

**PRACTICES AND CHALLENGES OF SECONDARY SCHOOL  
LEADERSHIP IN BABILE WOREDA, EASTERN HARARGE ZONE**

**MA THESIS**

**AHMEDNASIR ABRAHIM**

**SEPTEMBER 2020**

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY, HARAMAYA**

**Practices and Challenges of Secondary School Leadership in Babile  
Woreda, Eastern Hararge Zone**

**A Thesis Submitted to Department of the Educational Planning and  
Management**

**Postgraduate Program Directorate  
HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY, HARAMAYA**

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
MASTER OF ART (EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND MANAGE-  
MENT)**

**Ahmednasir Abraham**

**September 2020**

**Haramaya University, Haramaya**

# HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY

## POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMS DIRECTORATE

I hereby certify that I have read and evaluated this Thesis entitled “Practices and Challenges of Secondary School Leadership in Babile Woreda, Eastern Hararge Zone, Oromia Region.” prepared under my guidance by Ahmednasir Abraham. I recommend that it be submitted as fulfilling the thesis requirement.

1. **Dr. Feyera Dinsa**  
Major Advisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature                      Date

2. **Dr. Augustine Sesay**  
Co-Advisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signatur                      Date

As members of the Board of Examiners of the MA Thesis Open Defense Examination, I certify that I have read and evaluated the Thesis prepared by Ahmednasir Abraham and examined the candidate. I recommend that the thesis be accepted as fulfilling the thesis requirement for the Degree of Master of Art (Educational Planning and Management).

3. \_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature                      Date

4. \_\_\_\_\_  
Internal Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature                      Date

5. \_\_\_\_\_  
External Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature                      Date

## **DEDICATION**

I dedicate this thesis manuscript to my lovely wife Chaltu Abdela, for her great contribution and for being dedicated partnership in the success of my life.

## STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR

By my signature below, I declare 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 the Thesis. Any scholarly matter that is included in the Thesis has been recognition through citation.

This thesis has been submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Master of Art degree at Haramaya University. The Thesis is deposited at the University Library and is made available to borrowers under 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 acknowledgement of the source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this Thesis in whole or in part may be granted 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: Ahmednasir Abraham.

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

Date of submission: September 2020

School: Educational Planning and Management.

## **BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH**

Ahmednasir Abraham, the author, was born in Babile district, Oromia Regional State, in 1979. He had completed Elementary education at Bisidimo elementary school in 1994. He pursued his secondary education and then completed at Harar Medaniaim secondary school in 1997 and joined Harar Teacher Training College. He graduated in 1999 with diploma (Social Science) and then was employed at Babile Woreda Education office; he joined Adama University in 2005, and graduated with BA degree Educational Leadership and Management In 2009. After his graduation, he worked in Babile Woreda Education office and Babile trading office until he joined Haramaya University for his postgraduate study in October 2011.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

First and foremost, I thank my **ALLAH**, who has made everything to be favorable by His almighty generosity throughout my life.

I express my deepest gratitude to my major advisor Dr. Feyera Dinsa Hundessa for his support, guidance, suggestion and encouragement throughout the development of this thesis starting from the inception of the proposal.

I would like to express my gratitude to all sampled secondary school teachers, principals, supervisors and WEOs for they provided the necessary information and support to complete the study.

I would also like to extend special gratitude to my wife, W/ro Chaltu Abdela and my three daughters Asianat, Asma and Asanti Ahmednasir for their ceaseless support and love the completion of my study would have been impossible without them.

Finally, my sincere thanks go to Dr. Augustine Sesay who assisted me in writing the drafts of the study.

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<b>EDPM</b>	Educational Planning and Management
<b>ETP</b>	Education and Training Policy
<b>MoE</b>	Ministry of Education
<b>PTA</b>	Parent Teacher Association
<b>SPSS</b>	Statistical Package for Social Sciences
<b>TGE</b>	Transitional Government Of Ethiopia
<b>UNESCO</b>	United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization
<b>WEOs</b>	Woreda Education office

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents	Page
<b>DEDICATION</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>x</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b><i>ABSTRACT</i></b>	<b>xv</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	3
1.3. Basic Research Questions	4
1.4. Objective of the Study	5
1.4.1. General objective	5
1.4.2. Specific objectives	5
1.5. Significance of the Study	5
1.6. Delimitation of the Study	6
1.7. Limitation of the Study	6
1.8. Definition of Key Terms	7
1.9. Organization of the study	7
<b>2. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 Definition of School Leadership	8
2.2. Concept of School Leadership	9
2.3. Style of School Leadership	9
2.4. The role of Educational Leadership	11
2.4.1. Strategic vision of school development	11
2.4.2. Leading	13
2.4.3. Supervision of teaching process	13
2.4.4. Relationship between a school and community	14

Continues...

2.4.5. Curriculum development	15
2.4.6. Evaluation of teachers	15
2.5. Challenges for Effectives School Leadership Practices	15
2.5.1. Internal challenges/barriers	16
2.5.2. External challenges	17
<b>3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>19</b>
3.1. Description of the Study Area	19
3.2. Research Design	19
3.3. Sources of Data	19
3.3.1. Primary sources	19
3.3.2. Secondary sources	20
3.4. Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques	20
3.4.1. Target population	20
3.4.2. Sample population and sampling techniques	20
3.5. Instruments and Procedures of Data Collection	23
3.5.1. Questionnaire	23
3.5.2. Semi-structured interview	23
3.5.3. Document analysis	24
3.6. Procedures of Data Collection	24
3.7. Methods of Data Analysis	24
3.8. Ethical Considerations	25
<b>4. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA</b>	<b>26</b>
4.1 Background Information	26
4.1.1. Personal characteristics of respondents	27
4.1. 2. Educational qualification and services year of respondents	29
4.1.3. Respondents of principals interests and assignment	32
4.2. The Leading Practices of the School Leadership	34
4.2.1. The practices of school leadership in line with school vision	34
4.2.3. Participatory Practices of School Leadership	42
4.2.4. Staff development practice of school leadership	46
4.2.4. Supervision related practices of leadership	49
4.2.6. Curriculum development practice of school leadership	55

Continues...

4.3. Challenges of Secondary school Leadership Effectiveness	58
4.3.1. Lack of qualification and experience.	58
4.3.2. Lack of cooperation and commitment for school improvement.	62
4.3.3. Lack of organizing	66
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	69
5.1. Summary	69
5.2. Conclusions	72
5.3. Recommendations	73
6. REFERENCES	76
APPENDICES	81
APPENDIX-A	81
APPEDIX-B	89
APPEDIX-C	91

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table</b>		<b>Page</b>
1.	Population, sample size and sampling techniques	23
2.	The sex and age of the respondents	28
3.	Respondents by qualification and year of services of respondents	30
4.	Interest and assignment of the school leaderships	33
5.	The practices of visionary leadership	37
6.	Planning practices of school leadership	42
7.	Staff development practice of school leadership	45
8.	Supervision related practice of school leadership	51
9.	Respondents in creating school community relationship	56
10.	Curriculum development practices of school leadership	60
11.	lack of qualification and experience of school leadership	65
12.	Lack of cooperation and commitment for school improvement	69
13.	Lack of respondents on organizing	73

# **PRACTICES AND CHALLENGES OF SECONDARY SCHOOL LEADERSHIP IN BABILE WOREDA, EASTERN HARARGE ZONE**

## ***ABSTRACT***

*The main purpose of this study was to assess the practices and challenges of secondary schools leadership of Babile Woreda. The study employed a descriptive survey method by using both qualitative and quantitative methods. Questionnaire, Semi-structured interview and document analysis were used as data gathering tools. The data were collected from 4 secondary schools in Babile Woreda which were selected by purposive sampling technique. Based on this, eighty-two teachers were selected by simple random sampling technique. Eight principals and Two Woreda Education Office Heads were selected using availability method and Twelve PTA leaders were selected by purposive sampling technique. The data were tabulated and analyzed with the help of percentage, mean, frequency, and t-test. The findings of the study revealed that educational leaders provide and communicate vision and objectives in a good manner. Moreover, lack of qualification and experience, lack of cooperation and commitment for school improvement and lack of organization were the challenges that secondary school leadership faced. In line with the above findings and conclusions it was recommended that the directives for selecting and assigning school leadership should be prepared at Regional or Zonal level and implemented at Woreda or school levels and it is important for the Babile Woreda Education office in collaboration with Babile Woreda Civil Service office to equip educational leaders with necessary knowledge, attitude and skills. The Zonal and Woreda Education Officials should arrange workshops, seminars, short and long term training in collaboration with different universities, colleges and Nongovernmental organization. Finally, schools need to think of their own income generating sources on top of government budget through improving their relationship with local Nongovernment and school communities by preparing project proposal and submit it to international donors.*

# 1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives, significance of the study, delimitation, and limitation, Organization of the study and definition of key terms.

