alpha
1	Contribution of school leadership practices	7	0.962
2	Curriculum management	8	0.964
3	Creating conducive school environment	10	0.977
4	Challenges of school leadership practices	7	0.736
Average reliability result		32	0.909

Cronbach's alpha coefficient normally ranges between 0 and 1. George and Mallery (2003) provide the following rules of thumb: “ $\alpha > 0.9$  – Excellent,  $\alpha > 0.8$  – Good,  $\alpha > 0.7$  – Acceptable,  $\alpha > 0.6$  – Questionable,  $\alpha > 0.5$  – Poor and  $\alpha < 0.5$  – Unacceptable”. It is noted that an alpha of (0.91) is reasonable good to use the question for the research.

After the pilot test was conducted and modifications were made to answer the research questions raised for the sample selected respondents, the researcher went through series of data gathering procedures. The expected relevant data were gathered by using questionnaire, interview and document analysis. First, the researcher visited the selected sample Woreda education office and discussed the purpose of the research showing the letter of cooperation from Haramaya University and asks the Woreda education office to write a letter to secondary schools which found in their Woreda. Then the researcher visit the secondary schools supervisors, principals, vice-principals, department heads and teachers by showing the cooperation letters from the University and the Woreda education Office then later their copies distributed to each selected sampled respondents and clarifying the objective of the research.

After they agree on the issue, the final questionnaires were administered to sample principals, department heads, vice principals and teachers within the selected schools. The participants were allowed to give their own answers to each item independently as needed by the researcher. They were closely assisted and supervised by the data collectors to solve any confusion regarding to the instruments. Finally, the questionnaire was collected back after ten days by data collectors from the respondents at the right appointment. The interviewees were conducted after participants' individual consent on the issue by researcher for half hour using manually for three secondary school supervisors in their cluster office and document analysis by using check list.

### **3.7. Methods of Data Analysis**

The method of data analysis used in this study was both quantitative and qualitative in nature. The analysis of the data was based on the responses collected through questionnaire, interview and document analysis. The data collected through questionnaire from school leadership (principals, vice principals and department heads) and teachers by the use of closed-ended were organized, tabulated and analyzed using percentage, frequency, mean and independent t-test using SPSS version 20 to check whether there was significance difference on the preferences of response or not.

The data was analyzed by using percentage and frequency counts to interpret the background of the respondents. Mean was used for organizing, interpreting and summarizing sets of numerical data collected by Likert type scales in the questionnaire. Mean was generally considered as the best measures of a sample record on a particular measure (Aron et al., 2008). The t-test was also used to test whether there is any significant difference happened in responses of the two groups (Teachers and School leadership) in terms of a given items in titled of the practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in secondary schools of Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne. In such a way that t-critical (1.99), degree of freedom (83), alpha level of 0.05 was used for comparison of the various respondent opinions.

On the other hand, the qualitative data collected through semi-structured interview, open ended questions and document analysis were analyzed using narration in the way it

supplement the quantitative analysis. The qualitative analysis was done as follows. First, organizing and noting down of the different categories were made to assess what types of firmly may come through the instruments to collect data with reference to the research questions and finally the results were triangulated with the quantitative findings. A five point Likert Scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree were used for the sake of showing and interpretation of the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process. Accordingly, the mean values were categorized as  $1.00 \leq 1.49$ , it was interpreted as strongly disagree, 1.50-2.49, it was interpreted as disagree, 2.50-3.49, it was interpreted as undecided, 3.50-4.49, it was interpreted as agree and 4.50-5.00, it was interpreted as strongly agree implementation of the items (Rosemary, 2003).

For the case of analysis strongly agree and agree indicate effective implementation of each item in the school that means school leadership well practiced in improving teaching-learning process and undecided presents neither positive nor negative agreement. Similarly, strongly disagree and disagree indicates ineffective implementation of the items in the task. On the other hand, for the curriculum management, creating conducive school environment and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process five point scales ranging from very low to very high problem was used for the sake of interpretation. The mean values of each item were interpreted based on the terms of reference forwarded by Fowler (1996) as indicated below:  $1.00 \leq 1.49$  as very low, 1.50-2.49 as low, 2.50-3.49 as moderate, 3.50-4.49 as high and 4.50-5.00 as very high problem of the items were used.

### **3.8. Ethical Considerations**

In planning a research work involving human participants, is important to consider the ethical guidelines designed to protect the participants (Best and Khan, 2003). Hence, in this study a particular consideration was given to ethical principles that were developed by different researchers. First, the researcher visited the selected sample Woreda education office and discussed the purpose of the research showing the letter of cooperation from Haramaya University and asks the Woreda education office to write a letter to secondary schools in order to get the permission of data collection from the participants. Participates in the study was voluntary and anonymity was assured. Then informed that all data were treated as confidential

and only the research would have access to the data collected. Consent was given to participate with the return of the questionnaire. Thus, as much as possible effort was made by considering ethical issues in conducting research at all.

## **4. RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS**

This chapter deals with data presentation, analysis and interpretation of gathered from the respondents through questionnaires, interviews and document analysis. Thus, the quantitative as well as qualitative analysis of data was incorporated into this chapter. The qualitative part is complementary to the quantitative analysis. Hence, the qualitative data includes the data gathered through interviews, open ended question and document analysis

A total of 89 questionnaires were distributed to 50 teachers and 39 school leadership (28 department heads, 7 principals, and 4 vice principals). The return rate of the questionnaire was 85 (95.51%) specifically, 48 (96%) from teachers and 37 (94.87%) from department heads, principals and vice principals. Moreover, three secondary school supervisors were interviewed.

To examine the difference of the views of the two groups of respondents (teachers and school leadership) up on the practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process, an independent sample t-test has been conducted. Accordingly, if a calculated value is greater than 0.05 significant levels, there is no significance difference between the views of the two groups of respondents, while the calculated value is less than 0.05 significant values, there is significant difference between the views of the two groups of respondents.

The chapter consists of two sections. The first section deals with the characteristics of the respondents and the second section presents the analysis and interpretation of the main data.

### **4.1. Characteristics of the Respondents**

The respondents were asked to indicate their background information. The details of the characteristics of the respondents are given in table 4 below.

Table 4. Responses on Characteristics of the Respondents

No.	Variables	Category of variables	Respondents					
			Teachers		School leadership		Supervisors	
			No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	Sex	Male	32	66.7	34	91.89	3	100
		Female	16	33.3	3	8.10	-	-
		Total	48	100	37	100	3	100
2	Education level or qualification	Diploma	-	-	-	-	-	-
		BA/BED/BSC	46	95.8	37	100	2	66.7
		MA/MSc	2	4.2	-	-	1	33.3
		Others	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Total	48	100	37	100	3	100
3	Area of specialization	Subject major	48	100	37	100	2	66.7
		EDPM	-	-	-	-	1	33.3
		Others	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	Total work experience	5 and below 5 years	7	14.58	1	2.7	1	33.3
		6-10 years	25	52.08	15	40.5	-	-
		11-15 years	10	20.83	18	48.6	2	66.7
		16-20 years	4	8.33	3	8.1	-	-
		21 and above years	2	4.17	-	-	-	-
	Total	48	100	37	100	3	100	

The respondents of the study were teachers and school leadership. They were asked to indicate their background information. The details of the responses were given in table 4 and discussed as follows:

In item 1 of Table 4 above, the study revealed that, the majority of the questionnaire respondents 32 (66.7%) of teacher respondents and 34 (91.89%) of school leadership (principals, vice principals and department heads) were males. Additionally, 100% secondary school supervisors were males.

Item number 2 in Table 4 concerning their educational qualification the majority, 46(95.8%) of teacher respondents and 37 (100%) of school leadership (principals, vice principals and department heads) respondents had first degree of BA/BSC/BED holders. Regarding secondary school supervisors the majority of them 2 (66.7%) were first degree holders. Yet, the education and training policy suggests that teachers at the secondary schools level ought to have a minimum of first degree (MoE 2010). The implication, thus, is that these teachers were in a position to provide the required level of quality training and might have a better understanding of the issue under investigation and in turn might provide adequate and right responses to the items presented to them.

As contrary to this, without well qualified the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process will be threatened Mc Ewen, (2003). However, as the criteria on blue print, of teachers or school leadership development program (MoE, 2010) has stated that the academic qualification required for secondary school leadership is a master's degree regarding educational leadership and management.

As indicated under item 3 of Table 4, with regard to the respondents area of specialization, almost all of teachers 48 (100%), 37 (100%) of school leadership (principals, vice principals and department heads) and the majority 2 (66.7%) secondary school supervisors were subject major specialized. Accordingly, all of the teachers were academic subject area graduates and achieved the standard set by MoE (2010). But the majority of the schools were not headed by professional due to almost all of the school leadership were subject area graduates and this has its own impact on the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process like; lack of planning skills, lack of adequate knowledge about school leadership and lack of organizing the school community in improving teaching-learning process. In relation to this, Hallinger and Murphy (1987) suggested that lack of knowledge in managing curriculum and instruction determine the school leadership practices.

With respect to item 4 of Table 4, the work experiences of the majority of respondents, 25 (52.08%) of teachers had 6-10 year of teaching experience and 15 (48.6%) of school leadership (principals, vice principals and department heads) had 11-15 years of leadership experiences. On the other hand 2 (66.7%) of the secondary school supervisors had 11-15 years of work experience. Supporting to this ideas, Hoy and Miskel, (2001) the practices of school leadership influence could be measured through their qualifications, training and experience they have in leadership activity in improving teaching-learning and their experience to delegate authorities and provision of teachers' freedom to do their duties independently.

Therefore, it would be also possible to conclude that respondents possessed relatively adequate qualification; service years, experiences and professional specialization understand the questionnaire and give appropriate information regarding to the practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process.

## **4.2. Analysis of the Practices and Challenges of School Leadership in Improving Teaching-Learning Process**

The analysis was based on the responses of teachers and school leadership (department heads, principals and vice principals) from questionnaire relevant to this study. The questions centered on the views of respondents about the practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process. To assess the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in the sampled schools; teachers, principals, vice principals and department heads respondents were asked to rate to what extent do you agree or disagree the items.

### **4.2.1. Analysis of the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning**

The responses given were organized under three major practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process like: the contribution of school leadership practices in developing and achieving the vision and mission of school, curriculum management and creating conducive school environment. Furthermore, the data obtained through open-ended questionnaire, semi-structured interviews and document analysis were used to substantiate the findings.

Table 5. The Practices of School Leadership in Developing and Achieving the School Vision and Mission in Improving Teaching-Learning Process as Rated by Respondents

No.	The school leadership:	Respondents	N	Mean	SD	t-value	P- value																																																																																		
1	Well communicate the vision to all stakeholders	Teachers	48	2.65	0.758	-1.299	0.198																																																																																		
		School leadership	37	2.86	0.787			2	Timely allocate adequate resources	Teachers	48	2.48	0.899	0.216	0.830	School leadership	37	2.46	0.803	3	Develop missions that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school	Teachers	48	2.40	0.893	-0.307	0.760	School leadership	37	2.46	1.016	4	Frame the school missions in terms of staff responsibilities	Teachers	48	2.00	0.684	-1.090	0.187	School leadership	37	2.35	1.23	5	Design the strategies to achieve the mission of the school	Teachers	48	2.02	0.758	-1.340	0.184	School leadership	37	2.24	0.760	6	Develop a set of annual school-wide goals	Teachers	48	2.69	0.949	0.591	0.556	School leadership	37	2.57	0.899	7	Use students performance results to develop the school missions	Teachers	48	2.04	0.967	-1.669	0.099	School leadership	37	2.38	0.861	Average mean		Teachers	48	2.33				School leadership	37
2	Timely allocate adequate resources	Teachers	48	2.48	0.899	0.216	0.830																																																																																		
		School leadership	37	2.46	0.803			3	Develop missions that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school	Teachers	48	2.40	0.893	-0.307	0.760	School leadership	37	2.46	1.016	4	Frame the school missions in terms of staff responsibilities	Teachers	48	2.00	0.684	-1.090	0.187	School leadership	37	2.35	1.23	5	Design the strategies to achieve the mission of the school	Teachers	48	2.02	0.758	-1.340	0.184	School leadership	37	2.24	0.760	6	Develop a set of annual school-wide goals	Teachers	48	2.69	0.949	0.591	0.556	School leadership	37	2.57	0.899	7	Use students performance results to develop the school missions	Teachers	48	2.04	0.967	-1.669	0.099	School leadership	37	2.38	0.861	Average mean		Teachers	48	2.33				School leadership	37	2.47											
3	Develop missions that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school	Teachers	48	2.40	0.893	-0.307	0.760																																																																																		
		School leadership	37	2.46	1.016			4	Frame the school missions in terms of staff responsibilities	Teachers	48	2.00	0.684	-1.090	0.187	School leadership	37	2.35	1.23	5	Design the strategies to achieve the mission of the school	Teachers	48	2.02	0.758	-1.340	0.184	School leadership	37	2.24	0.760	6	Develop a set of annual school-wide goals	Teachers	48	2.69	0.949	0.591	0.556	School leadership	37	2.57	0.899	7	Use students performance results to develop the school missions	Teachers	48	2.04	0.967	-1.669	0.099	School leadership	37	2.38	0.861	Average mean		Teachers	48	2.33				School leadership	37	2.47																							
4	Frame the school missions in terms of staff responsibilities	Teachers	48	2.00	0.684	-1.090	0.187																																																																																		
		School leadership	37	2.35	1.23			5	Design the strategies to achieve the mission of the school	Teachers	48	2.02	0.758	-1.340	0.184	School leadership	37	2.24	0.760	6	Develop a set of annual school-wide goals	Teachers	48	2.69	0.949	0.591	0.556	School leadership	37	2.57	0.899	7	Use students performance results to develop the school missions	Teachers	48	2.04	0.967	-1.669	0.099	School leadership	37	2.38	0.861	Average mean		Teachers	48	2.33				School leadership	37	2.47																																			
5	Design the strategies to achieve the mission of the school	Teachers	48	2.02	0.758	-1.340	0.184																																																																																		
		School leadership	37	2.24	0.760			6	Develop a set of annual school-wide goals	Teachers	48	2.69	0.949	0.591	0.556	School leadership	37	2.57	0.899	7	Use students performance results to develop the school missions	Teachers	48	2.04	0.967	-1.669	0.099	School leadership	37	2.38	0.861	Average mean		Teachers	48	2.33				School leadership	37	2.47																																															
6	Develop a set of annual school-wide goals	Teachers	48	2.69	0.949	0.591	0.556																																																																																		
		School leadership	37	2.57	0.899			7	Use students performance results to develop the school missions	Teachers	48	2.04	0.967	-1.669	0.099	School leadership	37	2.38	0.861	Average mean		Teachers	48	2.33				School leadership	37	2.47																																																											
7	Use students performance results to develop the school missions	Teachers	48	2.04	0.967	-1.669	0.099																																																																																		
		School leadership	37	2.38	0.861			Average mean		Teachers	48	2.33				School leadership	37	2.47																																																																							
Average mean		Teachers	48	2.33																																																																																					
		School leadership	37	2.47																																																																																					

As can be seen from item 1 of Table 5 which is concerned with the practices of school leadership in communicating well the vision to all stakeholders in improving teaching-learning process. The mean value of teachers and school leadership were rated at 2.65 and 2.86 respectively, which were responded to undecided. This implies that, the respondents were unable to make decision regarding the practices of the school leadership towards communicating the vision of the school to stakeholders by the school leadership in the secondary schools of Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne. To cross-check the responses were obtained through questionnaire responses of the interviewed supervisors of the sample secondary schools explained:

*Communicating the school vision to the stakeholders during reporting annual school plan once at the end of academic year Mulo Woreda Supervisor response; give awareness about the school vision to the stakeholders during community conferences three times in a year Sebeta Awas Woreda Supervisor response. But Sululta Woreda Supervisor said that communicating the school vision to the stakeholders during school improvement plan preparation once in three years.*

The researcher observed document analysis from minutes of the selected sampled secondary schools in four secondary schools (Tefki, Awash Melka, Kura kemele and Sagno Gabiya secondary schools) communicate the school vision to the stakeholders twice a year but three secondary schools (Chancha Aba Gada, Gorfu, and Derba secondary schools) communicated only once during preparation of three years school improvement plan communicating the school vision to the stakeholders. From the above data obtained from semi-structure interviews of supervisors and document analysis implies that the practices of school leadership well communicated the school vision to the stakeholders in order to improving teaching-learning process. The calculated t-value (-1.299) is lower than the table value (1.99) at p-value  $0.198 > 0.05$  which denotes that there is no statistically significant mean difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents.

In line with the above analysis communicating the vision to stakeholders Mulfold (2008) emphasizes the school leadership should work hard with stakeholders including the whole staff by communicating the vision of the school through establishing a strong sense of overall purpose in improving teaching-learning of the school collaboratively. According to Day, et al.

(2010), school leadership has very strong and clear vision, which heavily influenced their actions and the actions of others and established a clear sense of direction and purpose for the school. These were shared widely, clearly understood and supported by all staff. In relation to this, Murphy (1990) stated that communicating vision to the stakeholder is a force that provides purpose, meaning and significance to the school improvement and creates commitment for the staff that contributes to the realization of the school leadership practices in improving teaching-learning process.

With regard to item number 2 of Table 5, this focuses on identifying whether the school leadership timely allocates adequate resources for the effective implementation of a school vision and mission in improving teaching-learning process. Accordingly, the mean values 2.48 and 2.46 were obtained from teachers and school leadership responses respectively which show that respondents interpreted as disagreement. In the same manner, the calculated t-result (0.216) was less than the table value (1.99) at p value (0.830) which is greater than 0.05. This showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents. As contrary to these issues, Day (2007) explained that school leadership as facilitators of collaboration who identify and allocate adequate resources for the effective implementation of a school vision and mission.

Concerning item 3 of Table 5, which states that the school leadership develop missions are easily understood and used by teachers in the school in improving teaching-learning process. In line with this, the mean values of the responses were 2.40 and 2.46 respectively which shows respondents interpretation as disagreement in related to the practices of school leadership developing missions that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school in improving teaching-learning process. The calculated t- value (-0.307) is lower than the t-critical value (1.99) at (p 0.760>0.05) this implies that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the response groups in rating the items. This indicated that the practices of school leadership were not successful to properly developing missions that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school in improving teaching-learning process. Regarding to this, data acquired from document analysis from minutes of school improvement committee showed that, the majority of the school leadership was not practice developing the

missions that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school in improving teaching-learning process.