## 1.1. Background of the Study

Education is one of the major driving forces behind economic, social, cultural and political development of a country. It is a key instrument for the overall development of a country so that it is widely recognized as indicator of development. According to UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) 2005 for instance, education improves self-esteem, empowerment, creativity and critical reflection of individuals. Since education is an investment, there is a significant positive correlation between education and socioeconomic productivity.

When people are educated, their standards of living are likely to improve. School leadership is a priority in education policy agendas in a global context. It plays a great role by improving school outcomes by influencing the motivation of teachers, parents, community and stakeholders in education (Moorman, Nusche and Pont, 2008).

School leaders play very significant role towards the success of their schools. They carry countless responsibilities (Cooley and Shen, 2010) to manage the school administration matters such as budget and time tables, students, discipline and attendance, co-curriculum activities, facilities, safety, recruitment and monitoring of teachers, assessments, curriculum, teaching and learning materials professional development (Elliott, Goldring, Murphy, and Porter, 2007), relationships with teachers and students (Quinn, 2002), and communication with parents and the surrounding community (Hornig, Klasik and Loeb, 2010). Hence, principals must have the necessary skills, knowledge and understanding in their major functions like, identifying organizational goal, developing and implementing best practices, organizing school activities identifying and solving school problem to be influential leaders in the schools.

The researcher argues that effective leadership practices of school principals play a great role in making school effective as Bush 2008) emphasizes, the quality of school principals leadership has a positive effect to improve students achievement and to make school effec-

tive. Day and Sammons (2009) described that school principals carry the leadership activities through practicing their knowledge and the required skills to influence followers to achieve common goals. Therefore, school principals are expected to improve the overall schools performance and student's achievement through effective school leadership practices

In Ethiopian context, education is highly expected to contribute for the overall development of a country. Realizing this, the government of Ethiopia is placing great attention on education with firm belief that the long term development of the country rests up on the expansion and provision of quality education ,Ethiopia (MoE, 2005).

In line with this, School leaders have a great role in working with all stakeholders to formulate a vision for the academic success of all students. Developing a shared vision around standards is an essential element of a school leader. Regarding the role of school principal Ethiopian Ministry of Education (2012) emphasizes that: The school principal is the leading professional of the school. The major role of the school principal is providing professional leadership and management for the school. This will be promoting a secure foundation from which to achieve high standards in all areas of the school's work. Therefore, school leadership is one of the most complex processes that help to influence people to achieve common goals. To be an effective leader, school principals need to have a better knowledge and the required skills of more than one leadership theory to serve their customers effectively and efficiently.

Additionally, when school principals have an adequate knowledge and skill on school leadership they are able to choose which leadership theory, model or style is appropriate to their environment. Moreover, as the major notion of leadership is to influence followers, school leaders should develop the skill of influencing others and the ability of engaging stakeholders to achieve common objectives.

In other words, of the forces affecting the school system probably is more important than the school leaders who have the responsibility for recommending change in educational activities and facilitate learning Fullan (2010) asserts that almost every single change or improvement and effectiveness of the school was rested on leadership. Regardless of this, the role to be played by educational leader is much, and great is expected from him or her because he/she is the one in a position to facilitate conditions and arrange the necessary

inputs. However, lack of training and experience, work over load, lack of teacher cooperation, Lack of Resources and school related problems are those that affect the effectiveness of school principals.

As Hopkin (2003), argue, the most important single factor in the success of schools is the quality of leadership of the head. In support of this generalization, Glover (2000) state that the quality of leadership makes the difference between the success and failure of school. Ethiopia ministry of education [MoE](1994) generalizes that although an attempt has been made to make the educational management system decentralized and professional, still a lot remains to be done particularly in the area of training and professionalizing principalship. Based on this reality and exacting related problem in the study area the researcher was initiated to study the practices and challenges of educational leadership in government secondary school of Babile Woreda East Hararghe Zone.

## **1.2. Statement of the Problem**

School leadership is a priority in education policy agendas in a global context. It plays a great role by improving school outcomes by influencing the motivation of teachers, parents, community and stakeholders in education (Moorman, Nusche and Pont, 2008).

In most cases the problem with school leadership is related to the fact that many schools leaders are not educational experts. Similarly, Hallinger (2003) suggest that in many cases school leaders have less expertise than teachers they supervise.

In Ethiopia, there are some evidences that verify the instructional leadership practice was not effective. Most of them are different in numerous ways from the current study. For example, a study by Tesfaye Nigussie (2010) entitled as “the role of instructional leadership in building organizational climate of secondary schools of Bale Zone”. These research findings generally identified the following four factors

1. Teacher resistance to change.
2. Pressure from none instructional jobs.
3. Lack of instructional feedback and lack of staff cohesiveness
4. Lack of training and inefficiency in administration are the major hindrances for unsuccessful implementation of instructional leadership secondary schools.

This study is different from the studies stated above in many ways.

**Firstly**, they focused on the role of instructional leadership but they did not say anything about the practice and challenges played by educational leaders.

**Secondly**, the methodology they emphasized was quantitative, whereas, this study is both qualitative and quantitative

Regarding the practices in the secondary school leadership of Babile woreda, since the researcher himself have been working in some of the secondary schools as supervisor and principal, he has faced a lot of challenges of instructional leadership. In addition, there are a bitter complaint from educational officials at the Woreda levels regarding the poor performance of principals in relation to their leadership responsibilities, lack of training, inefficiency and lack of commitment.

Additionally, the study conducted by Tadesse and Maeregu (2014) on the Harari Region and East Hararghe Zone schools showed that the leadership role of school leaders in managing school resources is inefficient.

However, the study does not show the practices and challenges of school leaders in terms of their leadership models as instructional or transformational. Moreover, the researcher is motivated to investigate the practices and challenges of school leadership and to suggest possible solutions to solve the problem under the study. Therefore, this study fills the gaps of the former study in relation to the practices and challenges of school leadership in Babile Woreda. In the process of the study the researcher would attempt to answer the following basic questions:

### **1.3. Basic Research Questions**

1. How are school leaders selected and assigned in secondary schools for the positions?
2. What are the current practices of school leadership in secondary school of Babile Woreda?
3. What are the major challenges that faced the secondary school leadership in the Babile Woreda?

## **1.4. Objective of the Study**

### **1.4.1. General objective**

The general objective of this study was to assess the current practices and challenges of secondary school leadership of Babile Woreda in exercising educational leadership so as to achieve the desired objectives of secondary school.

### **1.4.2. Specific objectives**

The specific objectives of this study were: to

1. Identify how secondary school leadership are selected and assigned for the positions.
2. Examine the current practices of secondary school principals.
3. Identify the major challenges that hinder the effectiveness of secondary school leadership in Babile Woreda.

## **1.5. Significance of the Study**

The statements of the problem show the gap between the intended school leadership practices and the observed actual practice of the school leadership of Babile Woreda ,East Hararge Zone. Therefore this study was expected to benefit as presented here under.

To inform educational officials of different levels: Zonal and woreda education offices about the challenges of secondary school leadership and the necessary measures to overcome the problems. It helps to create awareness about the challenges of secondary school leadership and make them to create possible solutions and to give relevant information to school leaders and teachers of secondary schools in the Woreda on practices and challenges of secondary school leadership.

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

The study tries to investigate the current of practices and challenges school leadership in secondary school of Babile Woreda East Hararghe Zone of Oromiya National Regional State. In order to make the study more manageable and feasible within the given time, it was geographically and temporally delimited to government secondary schools (9-12) of Babile Woreda. These are Babile secondary school, Babile preparatory school, Bisidimo secondary school and Bisidimo preparatory school.

The respondents were delimited to 82 teachers, 8 school leaders (4 principals and 4 vices principals), 12 PTA and 2 Woreda education office heads. The data gathering instruments were delimited to questionnaire, semi-structured interview and document review. The collected data were organized and analyzed by using quantitative and qualitative method.

Besides to the delimited scope the content of the study was delimited to practices and challenges of secondary school leadership placed under the variables such as the practices like inspiring vision, preparing school plan, curriculum and staff development and challenges related to lack of qualification and experiences, Lack of cooperation and commitment for school improvement and lack of organizing. Because leadership problems were directly or indirectly influence the quality of education.