As can be seen from item 4 of Table 5, the practices of school leadership frames school mission in terms of staff responsibilities in improving teaching-learning process. Accordingly, the mean score of teachers and school leadership 2.00 and 2.35 respectively which were perceived as in disagreement level. This revealed that the practices of school leadership were not well framed school mission in terms of staff responsibilities. The computed t-value (-1.090) is lower than the t-critical value (1.99) at  $p(0.187) > 0.05$  which denotes that there is no significant difference between the idea of the two groups of respondents. From the interviewed three supervisors were selected from sampled woredas regarding to the practice of school leadership frames school mission in terms of staff responsibilities in improving teaching-learning process explained as follows:

*The school leadership frames the school mission in terms of staff responsibilities in improving teaching-learning process that are easily translated in to action according to the objectives of the school (Mulo Woreda Supervisor response). But the rest two supervisors responded that the school leadership frame school mission in terms of staff responsibilities in improving teaching-learning process not practiced well in the school due to lack of commitment (Sebeta Awas Woreda Supervisor response) and lack of training (Sululta Woreda Supervisor) response regarding to the frame of the school mission.*

As contradicts to the above ideas, Latip (2006) stated that framing the school missions refers to the practices of school leadership in determining the area on which the school staff was focus their attention and resources during a given school year. Hence one can recognize from the above analysis the practices of school leadership frame the school missions in terms of staff responsibilities low practiced in improving teaching-learning process.

As indicated in item number 5 of Table 5, which focuses on the practices of school leadership with respect to design the strategies to achieve the mission of the school in improving teaching-learning process. The mean values of teachers and school leadership 2.02 and 2.24 respectively which were viewed as disagreement level. The result obtained from the calculated

t-value (-1.34) is lower than the table value (1.99) at ( $p = 0.184 > 0.05$ ) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two group of respondents.

Item 6 of Table 5 sought to identify whether the school leadership develop a set of annual school-wide goals focused on improving teaching-learning process. The mean values 2.69 and 2.57 by teachers and school leadership responses respectively which were within the scope of undecided. This revealed that both respondents unable to make decision in relation to the practices of school leadership develop a set of annual school-wide goals focused on improving teaching-learning process. The data explained in open ended questions the practices of school leadership were relatively well effective in developing a set of annual school-wide goals which focused on improving teaching-learning process.

In connection to the responses obtained from open ended questions all of the three interviewed supervisors explained that “The school leadership developed a set of annual school-wide goals with the collaboration of department heads, SIP committee and supportive staff.” The calculated t-value (0.591) is lower than the table value (1.99) at ( $p = 0.556 > 0.05$ ) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two group of respondents.

As it can be expressed in items 7 of Table 5, which states that the practices of school leadership used students performance results to develop the school missions in improving teaching-learning process. The analyzed mean values 2.04 and 2.38 were obtained from teachers and school leadership responses respectively which incline towards disagreement. The result obtained from the calculated t-result (-1.669) is lower than the table value (1.99) at ( $p = 0.099 > 0.05$ ) this denotes that there is no significant mean difference between the two group of respondents. Based on the result from the data gained analyzed, the practices of school leadership were not use students’ performance results regarding to developing the school missions in improving teaching-learning process.

In general, from the above assessment and the interview of secondary school supervisors’ responses were made, the researcher identified five commonly observed practices of the contribution of school leadership in developing and achieving the school vision and mission in improving teaching-learning process that occurred in secondary schools of Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne indicated disagreement. The results were presented and ranked

below according to the average mean values and the interview results of the respondents were ranked as follows:

Designing the strategies to achieve the school mission,

Framing the school missions in terms of staff responsibilities,

Using students' performance results to develop the school missions,

The missions were easily understood and used by teachers and

Adequate resources were timely allocated for the effective implementation of a school vision and mission in improving teaching-learning process.

Table 6. The practices of Curriculum Management by the School Leadership in Improving Teaching- Learning process as Rated by Respondents

No.	The school leadership:	Respondents	N	Mean	SD	t-value	P- value
1	Coordinate the curriculum evaluation process of the school	Teachers	48	2.60	0.962	-0.937	0.352
		School leadership	37	2.78	0.750		
2	Check periodically curriculum implementation	Teachers	48	2.08	0.739	-2.126	0.367
		School leadership	37	2.43	0.765		
3	Advice teachers regarding the curriculum	Teachers	48	2.33	0.996	-0.732	0.466
		School leadership	37	2.49	0.901		
4	Help teachers to evaluate curriculum	Teachers	48	2.37	1.018	0.090	0.928
		School leadership	37	2.25	0.753		
5	Ascertain the effectiveness of teaching-learning program	Teachers	48	2.48	0.945	-0.034	0.973
		School leadership	37	2.49	1.017		
6	Ensure the timely allocation of resources	Teachers	48	2.38	1.084	-0.135	0.893
		School leadership	37	2.41	0.956		
7	Regularly talk with parents	Teachers	48	2.38	0.890	0.613	0.541
		School leadership	37	2.27	0.608.		
8	Provide the teaching-learning results to teachers in a report form	Teachers	48	3.50	1.185	0.048	0.237
		School leadership	37	3.78	0.947		
Average mean		Teachers	48	2.52			
		School leadership	37	2.61			

Curriculum management in improving teaching-learning process was one of the major functions of the practices of school leadership involved in to educational issues. It basically refers to the practices of school leadership activities providing opportunity for staff to collaborate for the alignment of curriculum contents and achievement in improving teaching-learning process. In this relation, eight questions were administered to gather the opinions of teachers and school leadership concerning the practices of curriculum management by the school leadership in improving teaching-learning process of their respective schools.

While responding to item 1 of Table 6, the practices of school leadership in coordinating the curriculum evaluation process of the school to address problems related to improving teaching-learning process. The mean value of teachers and school leadership response 2.60 and 2.78 respectively which were moderate level of performance according to the perception of teachers and school leadership in the sampled secondary schools. Moreover, the computed t-value (-0.94) was below the table value (1.99) at (P 0.35 >0.05). These verify that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups. The data obtained from the interviewed supervisors from the selected three secondary schools revealed that the practices of school leadership coordinate the curriculum evaluation process of the school to address problems related to improving teaching-learning process and explained:

*The strong and weak side of the curriculum was evaluated and reported twice a year by the teachers and the coordinator of school leadership at the end of first semester and second semester (Mulo Woreda Supervisor response). On the other hand, school principal prepared school curriculum (text book) evaluation format in order to identify the problems of the curriculum content by teachers (Sebeta Awas Woreda Supervisor response). By the coordination of department heads in the school, discussion was held about the strong and weak side of the curriculum (text book) and finally the result was reported to the school (Sululta Woreda Supervisor response).*

Most of the document analysis from minutes of curriculum committee from the discussion of the selected secondary schools revealed that curriculum evaluation implemented only once in Gorfu secondary schools among the seven selected secondary schools in the Zone. Secondary school leadership was low performed in coordinating the curriculum evaluation process of the school to address problems related to improving teaching-learning process.

As can be seen from item 2 of Table 6, the practices of school leadership related to periodically checking curriculum to ensure the effective implementation of teaching-learning process. The mean score obtained from teachers and school leadership was 2.08 and 2.43 respectively, which was found to be low performance level regarding the practices of school leadership in periodically checking curriculum in order to ensure the effective implementation of teaching-learning process. The computed t-value (-2.126) is less than the table value (1.99) at (P 0.36 >0.05) confirms that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

As it is indicated in item 3 of Table 6, practices of school leadership advice teachers regarding the curriculum in relation to the improvement of teaching-learning process. The mean value of teachers and school leadership 2.33 and 2.49 respectively, both groups had perceived the practices of school leadership advice teachers regarding the curriculum in relation to the improvement of teaching-learning was rated as low level of performance. The computed t-value (-0.732) is less than the table value (1.99) at (P 0.47 >0.05) confirms that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups. The interviewed from secondary schools supervisors explained:

*Advice teachers' regarding the curriculum in relation to the improvement of teaching-learning process was not well trained and only revealed paper value Mulo Woreda Supervisor interviewed response. However; the interviewed from Sebeta Awas Woreda Supervisor explained that advising teachers regarding the curriculum in relation to the improvement of teaching-learning process only at the beginning of first semester. According to Sululta Woreda Supervisor interviewed school leadership advising and giving comment to individual teachers regarding the curriculum in relation to the improvement of teaching-learning only during internal supervision.*

The data obtained from open ended questions related to advice teachers regarding the curriculum indicated that most of the respondents' responses revealed that school leadership had not regular time of advising teachers regarding the curriculum in improving teaching-learning process. As contradicts to the above data analysis, Adeolu (2012) stated that, the practices of school leadership should advice teachers regarding the curriculum to ensure periodic review and facilitate further improvement in their teaching-learning process.

As the data Table 6 indicated in the item 4, the practices of school leadership helping teachers to evaluate curriculum in order to improving teaching-learning process. The mean values of the teachers and school leadership 2.37 and 2.25 respectively which were perceived as low performance level. This revealed that helping teachers to evaluate curriculum were not well implemented by the school leadership in the secondary schools of Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne. The calculated t-result (0.09) is less than the table value (1.99) at (P 0.928 >0.05) confirms that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups. In connection to this, the data obtained from document analysis from minutes of curriculum committee discussion (Department heads) in the seven selected secondary schools indicated that, no written document was mentioned in the minutes that showed school leadership helping teachers to evaluate curriculum in improving teaching-learning process.