## **1.7. Limitation of the Study**

The study was conducted on 4 selected secondary schools of Babile Woreda. There were some challenges encountered in the progress of finalizing this research. The lack of similar research works on the issue in study area impedes the researcher from dealing with more findings in the literature as well as in the discussion part. Moreover, during the process of data collection especially in interviewing, some respondents were unwilling to give information sufficiently and some individuals were busy in routine works. To overcome this limitation, the researcher made consent with the respondents through explaining, as their information is critically important for the success of this study.

## 1.8. Definition of Key Terms

**Educational leadership:** At the school level, it refers to the principal's influence on school community to set and accomplish educational objectives focusing on learning pedagogy and curriculum i.e. in diagnosing and solving problems in the teaching learning process (Dimnock, 2000).

**Principal:** The administrative head and professional leader in charge of secondary schools

**School leadership:** The term refers to the capacity to influence others to work together voluntarily in the schools (UNESCO, 2009).

**Secondary schools:** The second educational level from grade 9 to grade 12 subdivided in to two grade 9-10 and grade 11-12. Ethiopia (MoE, 1994).

## 1.9. Organization of the study

The research consists of five main chapters, Chapter one deals with the introduction part that includes background of the study, statement of the problems, objectives, and significances of the study, delimitation, limitation and operational definitions. Chapter two deals with the review of related Literature to the study, the third chapter presents the research design and methodology. Chapter four comes up with presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data. Finally, the last chapter comprises the summary, conclusions and recommendations.

## 2. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review the theoretical perspectives guiding the study and outline in greater detail the dimensions of school leadership adopted as the conceptual framework for the enquiry.

### 2.1 Definition of School Leadership

Tigist (2018) defines leadership as “a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal.” These definitions suggest several components central to the phenomenon of leadership. Some of them are: Leadership is a process, leadership involves influencing others, leadership happens within the context of a group, leadership involves goal attainment, and these goals are shared by leaders and their followers. School leadership can be defined as those actions that principals take, or delegate to others, to promote growth in students learning (the concepts learner and student will be used interchangeably).

The language of leadership has joined or rather superseded the concept of management, leading Yukl (2002) to argue that the ‘definition of leadership is arbitrary and very subjective. Some definitions are more useful than others, but there is no “correct” definition’. The many definitions and conceptualizations has resulted in the dramatic growth of research over the past 10 years in developing societies to describe and analyze educational leadership and management practices (Chen and Hallinger, 2015;) meanwhile the combined forces of information technology, globalization and knowledge-driven economy has brought upon an age of accelerations (Engelke and McNeill, 2014) catalyzing changes in schools and societies (Friedman, 2016). Educational leadership stands in the midst of these accelerations. As the environmental pressures intensify, leaders and managers require greater understanding, skills and resilience to sustain their institutions. School leadership demands high standards of academic excellence: setting high expectations for learner success; having knowledge and experience with effective teaching or instructional strategies. Glanz (2006) instructional leadership is thus about encouraging best practices in teaching. Principals should become familiar with innovative theories and practices and motivate teachers to model them in classrooms.

Botha (2013) stressed that there must first be a major shift in the definition of educational leadership to allow for the reconstruction of thinking, assumptions and practices. Over the last decade, strong efforts are made to ensure upcoming school leaders gain adequate accredited training with hands on experiences in school settings, classroom theoretical exposure, and relevant professional development to prepare them for a role of school leadership (Hilliard and Jackson, 201, Scot, 2015).

## **2.2. Concept of School Leadership**

School leadership is a series of school leaders' behavior that is designed to affect classroom learning and teaching process. Other researchers defined school leadership as "The recognition that leaders who operate from this frame of reference rely more on expertise and influence than on formal authority and power to achieve a positive and lasting impact on staff motivation and behavior and student learning. In brief, when the school leader emphasizes what students' study, the content the methods adopted in teaching and creating different opportunities for professional development for teachers must not be conventional. (Glatthol and lailall, 2009).

## **2.3. Style of School Leadership**

### **Instructional style**

Leadership style has a strong focus on the improvement of the quality of teaching and learning. According to Hallinger (2005), school principals lead through building a learning mission and aligning teaching and learning activities with the defined purposes. In addition, effective instructional leaders develop a climate of high expectations for teaching and learning; engage in monitoring and evaluation activities (Nettles and Herrington, 2007). Finally, effective school leaders are constant stimulators of instructional innovation. According to Waters (2003).the "optimizer role" adopted by school leaders contributes to an increase in student achievement.

### **Structuring style**

The structuring style of leadership concerns the aspects of providing direction and coordination to the school. Research has shown that the principal's vision positively affects their instructional and strategic behavior Kruger (2007). The task focuses goals and the use of innovative and professional teaching practices (Barnett and McCormick (2004).

### **Participative style**

The participative style recognizes that leaders can organize their management activities through others in many different ways according to their own preferences, the types of people with whom they are working and the culture of the organizations in which they work Pashiardis (2003). As a result, the members of the school develop greater commitment to accomplish organizational goals Leithwood (2004).

### **Entrepreneurial style**

The entrepreneurial style concerns the creative utilization of external networks and resources in order to aid the implementation of the school mission. Firstly, effective school leaders create partnerships with the parents and the wider community of the school. The principals stressed the fact children improved their behavior in school once they sensed that their parents had a close interaction with their teachers and the principal. Also, Dinham's (2005) detailed analysis of the case studies of secondary schools in Australia revealed that one of the components of effective leadership is the external awareness and engagement of the wider environment of the school. The external environment included other schools and systems, the community, society, business and government. External networks are also likely to secure adequate resources for the school activities. In a meta-analysis of 19 studies, strategic resourcing is identified as having a moderate indirect effect on students (Robinson, 2007).

### **Personnel development style**

Developing school personnel constitutes a major area through which school leaders can influence school performance outcomes. Youngs and King (2002) assert that one of the ways "principals shape school conditions and teaching practices is through their beliefs and actions regarding teacher professional development". In this effort, they provide intellec-

tual stimulation and individual support to the staff as well as appropriate models of best practice Leithwood (2006). In a qualitative research in two suburban Flemish elementary schools, one group of teachers maintained that the school leader creates a culture of professional development “by passing through relevant information, by allowing teachers to participate in service training, by buying relevant professional journals, by discussing interesting innovations at meetings”(Clement and Vandenberghe, 2001). A leadership style is a leader's style of providing direction, implementing plans, and motivating people. There are many different leadership styles proposed by various authors, which can be exhibited by leaders in the political, business or other fields.

## **2.4. The role of Educational Leadership**

To really pin point the significance of various roles that educational leadership plays in an education systems depends upon the theoretical orientation of the people involved. What should be appreciated is however the simple fact that almost all facets of organized human activity the world over need the services of highly-qualified, well prepared and highly motivated leaders to clarify goals and ensure that everyone in the organization has the support and authority to do their part to reach those goals

Bush (2007) echoed the same sentiments and went further to point out that; there are virtually no documented instances of troubled schools being turned around in the absence of interventions by talented leaders. The first and most important step in turning around a troubled school is to find a strong and talented leader to catalyze the process visioning and influencing followers to work towards shared objectives. According to (Daresh 2002) effective instructional leader actively promotes more effective practice in the teaching and learning processes in his/her school. The key to instructional leadership is in the principal defining his/her role in terms of recognizing instructional priorities rather than by serving as a school manager. The defined instructional leader is the principal who makes instructional and learning excellence the center of his/her actions, communications, and decisions.

### **2.4.1. Strategic vision of school development**

A vision must be sufficiently clear and concise that everyone in the organization understands it and can fulfill it with passion. Recent research findings define vision as a realistic, credible, attractive future for an organization. Let's dissect this definition. In a first place, a

vision must be realistic by being meaningful to the school. This means that vision must be somewhat specific rather than a vague idea about the future. Tatum (2013) asserts that vision has to be relevant to those who will be involved in reaching that ultimate goal. This means that teachers and all who have a stake in a school must recognize the potential of the vision and be committed to help it come to pass. Furthermore, a vision must be attractive by making sure that all parties involved can identify some benefit from pursuing the vision. The degree of attractiveness must be sufficient to sustain commitment even when unforeseen difficulties threaten to slow progress toward the goal. Therefore, vision should describe a set of ideals and priorities, a picture of the future, a sense of what makes the school special and unique, a core set of principles that the company stands for, and a broad set of compelling criteria that will help define organizational success.