As item 5 of Table 6, the practices of school leadership ascertain the effectiveness of teaching-learning program showed that, teachers and school leadership rated the mean values 2.48 and 2.49 respectively were performed at low level. The computed t-value (-0.034) is less than the table value (1.99) at (P 0.973 >0.05) confirmed that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

As can be observed from item 6 of Table 6, the practices of school leadership ensured allocation of resources timely in improving teaching-learning process. The mean value obtained from teachers and school leadership 2.38 and 2.41 respectively, which shows that respondents' interpretation as low performances with respect to the practices of school leadership ensured allocation of resources timely in improving teaching-learning process. The computed t-value (-0.135) is below the table value (1.99) at (P 0.893 >0.05) this confirmed that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses from teachers and school leadership. As contrary to this, in order to improving teaching-learning process allocation of resources timely must be available like, stationery and instructional aides are important for the culture of achieving instructional objectives (Chisolm and Vally, 1996).

As depicted in item 7 of Table 6, the practices of school leadership regularly talk with parents regarding the improvement of teaching-learning process. Teachers and school leadership

mean values 2.38 and 2.27 respectively which were viewed as rated at low perception. Since the calculated t-result (0.613) was lower than the table value (1.99) at (P 0.541 >0.05) significance level. So, there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents. Based on the above analysis, the practices of school leadership were not regularly held a discussion with parents regarding the improvement of teaching-learning process in effective way.

Supporting this finding, there were no minutes that show the practices of school leadership regularly held discussion with parents regarding the improvement of teaching-learning process in most secondary schools during document analysis. As oppose to the above finding, McEwen (2003) has precisely pointed out that the practices of school leadership communicate teaching-learning process to parents through published documents, parent conferences, narratives and portfolios that give a holistic picture of student strengths and weaknesses.

According to item 8 of Table 6, practices of school leadership provided the teaching-learning results to teachers in a report form. The mean scores values of teachers and school leadership 3.50 and 3.78 respectively which were rated under highly performed. The calculated t-value (0.048) is less than the table value (1.99) at (P 0.237 >0.05) confirms that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups. This confirmed that the practices of school leadership provided the teaching-learning results to teachers in a report form were effectively implemented. In line with this above data, the information obtained from interview of supervisors showed:

*The teaching-learning process results were introduced to the teachers on the staff meeting regarding to the practices of school leadership Sebeta Awas Woreda Supervisor response. The school leadership provided the teaching-learning process results to teachers in a report form twice in a month Sululta Woreda Supervisor response and Mulo Woreda Supervisor explained that school leadership provided the teaching-learning results to teachers in a report form after internal supervision during staff meeting.*

In general, from the above respondents responded that the researcher identified the top five commonly indicated were found to be under low level of performance on practices of

curriculum management by the school leadership in improving teaching-learning process were ranked as follows:

Checking periodically curriculum implementation,

Regularly talking with parents,

Helping teachers to evaluate curriculum to ensure allocation of resources timely,

Advising teachers regarding to the curriculum and

Ascertain the effectiveness of teaching-learning program.

Table 7. The Practices in Creating Conducive School Environment by School Leadership as Rated by Respondents

No	The School Leadership:	Respondents	N	Mean	SD	t-value	P- value
1	Create conducive environment in which school and parents are working together	Teachers	48	2.10	0.881	-2.954	0.154
		school leadership	37	2.65	0.789		
2	Create positive environment in which good working relationship exists among staff	Teachers	48	2.33	0.781	-1.459	0.148
		school leadership	37	2.45	0.865		
3	Carry out advocacy work to make school conducive for improving teaching-learning	Teachers	48	2.27	0.818	-0.310	0.757
		school leadership	37	2.32	0.747		
4	Provide support in building collaborative cultures among teachers	Teachers	48	2.23	1.016	-1.361	0.177
		school leadership	37	2.27	0.870		
5	Encourage a culture of trust between teachers and students	Teachers	48	2.46	0.945	0.828	0.410
		school leadership	37	2.32	1.002		
6	Encourage teachers to collaborate with surrounding schools for experience sharing	Teachers	48	2.13	0.914	0.089	0.929
		school leadership	37	2.11	0.809		
7	Making classroom conducive for improving teaching-learning	Teachers	48	3.31	1.133	0.695	0.489
		school leadership	37	3.11	1.577		
8	Provides guidance and counseling services to student	Teachers	48	2.08	0.895	1.257	0.212
		school leadership	37	2.32	0.852		
9	Use different recognition or reward system	Teachers	48	1.92	0.895	-3.040	0.348
		school leadership	37	2.49	0.804		
10	Organize professional skill development opportunity for all staff	Teachers	48	2.17	0.834	-0.759	0.450
		school leadership	37	2.32	1.082		
Average mean		Teachers	48	2.31			
		School leadership	37	2.44			

As it is revealed that in item 1 of Table 7, respondents were asked to reflect on the practices of creating conducive school environment by school leadership in which schools and parents are working together in improving teaching-learning process. The analyzed mean value 2.10 and 2.65 was obtained from teachers and school leadership responses which showed that respondents interpretation as rated at low and moderate performance respectively in connection to the practices of school leadership creating conducive environment in which school and parents were working together. The calculated t-value (-2.954) is lower than the table value (1.99) at (P 0.154 >0.05) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. In supporting the above teachers' responses, the interviewed supervisors' suggested that:

*School leadership did not create conducive environment in which school and parents were working together in improving teaching-learning due to lack of school leadership commitment Mulo Woreda Supervisor response; lack of community interest working together with the school Sebeta Awas Woreda Supervisor response and lack of support of the school leadership from government body to aware the parent about the ownership of the school Sululta Woreda supervisor response.*

As it has been shown in item 2 of Table 7, the practices of school leadership which focused on creating positive environment in which good working relationship existed among staff in improving teaching-learning process. The analyzed mean values 2.33 and 2.45 which were found from teachers and school leadership respondents respectively which showed that respondents' interpretation at low performance level in relation to the practices of school leadership focused on create positive environment in which good working relationship existed among staff in improving teaching-learning process. With the same manner the calculated t-value (-1.459) is less than the table value (1.99) at p value 0.148>0.05 which refers to that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents'.

As can be seen from item 3 of Table 7, the practices of school leadership carry out advocacy work to make school conducive for improving teaching-learning process. The mean value obtained from teachers and school leadership 2.27 and 2.32 respectively. This shows that the practices of school leadership were performed this activities at low level of success. This showed that carrying out advocacy of work to make school conducive for improving teaching-

learning process did not effectively implemented by the school leadership in the secondary schools of Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne. The computed t-value (-0.310) was lower than the t-critical (1.99) at (p-value  $0.757 > 0.05$ ) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. In line with this, the data obtained from open ended question the practices of school leadership did not advocated well school environment conducive in improving teaching-learning process.

As it is indicated in item 4 of Table 7, the practices of school leadership which focus on provide support in building collaborative cultures among teachers in improving teaching-learning process. The result of teachers and school leadership response mean values 2.23 and 2.27 respectively which were perceived at low performance level. The result obtained from the calculated t-value (-1.361) is lower than the table value (1.99) at (p  $0.177 > 0.05$ ) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

As it can be observed from the data in item 5 of Table 7, the practices of school leadership encourage a culture of trust between teachers and students in improving teaching-learning process. The analyzed mean values 2.46 and 2.32 were found from teachers and school leadership respectively, which were viewed in low performance. The result obtained from the calculated t-value (0.828) is lower than the table value (1.99) at (p  $0.410 > 0.05$ ) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two group of respondents.

As it is illustrated in item 6 of Table 7, which the practices of school leadership encourage teachers to collaborate with surrounding schools for experience sharing in improving teaching-learning process. The analyzed mean values obtained from teachers and school leadership 2.13 and 2.11 respectively were perceived as low performance level. The result obtained from the computed t-value (0.089) is lower than the t- table value (1.99) at (P  $0.929 > 0.05$ ) this denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

With regard to item 7 of Table 7, this focuses on the practices of school leadership making classroom conducive in improving teaching-learning process. The analyzed mean values 3.31 and 3.11 were obtained from teachers and school leadership responses respectively, which were perceived as moderately performed. The result obtained from the calculated t-value (0.695) is lower than the table value (1.99) at (p  $0.489 > 0.05$ ) this denotes that there is no

significant difference between the teachers and school leadership of respondents. However, the data obtained from interviewed supervisors explained that;

*The practices of school leadership were making classroom conducive in improving teaching-learning was implemented effectively by using school internal income budget (Mulo Woreda Supervisor response), using school grant for making classroom conducive (Sebeta Awas Woreda Supervisor response), making classroom conducive by using the budget of school grant and generating internal income by different mechanisms (Sululta Woreda Supervisor response).*

As can be seen from item 8 of Table 7, which focused on whether the practices of school leadership provided guidance and counseling services to student in improving teaching-learning process. The teachers and school leadership mean values 2.08 and 2.32 respectively were perceived as low performance level. The computed t-value (-1.257) is below the table value (1.99) at (P 0.212 > 0.05) confirms that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses from teachers and school leadership. This implied that the practices of school leadership were not providing guidance and counseling services to student in improving teaching-learning process according to their school needs. In relation to the above result, the data obtained from open ended question in majority of selected secondary schools indicated that the school leadership did not provide guidance and counseling services to students in improving teaching-learning due to school leadership overburdened different work activities and shortage of time.

Concerning on item 9, the practices of school leadership use different recognition or reward system for greater improvement of teaching-learning process. The analyzed mean values 1.92 and 2.49 were found from teachers and school leadership respectively, which were perceived as low performance. This revealed that the system was not building strong sense of competition between teachers with teachers and students with students in improving teaching-learning process. The result obtained from the computed t-value (-3.040) is lower than the table value (1.99) at (p 0.348 > 0.05) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two group of respondents.

As can be seen from item 10, which sought to identify whether the practices of school leadership organize professional skill development opportunity for all staff in improving teaching-learning process. The mean value from teachers and school leadership were 2.17 and 2.32 respectively, which were perceived as low performance level. The result obtained from the computed t-value (-0.759) is less than the table value (1.99) at  $P = 0.450 > 0.05$  which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

In connection to the above idea, the document analysis from training minutes shows less on giving workshops and internal training to meet the training needs of teachers, ability to develop criteria's and definite steps to aid teachers professional growth as well as they do not create in-service training for a spirit of cooperative working atmosphere. But training is an important aspect in developing and increasing the human efficiency in order to attain the desired objectives. In relation to this, in schools, it is one of the school leadership duties together with other concerned bodies to create favorable situations for school community to have training to carry out their activities effectively (Wudu, 2003).

In general, from the above results of the findings, the researcher identified eight commonly responded low performance level on practices of creating conducive school environment by the school leadership in improving teaching-learning process were ranked as follows: Encouraging teachers to collaborate with surrounding schools for experience sharing, Providing guidance and counseling services to student, Providing support in building collaborative cultures among teachers, Use different recognition or reward system, Organizing professional skill development opportunity for all staff, Creating conducive environment in which school and parents were working together, Creating positive environment in which good working relationship exists among staff and encouraging a culture of trust between teachers and students.

#### **4.2.2. Analysis of the major challenges of school leadership practices in improving teaching- learning process**

The respondents were asked to rate some of the possible challenges that may hinder the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process that were presented by

researcher and their response were analyzed in the following table as follows: Range of the practices of school leadership barriers in improving teaching-learning can be listed depending on the context to which each sampled schools were exposed. However, with the exception of some particularities, most of the challenges that hinder the practices of school leadership in the zone were common to every school.

Therefore, the study had dealt with some of the major challenges supposed was seriously affect the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process. Seven groups of challenges were selected for the inquiry namely; lack of in-service training and school leadership development program in improving teaching-learning, lack of cooperation and commitment with stakeholder in improving teaching-learning, lack of planning skill in improving teaching-learning, lack of resource in improving teaching-learning, lack of adequate knowledge about school leadership in improving teaching-learning, lack of organizing the school community in improving teaching-learning and unwillingness to devote more time in improving teaching-learning.

Table 8. Major Challenges of School Leadership Practices in Improving Teaching-Learning Process as Rated by Respondents

No.	Items	Respondents	N	Mean	SD	t-value	P-value
1	Lack of in-service training	Teachers	48	3.17	1.478	0.460	0.647
		school leadership	37	3.03	1.258		
2	Lack of cooperation with stakeholder	Teachers	48	3.56	1.320	-0.478	0.634
		school leadership	37	3.59	1.279		
3	Lack of planning skill	Teachers	48	3.71	0.988	0.135	0.893
		school leadership	37	3.68	1.248		
4	Lack of resource	Teachers	48	3.08	1.366	-1.002	0.319
		school leadership	37	3.38	1.320		
5	Lack of adequate knowledge about school leadership	Teachers	48	3.67	1.117	-0.253	0.801
		school leadership	37	3.73	1.170		
6	Lack of organizing the school community	Teachers	48	3.63	1.196	-0.086	0.931
		school leadership	37	3.65	1.317		
7	Unwillingness to devote more time	Teachers	48	3.33	1.243	-0.831	0.408
		school leadership	37	3.57	1.345		
	Average mean	Teachers	48	3.45			
		school leadership	37	3.52			

As can be seen from item 1 of Table 8, which indicated lack of in-service training in improving teaching-learning process. The response from teachers and school leadership with mean value of 3.17 and 3.03 respectively was rated as moderately challenged the practices of school leadership related to lack of in-service training in improving teaching-learning process. The computed t-value is (0.460) which is less than the critical t-value (1.99) at p value ( $P 0.647 > 0.05$ ) with degree of freedom 83 implies that there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

As contrary the above ideas the information from demographic background showed that almost of the school leadership had never got any training especially principals, supervisors and vice principals regarding to leadership because most of them 39 (97.5%) specialized by academic subject matter than school leadership. However, Sergiovanni (2001) stated that the conceptual, technical and human skills are among the most important components of skill that school leadership has possessed in improving teaching and learning process.

In Ethiopian context, although an attempt has been made to make the school administration system professionalized, still a lot remain to be done, particularly in the area of in-service training and development program. In line to this, MoE (2010) as cited in ESDPV in which states efficient school leadership was established in order to enhance the quality of instruction and thereby improving learning achievement.

As it can be seen from the data related to item 2 of Table 8, major challenges of school leadership practices related with lack of cooperation with stakeholder in improving teaching-learning process. The teachers and school leadership mean value 3.56 and 3.59 respectively, which were rated as highly challenged the practices of school leadership in relation to lack of cooperation with stakeholder in improving teaching-learning process. The calculated t-value (-0.478) is less than the critical value (1.99) at P- value  $0.634 > 0.05$ . This implies that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

In relation to this, the data obtained from interviews held with school supervisors were lack of cooperation with stakeholder in improving teaching-learning process explained as:

*Lack of support from woreda education bureau was one of the challenges that hindered the practices of school leadership cooperation with stakeholder in improving teaching-learning (Mulo Woreda Supervisor response); work load of school leadership hindered their practices cooperation with stakeholder in improving teaching-learning (Sebeta Awas Woreda Supervisor response) and lack of stakeholder interest working with school leadership improving teaching-learning (Sululta Woreda Supervisor response).*

However, according to Bell (2003) the cooperation of school community and parents could be available in improving teaching-learning process.

As explained in item 3 of Table 8, this focused on lack of planning skills in improving teaching-learning process. The response from teachers and school leadership with mean values of 3.71 and 3.68 respectively, which were rated as highly challenged the practice of school leadership regarding to lack of planning skills in improving teaching-learning process. The computed t-value (0.135) is less than the critical t-value (1.99) at the p-value ( $0.893 > 0.05$ ) with degree of freedom 83. This shows that there is no statistical difference between the two groups of respondents. But according to Muijs (2003) school leadership should have the practices of planning skills in improving teaching-learning process.

As one can see from the data in item 4 of Table 8, concerning to lack of resource in improving teaching-learning process. The response from teachers and school leadership with mean value of 3.08 and 3.38 respectively, which were rated as moderately challenged the practices of school leadership in connection to lack of resource in improving teaching-learning process. The computed t-value (-1.002) is less than the critical t-value (1.99) at the p-value ( $0.319 > 0.05$ ) with degree of freedom 83. This shows that there is no statistical difference between the two groups of respondents. By supporting the above results, Bush and Bell, (2003) assert, shortage of highly educated work force is found as critical problems of those economically advanced countries, while scarcity of resource for more investment in education has created a dividing line between those developed and developing nations in the world.

As it can be seen from item 5 of Table 8, the other challenges which deal with lack of adequate knowledge about school leadership in improving teaching-learning process. The teachers and school leadership mean value 3.67 and 3.73 respectively, which were rated as

highly challenged the practices of school leadership regarding to lack of adequate knowledge in line with leadership in improving teaching-learning process. The calculated t-value (-0.253) is less than the critical value (1.99) at P- value  $0.801 > 0.05$ . This implies that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

As indicated in the item 6 of Table 8, the other challenges which deals with lack of organizing the school community in improving teaching-learning process. Accordingly, teachers and school leadership mean value 3.63 and 3.65 respectively, which were rated as highly challenged regarding to the practices of school leadership lack of organizing the school community in improving teaching-learning process. The calculated t-value (-0.086) is less than the critical value (1.99) at P- value  $0.931 > 0.05$ . This implies that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

As depicted in item 7 of Table 8, the challenges of school leadership unwillingness to devote more time in improving teaching-learning process. The mean values of teachers and school leadership 3.33 and 3.57 which were rated as moderately and highly challenged respectively the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process. The computed t-value (-0.831) is less than the critical t- table value (1.99) and the p-value ( $0.408 > 0.05$ ) with degree of freedom 83. This shows that there is no statistical difference between the two groups of respondents. In supporting the responses of school leadership mentioned above, most of the secondary schools interviewed supervisors explained that the practices of school leadership did not devote more time in improving teaching-learning process rather than administrative issues. This showed that the practice of school leadership needed much effort to improve for better teaching- learning process.

In general, from the above findings the researcher identified commonly observed the major challenges that hindered the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in secondary schools of Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne were ranked as follows: lack of adequate knowledge about school leadership, lack of planning skill, lack of organizing the school community, lack of cooperation with stakeholder, lack of resource and lack of in-service training.

## **5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This chapter deals with the summary of major findings, the conclusion drawn from the findings and recommendations that the researcher suggests to improve the teaching-learning practices and challenges of school leadership in secondary schools of Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne.