The strategic vision must be communicated through multiple means. Some techniques used by institutions to communicate the vision include disseminating the vision in written form; preparing audiovisual shows outlining and explaining the vision; and presenting an explanation of the vision in speeches, interviews or press releases by the organization's leaders. The school head has to "walk his/her talk." In addition, Tatum (2013) continues that, after communicating the vision, implementation must take place if the vision is going to have any effect on the school. This is where strategic planning comes in. Strategic planning determines how-to get there from where you are now. Strategic planning links the present to the future, and shows how the school head intend to move toward the vision. Even worse, a stated vision which is not implemented may have adverse effects within the school because it initially creates expectations that lead to cynicism when those expectations are not met. In the same manner, Mpondo (2004) states that a head of school should formulate vision direction, which secures effective teaching, students achievement in learning, spiritual, moral, cultural, mental and physical development, and prepare the students for adult life to be responsible and functional citizens.

Furthermore, a school head provides the direction on how to implement the strategic plan based on the finance allocated, which should be identified by stating the priorities that ensure high students' academic achievements and increasing teachers' effectiveness. On top of that, Babyegya (2002) clarifies that a school calendar or almanac which shows dates of school events and special activities for the whole year should be identified by the school head. Therefore, a school head is required to have the vision and direction that motivate

people to work as a team. He or she should organize staff to carry out different tasks, manage the school curriculum and manage finances/resources in the way that teaching and learning process is improved.

#### **2.4.2. Leading**

Leading is one of the key school leadership roles of school principals. According to MoE (2002), the school principal plays high roles in coordinating, leading and controlling teachers, students and parents to bring them toward education goal in the school. School principals are expected to provide leadership in important educational activities such as organizational planning and goal setting, guiding instruction and monitoring staff and facilitates for effective teaching-learning process.

School head is expected to prepare the school budget that covers different responsible areas for the fulfillment of educational objectives, specifically teaching and learning process. However, recent studies such as Mbise (2012) have discovered that unlike heads of private schools, heads of public schools in Tanzania such as community secondary schools have no real powers over staff. They cannot hire, relocate, reward, punish or fire them. In a school, funds are required to facilitate the extension of the school opportunities and facilities as well as to meet the cost of running the school. Schools need to have laboratory, apparatus, library, textbooks, teaching aids, chalk, notebooks and teacher's reference books. Addition, the permanent construction and improvement of school buildings, painting, repairing of walls, windows, doors and school furniture, fencing, clearing and landscaping are other duties of the school head. The school head should make sure that all buildings meet the required standards. In addition, he must control the equipment and materials by overseeing their acquisition, storage and use. Therefore, in order for the school head to supervise well the resources he/she must make sure that school equipment and materials are updated annually and inspected periodically for the achievements of the school objectives.

#### **2.4.3. Supervision of teaching process**

Mpondo (2005) defines supervision as evaluating the educational practices in a school to find out if the school objectives are attained or not. The school head has together information systematically, which can be used to create possibilities for further improvement in a schools' academic performance.

In order to raise the students' academic performance, its efficiency and productivity, better learning materials are needed. Moreover, UNESCO (2011) insists that, school head needs to ensure that delegated tasks are actually carried out on time, and in a proper manner. Therefore, the school head supervise, oversee, the work of others in the school. Through meeting senior management, individually or in groups, feedback on the administrative functioning of the school, including curriculum implementation and development will be recognized. By being active within the school, by visiting classes, talking to teachers, pupils and parents, he/she will be informed about the school community, its people and events. Problems can often be prevented, simply because the school head keeps, as they say, his or her 'ear to the ground' at the same time setting a good example to others of self discipline. In addition, a school should have enough classrooms, play grounds, furniture, libraries, laboratory, water and sanitary equipment to facilitate teaching and learning. Again, there must be a systematic way that channels essential performance reports from subject teachers, subject departments to the school head regularly for feedback.

#### **2.4.4. Relationship between a school and community**

According to UNESCO (2011), the word community may refer to a group of people living in one place or locality such as a village or town, or it may refer to a group of persons having the same or similar interests. Community is a part of the society and education is the counterpart of both the mentioned elements. School is the social institution where consciously designed learning experiences are provided with the objectives of achieving social needs at large, over a period of time. School is also defined as a subsystem of the larger system of the society. It has to functionally coordinate with its immediate environment, the community in which it is situated. Moreover, Nirav (2012) explains that, the main group and agents involved in the dynamics of the relationship between school and community are school administration, teachers, non-teaching staff, students and parents, governing bodies and school board.

Furthermore, State University (2013) asserts that communities are naturally interested in their own well-being and survival, and so have a keen interest in their offspring or new recruits. Hence, they attempt to hand on the knowledge, values and skills which are special to their group. The school is the main institution for the transmission and acquisition of the knowledge, values and skills, and thus it might be regarded as the most important asset of any community. Thus, it is quite natural that we should expect close links between schools

and their communities. Both parents and educators have a large stake in children's success and the linkages promoted to facilitate it. The parents within a ward are responsible to share the learning cost by paying some of the expenses to make sure the students acquire full knowledge offered by the school. Through the school board the school head can utilize both human and non human resources to improve the students' academic performance in community secondary schools.

#### **2.4.5. Curriculum development**

State that the school principals use their visibility to a Vance idea that influence curriculum McNergney and Robert (2004). Public opinion, professional education groups and vocal individuals all work to influence the curriculum in its many forms. In relation to the above idea, Sergovanni (2001) confirms that a principal has the proficient persons tends to facilitate the establishment of a curriculum frame work that provides direction for teaching and learning of curriculum and instruction, the proficient representatives to identify a curriculum framework and common care of learning the school and demonstrates to all state holders knowledge of the school's curriculum frame work and common care of learning that support the mission and the goals of the school.

#### **2.4.6. Evaluation of teachers**

Smith, (2009) states that the evaluation of teachers Coaches and the classified staff are very important to the performance based school. However, the teacher evaluation may be the principal's most important activity. The evaluation proves presents the principal with the opportunity to stimulate growth and improve teacher performance as well as to recognize quality instruction. The improvement of teacher performance is critical because it is directly correlated to improved student performance. The success of students depends on the success of the teachers.

### **2.5. Challenges for Effectives School Leadership Practices**

School leadership should relate or balance a wider issue of prevailing schools and social needs. These needs are highly divergent that demand effective leadership to bring them mutual bondett .(2003).

The challenges demand proactive school leadership to handle them effectively. Based on the

principle of leadership density, though every members or stakehoders of schools could play the role in school leadership ,school principals supposed to take lion share of it.trend responsibilities of principals play an important role for the achievement ofeducat ional objectives. But in carrying out the task of leadership, principals, usually face alotofc hallenges, stressing this point, different scholars listed different challenges that impede leadership responsibility of principals.

### **2.5.1. Internal challenges/barriers**

**Lack of Training and Skills:** As Sergiovanni (2001) stated that, technical, human and educa-tional skills, abilities and knowledge are essential properties that instructional leaders have to possess.

**Lack of teacher Co-operation/leader member relation/:** teachers as the system of school they do have invaluable role in realization of school vision. Co-operation between and among teachers or principal will have an effect on instructional processes such as learning style, decision making processes, and etc.(Dimmock,2000). Beside this ,if the perception of teachers to their principal is undermined, this way drives teachers not to be commented by the principal. This in turn, will cooperation of teachers in every school conern (McEwan,2003). Therefore, inability of school leadership to maintain or/and improve cooperation and health relationship between and among teachers and principal could be among the internal challenges to effectiveness of school leadeship.

**Shortage of Time:** Principals have multiple roles they have play. For instance information overloads, paper work, too many reports, many non-academic demands and work over load consume much of the principals time. Therefore, only principals committed to instructional improvement can choose and use their time for the enhancement of the classroom instruc-tion and teacher development (Harris and Muijs, 2003).

**Lack of Resources:** Resources are the means to the end. They matter in terms of school im-provement and long-term effectiveness. In research synthesis about practices in high per-formance schools, the finding that relate to resource is evident Ubben and Hughes (1997). In other words, a lack of resource (Financial, physical or human) can be a serious obstacle to principal.

**Lack of Vision;** nothing can affect instructional improvement more than lack of leaders will. Instructional leaders have to spend more time on improving the teaching learning, in-

itiating changes and encouraging others to achieve educational goals. However lack of vision, will and courage could hinder the effectiveness of leadership performance (Sergiovanni, 2001). Generally the barriers of educational leadership hinder the leader's performance, sabotage principal's attempts and finally bring a serious problem on the quality of education.

### **2.5.2. External challenges**

**Socio-cultural environment:** school leadership must operate under the domains of socio-cultural expectation; demographic changes that may demand progressive capacity of school and school leadership, and existing working culture of the society (Brundt, 2003). Therefore, school leadership should acknowledge the socio-cultural needs of the society and changes that come because of globalization. Thus compromising the rate of socio-cultural needs and changes with rapid change in globalization, and existing situation of school may put school leadership under challenging situation.