### **5.1. Summary**

The main purpose of this study was to assess the practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in secondary schools of Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne. To this end, an attempt was made to assess the practices of school leadership and barriers to their practices in improving teaching-learning process. Finally, the study came up with suggestions and forwarded recommendations. In order to achieve the objectives of the study, the following basic questions were posed and answered:

1. What are the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in the secondary schools of Oromia special zone surrounding Finfinne?
2. What is the extent of curriculum management by the school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in secondary schools of Oromia special zone surrounding Finfinne?
3. What is the extent of creating conducive school environment by the school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in the secondary schools of Oromia special zone surrounding Finfinne?
4. What are the major challenges faced the school leadership practices in improving teaching-learning process in the secondary schools of Oromia special zone surrounding Finfinne?

In order to get answers for the above basic questions, the study was carried out in seven secondary schools that were selected by availability sampling techniques. The study incorporated a total of 92 respondents (50 teachers and 42 school leadership) in the study. Among the school leadership three secondary school supervisors were interviewed. The remaining 50 teachers' and 39 school leadership were asked to respond the questionnaire. From 89 questionnaires that were distributed to 50 teachers and 39 school leadership only 85

were completed and returned to the researcher (48 teachers and 37 school leadership). In addition, to supplement the information gathered through questionnaire, the interviews were undertaken with three secondary school supervisors and also information from document analysis is used as supplementary as planned. Finally, the data were carefully collected, coded and presented for analysis. In the study, different data analysis tools such as mean values, average mean values, and an independent sample t-test for comparing means were used. According to the result of data analysis, the following major findings were identified.

### **Characteristics of the respondents**

Regarding to the characteristics of the respondents, most teachers and school leadership in secondary schools are males. The researcher, therefore, found that males dominated secondary schools of Oromia Special Zone Surrounding Finfinne in both teaching and school leadership. This implies that women participation practices in improving teaching-learning process in the leadership positions are low.

With respect to educational qualification, the result shows that most school leadership holds first degree. But, the educational qualification of school leadership was found to meet the standard set by the MoE, (2010) master's degree for secondary schools. The secondary school leadership (especially principals, vice principals and supervisors) in Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne, however, has lacked an appropriate qualification (master's degree in school leadership). In addition, most of school leadership was not specialized in the area of leadership other than academic subject in order to improving teaching-learning. From the analysis made so far, majority of schools were not headed by professional. This, therefore, can negatively influence the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning.

### **The practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process**

Majority of the responses of respondents believed that the overall judgment practices of school leadership in developing and achieving the vision and mission of the school indicated disagreement related to design the strategies to achieve missions of the school, frame the school missions in terms of staff responsibilities, use students performance results to develop the school missions, developing the missions that are easily understood and used by teachers

and timely allocate adequate resources for the effective implementation of a school vision and mission in improving teaching-learning. In addition to this, the reports of document analysis such as minutes and different checklists supported that, the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process was implemented ineffectively.

However; the remaining activities were well communicated the vision to all stakeholders and develop a set of annual school wide goals were perceived as agreed in improving teaching-learning process which indicates both groups of respondents (Teachers and School leadership).

### **Practices of curriculum management by the school leadership in improving teaching-learning process**

The data obtained from teachers and school leadership showed that the practices of school leadership in curriculum management in improving teaching-learning process were indicated that low practiced related to checking periodically curriculum implementation, regularly talk with parents, ensure the timely allocation of resources, help teachers to evaluate curriculum, advising teachers regarding the curriculum and ascertaining the effectiveness of teaching-learning program which implies that ineffectively implemented. In contrast, some respondents viewed the overall practices of school leadership in curriculum management high performance level regarding to coordinating the curriculum evaluation process of the school to address problems and provided the teaching-learning results to teachers in a report form.

### **Practices in creating conducive school environment by the school leadership in improving teaching-learning**

Data obtained from respondents revealed that the overall perception on the practices of school leadership in creating conducive school environment in improving teaching-learning process rated as low practice related to creating conducive environment in which school and parents were working together, provide support in building collaborative cultures among teachers, encourage a culture of trust between teachers and students, encourage teachers to collaborate with surrounding schools for experience sharing, making classroom conducive, provides guidance and counseling services to student, use different recognition or reward system for greater improvement of teaching-learning, organize professional skill development

opportunity for all staff and create positive environment in which good working relationship exists among staff.

In connection to this carry out advocacy working to make school conducive and making classroom conducive in improving teaching-learning process rated as high performance level of implementation.

### **Challenges of school leadership practices in improving teaching-learning**

The findings show that the major challenges of school leadership practices in improving teaching-learning process were identified: lack of adequate knowledge about school leadership, lack of planning skill, lack of organizing the school community, lack of cooperation with stakeholder, lack of in-service training and lack of resource in improving teaching-learning process.

## **5.2. Conclusions**

The following conclusions were drawn from the results of analysis and summary of the major findings made above.

With respect to educational qualification, the result showed that most of the school leadership had not master degree in their respective schools in secondary schools of Oromia Special Zone Surrounding Finfinne. In addition, most of school leadership specialized in the area of academic subject rather than leadership in order to improving teaching-learning process. From this, one can conclude that most of the secondary schools in Oromia Special Zone Surrounding Finfinne were not headed by professionals. As a result, the school leaders were incompetent in providing school leadership practices in improving teaching-learning process.

Most of the result of the analysis revealed that the practices of school leadership did not implement well communicate the vision to all stakeholders, timely allocation of adequate resources, develop mission that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school, frame the school mission in terms of staff responsibility and design strategies to achieve mission of the school effectively. From this, it can be concluded that the practices of school

leadership in developing and achieving the school vision and mission in improving teaching-learning process was low.

The findings showed that most of the practices of curriculum management by the school leadership in improving teaching-learning process related to check periodically curriculum implementation, regularly talk with parents, help teachers to evaluate curriculum, ensure the timely allocation of resources, advice teachers regarding the curriculum and ascertain the effectiveness of teaching-learning program were not well implemented among secondary schools of Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne. Therefore, it can be concluded that the school leadership low practiced curriculum management in order to improving teaching-learning process.

The findings of the study showed that the practices of school leadership were low practiced in creating conducive school environment like encourage teachers to collaborate with surrounding schools for experience sharing, provides guidance and counseling services to student, provide support in building collaborative cultures among teachers, use different recognition or reward system, organize professional skill development opportunity for all staff, created conducive environment in which school and parents are working together, create positive environment in which good working relationship exists among staff and encourage a culture of trust between teachers and students. Therefore, it can be concluded that the school leadership did not practice in the study area in the way that addressed in improving teaching-learning process in the selected secondary schools of Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne.

Lastly, the study identified various possible challenges of school leadership practices in improving teaching-learning process including: lack of in-service training, lack of cooperation with stakeholder, lack of planning skill, lack of resource availability and allocation, lack of adequate knowledge about school leadership, lack of organizing the school community and unwillingness to devote more time. According to this study, it can be concluded that the challenges of school leadership practices have a major impact in improving teaching-learning process.

### **5.3. Recommendations**

Based on the findings, the following recommendations were made:

The finding of the study showed that the school leadership low practiced regarding to frame the school mission. Therefore, the researcher recommended that secondary schools leadership frame school mission through creating effective communication channels such as educational conference, meetings, seminars and workshops to parents, school communities and stakeholders and display the mission of the school in a visible place on the school compound.

As the finding indicated, the school leadership low practiced timely allocation of adequate resources for the effective implementation of school vision and mission in improving teaching-learning process. Therefore, it was recommended that, secondary school leadership should timely allocate the necessary resources for the improvement of teaching-learning process like students' reference book and different teaching aid materials like laboratory equipment which found in the market and mobilizes community participation so as to solve budget deficit.

As the finding showed that, lack of resource hinders the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process. To solve such problem the researcher recommended that secondary school leadership especially principals, vice principals and supervisor should facilitate educational conference and bazar at least once in a year that will increase resources collaborate with surrounding community, woreda education bureau, woreda administrative and local NGO's in order to strengthen their practices in improving teaching-learning process.

From the findings of the study it was concluded that, lack of cooperation of school leadership with stakeholders become one of the challenges that hinders the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process. Therefore, the researcher recommended that school leadership should cooperate with stakeholders in order to improving teaching-learning process by encouraging collaboration and creating a sociable environment as well as create strong school-community relationships for the success of their practices.

The finding of the study revealed that, the practices of school leadership devote most of their time to administrative tasks, rather than teaching-learning process (supporting and supervising

teaching-learning process). Therefore, it is recommended that, school leadership increase the amount of time allocated for improving teaching-learning process by minimizing kebele meeting and other activities like participating in farmer supporting because teaching-learning is the heart of improving students' academic achievement.

As the finding of the study indicated that, the practices of school leadership encourage teachers to collaborate with surrounding schools for experience sharing in improving teaching-learning process was not satisfactory. Therefore, it is advisable that secondary school leadership should facilitate experience sharing with surrounding schools in order to encourage teachers in improving teaching-learning process.

From the findings it can be concluded that the school leadership low practiced in regarding to; use students performance results to develop the school mission, checked periodically curriculum implementation, advised teachers regarding the curriculum, organize professional skill development opportunity for all staff, carried out advocacy work to make school conducive and use different recognition or reward system in order to building the capacity of school leadership practices in improving teaching learning process. Therefore, it can be recommended that the secondary school leadership should design the strategies like experience sharing by creating good relationship with surrounding secondary schools which have good experiences or practices related to the issues.

The Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne education bureau and Woreda education offices should regularly supervise secondary schools leadership to provide professional support, as well as to give direction and guidance to fill the skill gaps of their practices in improving teaching-learning process.

The study found that most of the school leadership (principals, vice principals and supervisors) were not qualified to the required level (master degree in school leadership) that the area requires. The researcher recommended that Oromia Regional Education Bureau in collaboration with Ministry of Education should provide the chance to secondary school leadership in order to promote their academic level to enable them strengthen their knowledge and skills in improving teaching-learning process.

Most of the school leadership who has been leading the sampled secondary schools was subject specialists who have not attended any training related to school leadership in improving teaching-learning process. This has its own impacts on the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process. Therefore, the researcher strongly recommended that regional education bureau in collaboration with Ministry of Education should facilitate on-job and off-job trainings in wide range like postgraduate diploma in school leadership and MA in school leadership in relation to leadership.

## 6. REFERENCES

- Abiyi Zegeye, Alemayehu Worku, Daniel Tefera, Melese Getu and Yilma Silashi.2009. Introduction to research methods .Graduate studies and research office: Addis Ababa University
- Adams, J., Khan, H. T. A., Raeside, R. and White, D. 2007. Research method for graduate business and social science students. USA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Adeolu, 2012. Assessment of Principal's Supervisory Role for Quality Assurance in Secondary Schools in Ondo State, Nigeria.
- Alemu Labecha.2014. The role of school leadership in improving teaching-learning building organizational climate of secondary school. (AAU, Unpublished MA Thesis).
- Aron, A., Aron, E. N. and Coups, E. J. 2008.*Statistics for the behavioral and social Sciences*.(4<sup>th</sup>ed.). Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Alexandria, Virginia USA.
- Ash, R.C. and Persall, J.M. 2000. The principal as chief learning officer: *developing teacher leaders*. NASSP Bulletin, 84(616): 15–22.
- Beare, H., Caldwell, B., & Millikan, R. 1989. Creating an Excellent School. London: Routledge.
- Bennis, W. and Nanus, B. 1985. Leaders, New York, Harper and Row.
- Best, J.W. and Khan, J.W. 2003. Research in Education. (New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India). Pvt.Ltd.
- Blasé, J. and Blasé, J. 2000. Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: teacher perspective. Educational Administration Quarterly, 35(3): 349-378.
- Blase, C. 1999. Social psychology and management. Buckingham: Open University Pres.
- Bryce .1983.Leadership Instructional educational (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). London: SAGE Publications.
- Bush,T. and Bell, L. 2003. The principles and practice of educational management. London: Pall-Chapman publishing.
- Chell, J. 1991. Introducing principals to the role of instructional leadership. SSTA Resource Center: 95-14.
- Chisholm, L. and Vally, S. 1996. The culture of learning & teaching in Gauten schools: report of the Committee on the culture of learning & teaching Johannesburg, Educational policy Unit, University of the Witwatersrand.

- Clayton, H. 1999. Creating an effective vision for primary school. In Davies, Band Ellison (3eds). Managing the effective primary school. England:-Longman.
- Creswell, J. W. and Planoclark, V. 2007. Designing and conducting mixed methods research. USA: Saga publication, Inc.
- Day, C. 2007. The Impact of School Leadership on Pupils' Outcomes: Institute of Education: University of London.
- Day, et al. 2010. Ten strong claims about effective school leadership. Nottingham: National College for leadership of school and children's services.
- Dimmock, C. 2000. Principals and school restructuring: conceptualizing challenges as dilemmas. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 37 (5): 441-462.
- Fowler, J. 1996. Introduction to statistics. A non-parametric Approach for the social sciences. New york, John Willy.
- Fullan, M. and Hargreaves, A. 1991. Teacher development and educational change. New York: Falmer.
- Fullan, M. 2001. The new meaning of educational changes. (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: Rutledge Falmer.
- Gay, L. R., and Iranian, P. 2003. Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications (7th ed.) .Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., and Airasian, P. 2006. Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications (8th ed.) .Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- George, D. and Malley, P. 2003. Calculating, Interpreting, and Reporting Cronbatch's Alpha Reliability Coefficient for Likert Scales. Middle West Research to Practice Conference in Adult, continuing, and Community Education, p. 87-88.
- George, E. and Peter, F. 2008. The Leader's New Work: *Building Learning Organizations*. Sloan Management Review.
- Gherkin, N. 1991. Developing Teachers' Leadership Skills. ERIC Digest ED330691.
- Glickman, C. 2004. Supervision and instructional leadership: development approach. Boston: Person University Press.
- Harris, A. 2003. Effective Leadership for School Improvement. New York: Rutledge Flamer.
- Hallinger, P. and Heck, R. 1998. Exploring the Principal's Contribution to School Effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9 (2):157-191.
- Heck, D.A. 2006. The Power of Gentleness. Educational leadership.

- Hollinger, M. and Murphy, F. 1985. *Assessing and developing principal leadership*. Englewood Cliffs NG: Prentice Hall.
- Hollinger, M. and Murphy, F. 1987. *Assessing and developing principal leadership*. Englewood Cliffs NG: Prentice Hall.
- Hopkins.D. 2001. *Instructional Leadership and School Improvement*. In Harris et al. (2nd eds). *Effective Leadership for School Improvement*. Rutledge Flamer.
- Hoy, W.K & Miskel, C.G. 2001. *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice*, New Jersey: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Katzenmeyer, M. and Moller, G. 2001. *Awakening the Sleeping Giant: Helping Teachers to Develop as Leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Kruger, A. G. and et al. 2002. *School management international and external environment. Study Guide*. UNISA, Pretoria.
- Krug, S.1992. *Instructional leadership: a constructive perspective*. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28(3), 430-443
- Latip, M .2006. *Pelaksanaan Kepemimpinan Pengajaran di kalangan pengetua sekolah di Negeri Selangor darul ehsan*. Tesis doctor falsafah, Fakulti pendidikan, Bangi Unikessiti keban gsaan Malaysia.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D. and Steinbach, R. 1999. *Changing leadership for changing Times*. Philadelphia: Open University Press, 101(1): 35–61.
- Leithwood, K. et al .2006. *Successful School Leadership: What it is and how it influences pupil learning (Report Number 800)*, NCSL/Department for Education and Skills.
- Lockheed, M. and Verspoor, A. 1991. *Improving Primary Education in Developing Countries*. London: Oxford.
- Marks, M., Helen and Susan, M., Printy. 2003. *Principal leadership and school performance: an international and instructional leadership*. *Educational Leadership Quarterly*, 39 (3): 370-397.
- Marzano, R. 2005. *What works in schools: Translating Research in to Action*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- McEwen, E.K. 2003. *Seven steps to instructional leadership*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.
- McLaughlin, M. W. and Talbert, J. E. 2007. *Building Professional Learning Communities in High Schools: Challenges and Promising Practices in Professional Learning*

- Communities: Divergence, Depth and Dilemmas. Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.
- Million Melesa .2001. An Assessment on the Status of School Based Instructional Supervision in Secondary Schools of West Arsi Zone of Oromia Region. Addis Ababa University: Ethiopia. (Unpublished Master's Thesis).
- MoE .1994. *Education and Training Policy*: Federal Democratic Republic Government of Ethiopia. (1<sup>st</sup> ed), Addis Ababa. St. George Printing Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2002. Responsibility and practices of school principal. Unpublished Material.
- \_\_\_\_\_.2005. Education sector development program III (Addis Ababa). Retrieved from <http://www.globalpartnership.org/medi>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2006. Decentralized Management of Education in Ethiopia: A reference manual. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. The school improvement program (Blue Print). Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010. School Improvement Program Guidelines Final Draft. Improving the quality of Education and Student Results for All Children at primary and Secondary Schools. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008. Review of the Ethiopian Education and Training Policy and its implementation: Executive Summary. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008. General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP). Ethiopia, Addis Ababa.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2015. Education Sector Development Program V (ESDP V). Program action plan. Ethiopia, Addis Ababa.
- Murphy,W. 1986. The Unheroic side of leadership: Notes from the swamp. Phi Delta Kappan, 69,654-659.
- Murphy, J. 1990. Principal Instructional Leadership. Advances in Educational Administration CB: Changing *Perspective on the school*: 163200. AA: USAID. Pam.
- Mulfold, B. 2008. The Leadership Challenge: Improving Learning in Schools. .Australia: ACER Press.
- OREB. 2016. Educational Statistics Annual Abstract. Oromia, Ethiopia.
- Peter, S. M. 1990. The Leader's New Work: Building Learning Organizations. Sloan Management Review.

- Price, w. 2007. Independent study in to school leadership: Main report retrieved on 9. 10 2007: Retrieved from <http://www.des.gov.uk/research/data/> up load files /RR 818 A.pdf.
- Pont, B., Nusche, D. and Moorman, H. 2008. Improving School Leadership, 1: *Policy and Practice*, Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.
- Purkey, S.C., and Smith, M.S. 1985. School reform: The district policy implications of the effective schools literature. *The Elementary School Journal*, 85(3), 341-89.
- Rosemary, R. 2003. Calculating, Interpreting and Reporting Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient for Likert-Type scales. The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Rule, S.D. and John, M.K. 2011. Organizational behavior (7<sup>th</sup> ed). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Sergiovanni, T.T. 2001. The principal ship: a Reflective practice perspective (4th ed). London: Allyn and Bacon.
- Teck Hong,T., and Waheed,A.2011.Herzberg's motivation –hygiene theory and job satisfaction in the Malaysian :The mediating effect of love of money *Asian Academy of management Journal*, vol.16, No.1, 73-94.
- Townsend, T. 1997. What Makes School Effective? A Comparison between Schools Communities in Australia and the USA: *School Effectiveness and School Improvement* 8(3), 311-326.
- UNESCO. 2010. Education for All Global Monitoring Report. Paris: UNESCO.
- Waters, etal.2003. Leadership That Sparks Learning. *Educational Leadership*, 61 (7), 48-51.
- Weber, W. B. 1996. From Quarterback to Coach, From Actor to Director. *Educational Leadership*, 48(8): 35-40.
- West, K. Burnham. 1998. The changing role of the principal: View from the inside. *Planning and Changing*, 29, 130-150.
- William, G. C. 1977. Sampling techniques (3rd ed.). Canada: John Willey and Sons Inc.
- Wudu, Melka. 2003. The Contribution of School Curriculum Committee in Facilitating and Coordinating Curriculum Implementation and Improvement in Secondary Schools of Amhara Region. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Addis Ababa University School of graduate studies.
- Yalew Endawoke.1998. Basic research implementation. Bahair Dar. Alpha printing Enterprise. Ethiopia.