**The Press of Duty /Work Overload:** The principal is the one person in a school who oversees the entire program and holds great responsibility of his/her school. Confirming the above idea, Barth, (In Sergiovanni, 2001) states that the principal is ultimately responsible for almost everything that happens in the school and out. Responsibility other than instructional leadership will frequently press for the principal's time and drain his/her energy leaving him/her with the feeling that he/she is spread too thin and even though the principal would like to be an instructional leader he/she really does not have the time to function as one. Explaining in the above idea, Shields (2004) state that principals are expected to develop learning communities, build the professional capacity of teacher, take advice from parents, engage in collaborative and consultative decision-making, resolve conflicts, engage in effective instructional leadership, and attend respectfully, immediately and appropriately to the needs and requests of families with diverse cultural ethnic and socio-economic grounds.

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

The chapter addressed the Definition of school Leadership, concept of school leadership, leadership professional competences of school leader in Ethiopia and Style of School leadership, the role of educational leadership, and barriers to instructional leadership effectiveness to answer the following basic research questions.

To this end, to understand the current roles of Educational leadership, such as Strategic vision of school development, Leading, Supervision of teaching process, Relationship between a school and community and Evaluation of teachers are addressed. Concerning to major challenges that affected leadership effectiveness lack of skill and training, lack of teacher co-operation/leader member relation, Shortage of Time, Lack of resources , lack of vision, will and courage, socio-cultural environment, the Press of Duty /work Overload with stake holders and lack of resources are consulted. Thus, the reviewed literature helped the researcher to get the insight about the issues in detail.

### 3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This section provides a detailed description of the study area, design of the study, sources of data, population of the study, sample size and sampling techniques, instruments, data collecting procedures, method of data analysis and ethical principle.

#### 3.1. Description of the Study Area

The study area of this research was Oromia Region, East Hararghe Zone Babile Woreda. Babile Woreda is one of 21 Woredas of Eastern Hararge Zone. The relative location of Babile Woreda is bounded by Ethiopia Somali region at southeast, Gursum woreda at northeast, Harari region at north-west and Fadis woreda at southwest. More than 90 per cent of this Woreda climate is kola and only less than 10% is *woinadega*. Most of the people of this Woreda are farmers and their annual income depends on agriculture while some of them are merchants and a few of them are civil servants. Afan Oromo is the language of the people in the Woreda and there are also Amharic, Somali, and other languages are used in a minor case. In this woreda there are three governmental secondary schools and two preparatory schools. Namely; Babile karlhenz secondary school, Bisi-dimo secondary school, Wayu secondary school, Bisidimo preparatory school and Babile preparatory school.

#### 3.2. Research Design

The design of the study employed was descriptive survey research to collect reliable and relevant information from participants for the generalization of current existing practices of school leadership particularly in secondary school of the research area. To achieve this purpose, the researcher was use descriptive survey design because it helps to secure information as they exist. As the result both quantitative and qualitative data was employed using questionnaire, interview as well as document reviews

#### 3.3. Sources of Data

##### 3.3.1. Primary sources

The source of primary data for this study was Principals, Teachers and PTA from governmental secondary school in Babile Woreda. These are primary sources that bring first hand

information. For these study principals, teachers and parent teacher associations (PTA) were included as they are policy implementers who are directly attached to the task of educational leadership activity. Beside this, Woreda education office heads are also included as primary sources of data because they are educational policy implementers who have direct work relationship with school leaders.

### **3.3.2. Secondary sources**

Secondary sources are also included as sources of data in this study. These sources of data include relevant documents, strategic plan, and reports.

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

### **3.4.1. Target population**

The determination of the population and sample schools are based on the 2011 annual statistical reports of the Babile Woreda education office. According to this report there are 5 secondary schools. This school was selected by using Purposive-sampling technique for all except Wayu secondary school in Babile Woreda. The researcher believes that four government secondary schools was examined under this study since all schools have students who came from a community of different economic background, geographical settlement and life style.

The target population including 2 Woreda Education office heads, 8 principals (principals and vice principals), 28 PTA, and 161 Percent of teachers from sampled Secondary School.

### **3.4.2. Sample population and sampling techniques**

The study was include teachers, school leaders (secondary school principals and vice principals), PTA leaders and Woreda Education office heads. In the Woreda there are 161 teachers and among these 82 (50%) of them are selected using simple random sampling technique. For manageability reason, the researcher selected 50% of teachers from each school proportionally using simple random sampling technique due to the number of teachers across 4 schools were significantly varied. To support this, simple random sampling technique involves selecting randomly from a population such that each subset was an equal chance being selected as a sample (Evans, 2007).

First, the researcher took a total of 50% (82) teachers from 4 schools. Then, each participant of the study was selected using simple random sampling technique mainly by lottery method. In the lottery technique, the researcher also took the names of the teachers from each school and wrote their name on a piece of paper having equal size and then folding the papers, putting them on a carton. Then, the researcher put back in each of the drawn participants before the next draw until the required number of samples obtained to ensure that each participant had equal chance to be selected and from 28 parent teacher associations 12(43%) of them was selected using Purposive sampling technique. Because PTA leader's involvement in this study recognized their critical role in the school leadership and it was believed that they were offer adequate, quality and relevant information to the issue under study.

Four School Principals and four vice principal total 8(100%) and Woreda Education office heads 2(100%), all of them respectively was selected using available sampling technique due to their small number and manageable.

Table 1: Population, sample size and sampling techniques

Sample school	Teachers			Principals			PTA			WEO heads		
	Pop	Sample	%	Po	Sample	%	Po	Sample	%	Po	Sample	%
<b>Babile Seco.</b>	46	23	50	3	3	100	7	3	43			
<b>Bisidimo sco.</b>	45	23	50	2	2	100	7	3	43			
<b>Babile prep.</b>	37	19	50	2	2	100	7	3	43			
<b>Bisidimo- prep.</b>	33	17	50	1	1	100	7	3	43			
<b>Total</b>	161	82	50	8	8	100	28	12	43	2	2	100
		Simple Random sam- pling		Available sam- pling			Purposive sampling			Available sam- pling		

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

Data collection instruments were also called research methods. In this study in order to collect data on the practices and challenges of secondary school Leadership, questionnaire, semi-structured interview and document analysis are used. It was believed that the selected instruments fit the study method appropriately.

#### **3.5.1. Questionnaire**

The questionnaires were prepared for principals and teachers. The questionnaires contains open-ended and closed-ended. The questionnaires were prepared in English language containing both open-ended and closed-ended items.

Open ended questions were included because they give respondents a freedom to give their extended views on the issue. Close ended questions are used for their easiness in tabulation, objectivity and suitability to keep respondents on the subjects of discussion.

Finally, since the researcher used the survey method, it is the most important method in collecting data than others. the response category set was based on Likert Scale, five point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree (5= strongly agree, 4= agree, 3=undecided, 2= disagree and 1= strongly disagree) The questionnaire was containing both open and close ended questions are carefully selected and presented to respondents fewer than four subsequent sections: background information, practices of school leadership, professional qualification of school principals and challenges of school leadership.

#### **3.5.2. Semi-structured interview**

In addition to the questionnaire, the researcher was conduct interview as an instrument for data collection to complement and obtain relevant data that may not be handled by the questionnaire. The interview consists of oral questions to ask by the interviewers and oral responses given by the research participants. Interview is the second important data gathering instrument in this study. This data gathering instrument is selected with the belief that deeper information is obtained on issues critical to the study underway. In order to obtain deeper information related to the practices of school leadership in the study area, a semi structure interview is held with two groups of respondents: 12 PTA leaders and 2 Woreda Education Office Heads was interviewed to relate with the practices and challenges of edu-

cational leadership implementation in the study area. The interview was take place in local languages (Afan Oromo) to make the communication understandable and the analysis clear and the result better. The data of interview were recorded by mobile phone as audio recorder and writing main point of participant's facial expression. These two groups of respondents was selected for interview in the ground that more information can possibly be obtained from them due to their position in the educational leadership and daily engagements in the core activities of educational leadership. In addition, it is believed that they are very close to the day to day challenges exist in the schools.

### **3.5.3. Document analysis**

The primary sources of data are School Leaders, Teachers, PTA and Woreda education office heads. Additionally, to Secondary sources of data was gathered from different relevant school documents which are related to secondary School leadership. For example strategic plan, reports from School and Educational offices and policy documents. The researcher was gather recent information.

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

First of all, having letter of authorization from HU for gating permission the resaecher directly want to sample secondary schools principal for consent. After making agreement with concerned stecholdrs, the researcher introduced his objective. Then the questionnaires were administered to the sample respondents and the participants were encouraged to answer each item independently as needed by the researcher. Finally, the questionnaires were collected back at the right appointment.

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

The method of data analysis used in this study was both quantitative and qualitative in nature. Data that were obtained from questionnaire were analyzed quantitatively through descriptive statistical computations. Among various descriptive statistics percentage, mean score and were preferred to analyze all the basic questions. Because they are very important in identifying the difference and similarity of respondent's judgments on variables and easily understood by different stakeholders at different levels. Percentage was used to analyze the difference and similarity of respondents judgments to each variable out of hun-

dred. The mean score was used to analyze the middle of the strongly agree and strongly disagree in each item. T-test was used to compare the opinion of teachers and principals. Data obtained from interview and observation were analyzed qualitatively by using narration in line with the data obtained from closed and open ended questions.

### **3.8. Ethical Considerations**

The Research ethics refers to the agreement that the researcher entered in to with his respondents. First the researcher communicated with the Woreda education office head to get permission telling the significant and objective of the research. Then go to principals discussing on the objectives of the study at the last the researcher communicate with the respective teachers and share ideas on the study the respondents encourage and the researcher shows a respect for them. The researcher disseminating questionnaires to the respondents and orientation given for the participants to fill the questions correctly and then the interview was continued. The researcher explains the objectives and significance of the study to the respondents since it is disrupted the respondent's regular activity. The questions may not offensive disturb respondents psychology and personality. The researcher removes the identification of names of respondents. The questionnaire displays an opening introductory letter that requesting the respondent's cooperation to provide the required information for the study. At the end questioners was collected and ready for analysis.

## **4. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA**

This chapter deals with description of the sample population, analysis and interpretation of data obtained from teachers, principals, vice principals, PTA and heads of WEOs. The study employed questionnaires for teachers, vice-principals and principals and interviews with PTA and heads of WEOs. Besides, additional information was gathered through document analysis. Thus, the quantitative as well as qualitative analysis of data was incorporated in to this chapter. The qualitative part, was supposed to be complementary to the quantitative analysis. It consists two parts. In the first part, the characteristics of sample population involved in the study are presented. Here the study groups are discussed in terms of sex, age, service years and academic qualification. The second part deals with the analysis and interpretation of data.

### **4.1 Background Information**

Based on the sampling procedure described in Chapter three from the sampled Woreda four government secondary schools were included that consisted of a total of 104 respondents. That is 8 principals, 82 percent of teachers from sampled Secondary School, 2 heads of WEOs and 12 PTA members from sampled Schools were included. Accordingly, 97 copies of questionnaires were prepared and distributed to 82 secondary School teachers and 8 principals. Out of this, 96.34% of teachers and 87.5% of principals were filled and returned the questionnaires to the researcher. That producing an overall 91.92% return rate. This high return rate increases the validity of the study. The interview held with PTA and heads of WEOs. Observation were used as supplementary information and not quantified. Thus, the analysis was made on the basis of the information obtained from questionnaires.

#### 4.1.1. Personal characteristics of respondents

Table 2: Sex and age of the Respondents

	Items	Teachers		Principals		PTA		Heads of WEOs	
			%		%		%		%
<b>SEX</b>	Male	76	96.2	7	100	9	75	2	100
	Female	3	3.8			3	25	-	-
	Total	79	100	7		12	100	2	100
<b>AGE</b>	21-30	17	21.5	-	-				
	31-40	42	53.16	6	85.7	6	50	2	100
	41-50	13	16.45	1	14	6	50		
	51 and above	7	8.86						
	Total	79	100	7	100	12	100	2	100

As shown in table 2 item 1 indicated that 76(96.2%) of sample teachers respondents were males and only 3(3.8 %) of the sample teachers were females and 100% of sampled secondary School principals and WEOs heads were males. None of females was participating in assignment related to Secondary school leadership and WEOs, except they are assigned as the performer in PTA. So that as female teachers involvement in secondary school was low they could not participate equally in sampled population with their male counter parts.

With regard to the age distribution of the respondents as indicated under item 2 of the same table, item 2 only 17(21.5% ) of teachers were in the age range of 21-30 years, 42(53.16 %) of teachers 31- 40 years, 13(16.45%) of teachers 41-50 years, 7(8.86 %)of teachers 51 and above years, 6(85.7%) principals were in the age range between 31-40 years, 1(14%) of principals 41- 50 years, 6(50%) of PTA 31-40 years and 6(50%) of PTA 41-50 years and 2(100%) of WEOs heads 31-40 years. Therefore, this figure indicates that the majority of the respondents are matured enough to provide reliable information with regard to the issue under study.



Regarding the qualification of respondents as indicated in table 3 of item 1. 12(100%) of PTA leaders were below grade 12 and 50% of WEOs heads were diploma holders. But majority of teachers 68(86%) and 7(100%) principals were BA/BSC/Bed holders. Thus, it can be concluded that most secondary school teachers have necessary minimum requirement needed qualification for secondary school level and Only 11 (14%) of teachers MA/MSc degree holders. From what the researcher observe most of the principals were not qualified or trained in educational leadership. From the sampled school all of principals were under qualified in educational leadership that indicates under the minimum requirement assigned for secondary school leadership by the MoE and it was the same to WEOs except they were specialized in subject area. Then, from the data, it can be seen that all of the principals (100%) were assigned in leadership position without having educational background in EL/EdPM. Thus, it would be possible to conclude from this that the placement of individuals in a leadership position was on appointment basis rather than on proper educational background.

As indicated in the Table 3 of item 2 of the total work experience of the respondents 2(2.53%) of teacher respondents have the work experience of 1-5 years and majority of teacher respondents 32(40.5%) had the work experience of 11-15 years and 9(11.39%) of teachers had 21 and above years. Principals had the range of work experience between 6-10 years were 57.14 %, between 11-15 years were 28.57%, year of service between 16-20 years were 1(14.28%) and 50 % of Woreda education officials had the work experience between the range of 6-10 years and 50 % is 16-20 years of services. From the data one can observe that majority of teachers; principals and woreda educational officials have more than 6 years of total work experience. Due to this, it was believed that this group could give relevant information for the purpose of the study. Because as one stay for a long time in a specific job, can observe the way the school leadership acts or implement the good practices and solve the problems that the school faces and having more experience has a great contribution in leading and supervising a school for effective teaching and learning process for school leaders, and Woreda educational officials.

Item 5 of table 3, the teachers, the principals, vice principals and Heads of WEOs were asked to indicate their areas of specialization. Accordingly, all of the teachers were academic subject area graduates and all of the school principals and Heads of WEOs (100 %), and (100%) of them were academic subject area graduates respectively. As these data show

all of the principals in the secondary schools of Babile Woreda were subject area graduates, even though a blue print of Teacher Development Program (MoE, 2007:30-31) has stated that the academic qualification required for the secondary school principals are Master of Art degree in Educational planning and Management. This might have its own negative implication on the overall success of leaders in the implementation of their respected roles.

### 4.1.3. Respondents of principals interests and assignment

Principals are regarded by many educationalists as having the central and leading role in the successful operation of the teaching and learning process. So the following table indicates briefly respondents view on ways of assignment and interest.

Table 4: Interest and assignment of the School leaderships

N	Item	Response	Respondents			
			Teachers		Principals	
			f	%	f	%
1	Before you were a principal of this School, did you want to be a principal?	Yes			5	71.42
		NO			2	28.57
2	Position attainment condition of school leadership	By competition based on their merit	52	65.82	5	71.42
		Based on the directives set by MoE	12	15.8	2	28.57
		Close involvement in Supporting government policy	15	18.98	-	-
3	How do you rate the extent of your School leadership success?	Very good			4	57.12
		Good			2	28.5
		Fair			1	14.28
		Poor				

For item 1 of Table 4, 5(71.42%) of principals had interest to be in a leadership position before holding the position. Whereas 2(28.57%) of principals did not have any interest before they came to leadership position. This item was accompanied with open-ended question for why principals did like or did not like the position. Accordingly about 5(71.42%) suggested that they liked because they want to develop experience how to lead organization and to get advantage in case of better salary than when they were a teacher. The rest 2(28.57%) of principals reasoned out that, they disliked the position due to its complexity of work and challenging work.