Yonas Kebede. 2015. A comparative study of school leadership roles in improving teaching-learning some selected government and Catholic secondary school. (AAU, Unpublished MA Thesis).

ZEDAR .2016. Zone Educational Department Annual Report. Oromia Special Zone Surrounding Finfinne

## **7. APPENDICES**

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY**  
**POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE**  
**College of Education and Behavioral Sciences**  
**Department of Educational Planning and Management**

**PART ONE**

A questionnaire to be filled by Teachers and School leadership (Principals, Vice principals and Department Heads).

The main purpose of this questionnaire is to collect relevant data for the study entitled “practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning process in secondary schools of Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne.” You are, therefore kindly requested to fill the questionnaires by providing the necessary information on the issues related to the study. The success of this study depends on your honest and genuine responses. The information that will be obtained from the responses to these questionnaires will be used only for the purpose of the study. All the information will be kept confidential and will be used only for the academic purpose. This questionnaire will approximately take 30 minutes to complete. Once you have completed the questionnaire, please return to the data collectors.

Please note the following points before you start filling the questionnaires:

1. You do not need to write your name on the questionnaire papers;
2. Read all the instructions before attempting to answer the questions;
3. You can consult the data collector whenever necessary;
4. Please provide appropriate responses by using a tick mark “✓” to choose one of the suggested Likert scale and write your opinion briefly by writing for the short answer questions on the space provided.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation!!

## PART TWO

### I. Background Information of the Respondents

Give response by putting (✓) in the appropriate box for each closed ended items and by giving brief descriptions showing your opinion for open ended questions. Every response has to be based on your school context.

1. Name of the school \_\_\_\_\_
2. Woreda \_\_\_\_\_
3. Your role in the school: Teacher  Dept. head  Principal  Vice principal
4. Sex: Male  Female
5. Level of education or qualification:  
 Diploma  B.A/BED/BSc Degree  M.A/MSc Degree  other,  
 specify \_\_\_\_\_
6. Area of specialization or field of study:  
 Subject Major  EDPM/ Pedagogical Science  Other, specify \_\_\_\_\_
7. Total work experience or service year:  
 5 and below years  6-10 years  11-15 years  16-20 years  21 years and above

### PART THREE

Below are tables that consist of items that show the practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning of your school. Each Table contains five responses. Please indicate the extent to which each statement represents your school by putting tick mark (√) in one of the boxes in front of each item. Every response has to be based on your school context.

#### A. Closed ended Items

Use the following scales to indicate your level of agreement. Strongly agree(SA)=5; Agree (A)=4; Undecided(UD)=3; Disagree(D)=2; Strongly disagree(SD)=1

I. Items Related to the practices of school leadership in developing and achieving the school vision and mission of the school in improving teaching-learning

	Items	Rating Scales				
		SA	A	UD	DA	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
	The school leadership :					
1	Well communicate the vision to all stakeholders in improving teaching-learning					
2	Timely allocate adequate resources for the effective implementation of a school vision and mission in improving teaching-learning					
3	Develop missions that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school in improving teaching-learning					
4	Frame the school missions in terms of staff responsibilities in improving teaching-learning					
5	Design the strategies to achieve the missions of the school in improving teaching-learning					
6	Develop a set of annual school-wide goals focused on improving teaching-learning					
7	Use students performance results to develop the school missions in improving teaching-learning					

## II. Items Related to Practice Curriculum Management by School Leadership in Improving Teaching-Learning

Please rate each item, using the (1-5) scales that best describes the degree to which the availability in your school.

The numbers indicated: very high=5, high=4, moderate=3, low =2, very low=1

No.	Items	Rating Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
	The school leadership :					
1	Coordinate the curriculum evaluation process of the school to address problems related to improving teaching-learning					
2	Check periodically curriculum in order to ensure the effective implementation of teaching-learning					
3	Advice teachers regarding the curriculum in relation to the improvement of teaching-learning					
4	Help teachers to evaluate curriculum in order to improving teaching-learning					
5	Ascertain the effectiveness of teaching-learning program in achieving school goals					
6	Ensure the timely allocation of resources (human, material and financial) necessary for teaching-learning improvement process					
7	Regularly talk with parents regarding the improvement of teaching-learning					
8	Provide the teaching-learning results to teachers in a report form					

### III. Items Related to Practices Creating Conducive School Environment by the School Leadership in Improving Teaching-Learning

Please rate each item, using the (1-5) scales that best describes the degree to which the availability in your school.

The numbers indicated: very high=5, high=4, moderate=3, low =2, very low=1

No	Items	Rating Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
	The school leadership :					
1	Created conducive environment in which school and parents are working together in improving teaching-learning					
2	Create positive environment in which good working relationship exists among staff in improving teaching-learning					
3	Cary out advocacy work to make school conducive for improving teaching-learning					
4	Provide support in building collaborative cultures among teachers in order to improving teaching-learning					
5	Encourage a culture of trust between teachers and students in improving teaching-learning					
6	Encourage teachers to collaborate with surrounding schools for experience sharing					
7	Making classroom conducive for improving teaching-learning					
8	Provides guidance and counseling services to student in improving teaching-learning					
9	Use different recognition or reward system for greater improvement of teaching-learning					
10	Organize professional skill development opportunity for all staff					

#### IV. Items Related to Challenges of School Leadership in Improving Teaching-Learning

The following issues are assumed to be the common challenges of schools that hinder the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning. The five point scales indicated below reflect the degree of availability each challenge in your school. Please rate each item, using the (1-5) scales that best describes the degree to which the challenges are availability in your school.

The numbers indicated: very high=5, high=4, moderate=3, low =2, very low=1

No	Items	Rating Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Lack of in-service training in improving teaching-learning					
2	Lack of cooperation with stakeholder in improving teaching-learning					
3	Lack of planning skill in improving teaching-learning					
4	Lack of resource in improving teaching-learning					
5	Lack of adequate knowledge about school leadership in improving teaching-learning					
6	Lack of organizing the school community in improving teaching-learning					
7	Unwillingness to devote more time in improving teaching-learning					

**B. Open ended questions**

1. What do you think of the practices of school leadership in improving teaching-learning?

---

2. How does the school leadership manage curriculum and teaching-learning in improving teaching-learning?

---

3. How does the school leadership create conducive school environment in improving teaching-learning?

---

4. What do you think of the major challenges that the school leadership face in improving teaching-learning in your school?

---

5. What solutions do you suggest to improve the challenges face school leadership in improving teaching-learning?

---

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!!

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY**  
**POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE**  
**College of Education and Behavioral sciences**  
**Department of Educational Planning and Management**

**Interview Guide for Secondary School Supervisors**

The purpose of this interview is to collect data for the study entitled “the practices and challenges of school leadership in improving teaching-learning in secondary schools of Oromia special Zone surrounding Finfinne”. Your responses are vital for the success of the study. So you are kindly requested listen to all the questions and give genuine response. Be sure that your responses will be used only for academic purpose.

**Part I: General Information and Personal Data**

1. Name of the school \_\_\_\_\_ Woreda \_\_\_\_\_
2. Sex: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Age: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Level of educational or qualification: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Area of specialization or field of study: \_\_\_\_\_
6. Experience: As teacher \_\_\_\_\_ as supervisor \_\_\_\_\_ as department head \_\_\_\_\_ as principal \_\_\_\_\_ as vice principal \_\_\_\_\_ total experiences \_\_\_\_\_

**Part II: Interview Guide Questions**

Please respond to these interview questions based on your experiences as secondary school supervisor in your school

1. As a school supervisor, what is your contribution in improving teaching-learning?
2. As a school supervisor, how did you manage curriculum in the school in improving teaching-learning?
3. As a high school supervisor, how did you create positive environment in which good working relationship between school communities in improving teaching-learning?
4. What are the major challenges that hinder your practices as school supervisor in improving teaching-learning?
5. What mechanisms have been taken to overcome such challenges?

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY**  
**POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE**  
**College of Education and Behavioral Sciences**  
**Department of Educational Planning and Management**

**Document Analysis Checklist would Conduct Based on the Following School Documents**

No.	Items	Availability	
		Yes	No
1	Vision and mission document developed by the school leadership in order to improving teaching-learning		
2	Minutes that shows the discussion of school leadership practices in improving teaching-learning		
3	Regular checklist of school leadership in managing curriculum in improving teaching-learning		
4	Documents and regular schedule that show classroom observation made by the school leadership and feedback given for teachers on academic issues in improving teaching-learning		