Item 2 of table 4 shows that respondents were asked how the School leadership was assigned in leadership position. Regarding this 5(71.427%) of principal's and 52(65.82 %) of Teachers responded that they were assigned to the position by competition based on their merit, 2(28.57%) of principals and 15(18.98 %) of teachers responded that they were assigned to the position by close involvement in supporting the government policy, 12(15.18%) of teachers responded that they were assigned to position based on the directives set by MoE, However, it can be concluded that majority of the school leadership were assigned by competition on the basis of their merit. But the information that was obtained from personal suggestion of teachers in the open ended question and interview made with PTA leaders revealed that, selection and placement of School leadership were not all in all by competition and not according to the prerequisite criteria set by MoE and regional educational bureau. Rather, the main criteria seen to select and place a school leadership in a position is close involvement in supporting the government policy. But it's better to select and assign school leadership according to the directives set by MoE. As the result of this, school leaders face challenges in leading school for effective teaching-learning process.

Item 3 of table 4 shows that, the extent to which School leaderships success in managing the School. Based on this 4(57.12%) of principals rated excellent and 2(14.28%) principals rated well. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that principals were in a very good position in managing the Schools under the study.

## 4.2. The Leading Practices of the School Leadership

The principal is the most visible and directly accessible representative of the school management. Moreover, the school leadership retains ultimate accountability for the overall operation of the school, most studies on educational leadership revealed that the main function of principal as a leader is making effective teaching and learning. That is as contemporary educational reform places importance of effective leaderships and management of schools. The reason for this position is that, an orderly school environment which is efficient and well managed provides the pre-condition for enhanced student learning. Therefore, it can say that the School leader is the pivot person who has an involvement in all aspects of the School operation and responsibility for all activities that place his/her School. On the top of this, secondary School leadership are expected to the major practices, such as, providing clear vision, planning, creating collaborative work, supervision, working with community, staff development and curriculum development in order to improve the school. Based on this questionnaire was prepared to secure enough information from multiple sources, principals themselves and teachers. Therefore, the key Leaders practices of secondary school leadership presented below are believed to reflect the practices of secondary school principals. Hence, to evaluate to what extent the school leaderships practices. Thirty-nine (39) Likert type items were forwarded to the respondents. The items were rated on 5 points frequency indicators (strongly agree = 5, Agree =4, Undecided =3, Disagree =2, strongly disagree =1). The practices and challenges of the school leaderships were interpreted using the mean obtained as follows.  $< 1.49$  = strongly disagree  $1.52 - 2.49$  = disagree,  $2.5 - 3.49$  = undecided  $3.5 - 4.49$  = Agree,  $> 4.5$  = strongly agree. The data obtained through interview, and observation was used to supplement the findings. Remarks on the table, X=mean, SD=standard deviation, p-value at  $\alpha=0.05$  and degree of freedom=119.

### 4.2.1. The practices of school leadership in line with school vision

The quality and effectiveness of leadership towards school improvement vary as to the situation and capacity of leaders. The principal's primary responsibility is to promote the learning and success of all students (Lunenburg, 2010). Demands for greater accountability, especially appeals for the use of more outcome-based measures, requires the principal to be instruction oriented.

The school leadership's skills and knowledge about the field of leadership can create the

ability in developing different practices, which lead to success. In this study, an attempt was made to examine the secondary School leadership practices in the formulation of School vision to promote enabling environment for School improvement program.

**Table 5: Items describing about visionary School Leadership Practices**

N	Item	Res- pon- dents	Response[N&%]						x	SD	Over- all X	PVal ue(tt est)	
			5	4	3	2	1						
1	The School Leadership is capable in providing clear vision	F	17	43	11	8			3.8	0.8	4.14	0.38	
			7	6									
		Teach- ers	%	21.5	54.	14	10.1						
					4		2						
Prin- cipal	F	3	4					4.4	0.5				
	%	42.8	57					2	3				
2	The School Leadership is skilled in developing the school mission, goals and objective	F	17	40	10	10	2				4.11	0.12	
			7										
		Teach- er	%	22.7	50.	12.	12.6	2.5	3.8	0.9			
					4	6				7			
Prin- cipals	F	3	4					4.4	0.5				
	%	43	57					2	3				
3	The School Leadership is communicating the vision in order to have common understanding with staff and community	F	27	35	4	11	1	3.9	1.0	4.02	0.69		
			9										
		Teach- ers	%	34.2	44.	5.1	14	1					
					3								
Prin- cipals	F	3	3	-	1	-	4.1	1.0					
	%	42.8	42.	-	14.2	-	4	6					
			8										

Item 1 of Table 5 indicated that 17(21.5%) of teachers and 3(42.85%) of principals strongly agree, 43(54.4%) of teachers and 4(57.14%) of principals rated agree, 14 % of teachers rated undecided and 10.12 % of teachers disagree respectively. So that as it indicated in table 5 item 1 respondents were asked whether or not the school leadership is capable in providing clear vision, teachers and principals with the ( $X = 3.87$ ,  $SD = 0.86$ ) and ( $X = 4.42$ ,  $SD = 0.5$ ) respectively agree that, School leadership were capable in providing clear vision. The overall  $X = 4.14$  shows the agreement the total respondent with the point. Therefore based on the overall score value, it can be concluded that School leadership were capable in providing clear vision. In supporting the significant level ( $P = 0.38$ ) greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of teachers and principals. In line with this the information gathered through Interview made with PTA leaders and WEOs heads were also confirmed that School leadership was capable in providing clear vision.

Item 2 of table 5 indicates that 22.7% of teachers and 43% of principals rated strongly agree, 50.4% of teachers and 57% of principals rated their response agree, 12.6% of Teachers rated undecided, 12.6 % of Teachers rated disagree and 1.26% of Teachers were rated strongly disagree. So that majority of teachers and principals rated agree and strongly agree. The mean value of Teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.8$ ,  $SD=0.97$ ) agreed that School Leadership was skilled in developing the school mission, goals and objective and principals with ( $X =4.42$ ,  $SD=0.53$ ) strongly agreed that school leadership was skilled in developing the school mission, goals and objective. The overall  $X=4.11$  shows the agreement of the total respondents with the point. Therefore, based on the overall score value, it can be concluded that School leadership was skilled in developing the school mission, goals and objective. The t-test revealed that the significance level ( $p=0.12$ ) is greater than 0.05 this shows there is no significance difference between Teachers and principals views regarding School leadership were skilled in developing the school mission, goals and objective .

Item 3 of table 5 reflected that 34.2% of Teachers and 42.8% of Principals were rated strongly agree on the School leadership practices of communicating the vision in order to have common understanding with the staff and community, 44.3% of teachers and 42.8 % of Principals were rated agree, 5.1 % of teachers rated undecided, 14% of teachers and 14.2 of principals were rated disagree and 2.5% of Teachers was rated strongly disagree.

The mean value of Teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.98$ ,  $SD=1.09$ ) and ( $X=4.14$ ,  $SD=1.06$ ) respectively agreed that, school leadership was communicating the vision in order to have common understanding with staff and community. The overall  $X=4.02$  shows the agreement of the total respondents with the point. This implies that the majority of respondents agree with the issue. Therefore, from the response of the majority, it is possible to conclude that School leadership was communicating the vision in order to have common understanding with staff and community. The significance level ( $p=0.69$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of Teachers and Principals regarding the point.



Item 1 of Table 6 shows that the practice of school leadership in practicing, the analysis of the School environment before preparing Schools plan. Regarding this 25.3 % of teachers and 43% of Principals rated strongly agree, 41 % of teachers and 57.1 % of principals rated agree, 23 % of teachers rated undecided, 7.5 % of teachers rated disagree and 3.7% of teachers rated strongly disagree. The mean value of teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.78$ ,  $SD=1.02$ ) agreed that the school leadership carry out analysis of the school environment before preparing school plan and Principals with ( $X=4.42$ ,  $SD=0.53$ ) strongly agreed that the school leadership carry out analysis of the school environment before preparing school plan. The overall  $X=4.1$  shows the agreement of the total respondents with the point. Therefore, based on the overall score value, it can be concluding that school leadership carries out analysis of the school environment before preparing school plan. The significance level ( $p=0.78$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of teachers and principals regarding the point. Every organization exists in an environment with which it is independent. In case of school, the local community, the school district, region, state and the national system can be considered as its environment.

Item 2 of table 6 deals the leadership practices of plan and working toward changing the school. Accordingly 31.6 % of teachers and 57.14% of principals rated strongly agree, 43 % of teachers and 28.57 % of Principals rated agree, 15.1 % of teachers and 14.3% of principals rated undecided and 12.65% of teachers rated disagree. Majority of teachers and Principals respondents agree or strongly agree that the school leadership plans and work toward changing the School. The mean value of teachers and principals were found to be ( $X=3.88$ ,  $SD=0.97$ ) and ( $X =4.42$ ,  $SD=0.78$ ) respectively agreed that, the school leadership plans and work toward changing the school. The overall  $X=4.15$  shows the agreement of the total respondents with the point. Therefore, based on the overall score value, it can be concluding that the school leadership plans and work toward changing the school. The significance level of t-test ( $p=0.33$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of teachers and principals showing consensus or agreement of responses

Item 3 of table 6 deals the practice of the school leadership in making School plan flexible. Accordingly 21.5% of teachers and 57.14 % of principals rated strongly agree, 39.24 % of teachers and 28.57 % of principals rated their response agree, 24.1% of teachers and 14.3% of principals rated undecided. The rest 13.9 % of teachers rated disagree and 1.26 % strongly disagrees respectively. The mean value of teachers and were found to be ( $X=3.65$ ,  $SD=1.01$ ) and ( $X =4.14$ ,  $SD=1.46$ ) respectively agreed that school leadership was making the school plan flexible. The overall  $X=3.89$  shows the agreement of the total respondents with the point. This implies that the majority of respondents agreed with the issue. Therefore, from the response of the majority, it is possible to conclude that, the school leadership is making the school plan flexible. Supporting this significance level of t-test ( $p=0.17$ ) is greater than 0.05, t indicating that there is no significance difference between the opinions of teachers and principals.

Item 4 of table 6 deals School leadership practices in encouraging the staff to participate in the School Planning. Accordingly 33 % of teachers and 57.14% of principals rated strongly agree, 34 % of teachers and 42.85 % of Principals rated agree. The rest 14 % of teachers rated undecided, 12.15 % of teachers rated disagree and 3.79 % of teachers rated strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.77$ ,  $SD=1.18$ ) agreed with that the School Leadership was encouraging the staff to participate in school planning and principals with the ( $X=4.57$ ,  $SD=0.53$ ) strongly agreed that the school leadership was encouraging the staff to participate in school planning. The overall  $X=4.17$  shows the agreement of the respondents with the point. This implies that the majority of respondents agree with the issue. Therefore, from the response of the majority, it is possible to conclude that, the school leadership was encouraging the staff to participate in school planning. The significance level ( $p=0.01$ ) is less than 0.05, this indicates that there is significance difference between the opinions of teachers and principals regarding the point where principals agreement was found to be higher than that of teachers. In addition, document analysis in all sample secondary schools revealed that there was the trend to participate all teachers in school planning. On the top of this the interview made with PTA and WEOs heads, even though they have trends in encouraging the staff to participate in school planning.



Item 1 of table 7 indicates that the respondents were asked whether or not the school leadership works with the staff members to improve the school. Based on this 31.6 % of Teachers and 42.85 % of Principals rated strongly agree. 47 % of Teachers and 43% Of Principals rated agree. The 10.2 % of teachers and 14% of Principals rated undecided. 10.2% of Teachers rated disagree. None of Teachers and Principals rated strongly disagrees. The mean value of teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=4.02$ ,  $SD=0.91$ ) and ( $X =4.28$ ,  $SD=0.57$ ) respectively agreed that, the school leadership work with the staff members to improve the school. The overall  $X=4.15$  shows the agreement of the respondents with the point. This implies that the majority of respondents agree with the issue. Therefore, from the response of the majority, it is possible to conclude that the school leadership works with the staff members to improve the school. The significance level ( $p=0.66$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of Teachers and Principals regarding the point. In line with this the information gathered through interview with PTA leaders and WEOs heads were also confirmed that school leadership was working with the staff members to improve the school. Here it is possible to conclude that school principals in the study area were in better position in working with the staff members to improve the school. So that effective leaders give more attention to work with the staff members to improve the school.

Item 2 of table 7 shows that the ability of school leadership in delegating and sharing responsibility. Accordingly 31.6% of Teachers and 71.42% of Principals rated strongly agree. 36.7 % of Teachers and 29% of principals rated agree. 18.9 % of Teachers rated undecided. 12.6 % of Teachers rated disagree. The mean value of teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.87$ ,  $SD=1.01$ ) agreed that school leadership have the ability to delegate and share responsibility and principals with the ( $X=4.71$ ,  $SD=0.48$ ) strongly agreed that school leadership have the ability to delegate and share responsibility. The overall  $X=4.29$  shows the agreement of the respondents with the point. This implies that majority of the respondents agree with the issue. The significance level ( $p=0.02$ ) is less than 0.05, this indicates that there is significance difference between the opinions of teachers and principals regarding the point. So that, the school leadership's under the study were effective in delegating tasks. In organizations a single man cannot perform several duties unless shared with others. In addition delegation and sharing of responsibilities reduces burden of work and facilitate staff empowerment.

Item 3 of table 7 indicates that the practice of school leadership in providing opportunity for shared decision making. Based on this 25.32 % of Teachers and 43% of Principals were rated strongly agree. 36.7 % of Teachers and 28.57 % of Principals rated agree. 16.5 % of Teachers and 14.28% of Principals rated undecided. 18.98 %of Teachers and 14.28 % of Principals rated disagree. 2.53 % of Teachers rated strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.83$ ,  $SD=1.13$ ) and ( $X =4.00$ ,  $SD=1.05$ ) respectively agreed that, the school leadership provide opportunity for shared decision making. The overall  $X=3.92$  shows the agreement of the respondents with the point. This implies that the majority of respondents agree with the issue. Therefore, from the response of the majority, it is possible to conclude that the school leadership provides opportunity for shared decision making. The significance level ( $p=0.06$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of teachers and principals regarding the point. In line with this the information gathered through interview with PTA leaders and WEOs heads were also confirmed that the school leadership provides opportunity for shared decision making. Here it is possible to conclude that school principals in the study area were in better position in participating teachers in decision making process.

In line this, with Somech (2002) suggested that involving teachers in the decision-making process offers a variety of potential benefits, which can generate the social capacity necessary for excellent schools: improving the quality of the decisions, enhancing teacher motivation and contributing to the quality of their work life. In addition to these allowing teachers in decision making process can develop trust and initiation between school leadership and teachers. Because, the school improvement is the result of a joining and coordinated activities of the school community in decision making processes.

Item 4 of table 7 reveals that the practices of school leadership in making relationship based on collegiality and mutual trust. Accordingly 21.5% of Teachers and 57.14 % of Principals rated strongly agree. 42 % of Teachers and 14.3 % of Principals rated agree. 19 % of Teachers and 28.6% of principals rated undecided. 15.1 % of Teachers rated disagree and 2.53% of Teachers were rated strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers and principals were found to be ( $X=3.64$ ,  $SD=1.06$ ) and ( $X =4.28$ ,  $SD=0.95$ ) respectively agreed that the school leadership making relationship based on collegiality and mutual trust. The overall  $X=3.96$  shows the agreement of the respondents with the point. This implies that the majority of respondents agree with the issue. Therefore, from the response of the majority, it is possible to conclude that the School Leadership making relationship based on

collegiality and mutual trust. The significance level ( $p=0.06$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of teachers and principals regarding the point. So that the school leadership can play a leading role in facilitating and improving the School environment by creating a strong link with a school community and stakeholders.

#### 4.2.4. Staff development practice of school leadership

**Table 8: Views on Staff Development Practice of School Leadership**

	Item	Respon- dents	Response[N&%]								x	SD	Ove rall X	PV( ttest )
				5	4	3	2	1						
1	The School Leadership develops mechanism by which competent teachers share their experiences with their colleagues.	teachers	F	19	30	14	15	1	3.6	1.11	3.9	0.11		
			%	24.0	38	17.7	18.9	1.26						
		princip- als	F	2	4	1	-	-	4.1	0.69				
			%	28.5	57.14	14.28	-	-	4					
2	The School Leadership helps the teacher to attend CPD/contin uous profes- sional de- velopment	Teachers	F	24	41	5	7	2	3.9	0.98	4.13	0.57		
			%	30.4	51.8	6.3	9	2.53						
		princip- als	F	4	2	-	1	-	4.2	1.11				
			%	57.1	28.57	-	14.28	-	8					
3	The School Leadership helps the teachers to read different current edu- cational pub-	Teachers	F	13	27	18	16	5	3.3	1.16	4.09	0.38		
			%	16.5	34.2	23	20.3	6						
		princip- als	F	2	4	1	-	-	4.8	1.34				
			%	30	57	14	-	-	5					

lications.											
------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Item 1 of table 8 deals the practices of School leaderships in developing mechanisms by which competent Teachers share their experiences with their colleagues. Accordingly 24.05 % of Teachers and 28.57 % of Principals rated strongly agree, 38% of Teachers and 57.14% of Principals rated agree. 17.7% of Teachers and 14.28% of Principals rated undecided. 18.9% of Teachers rated disagree and 1.26% of Teachers strongly disagree respectively. The mean value of Teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.66$ ,  $SD=1.11$ ) and ( $X=4.14$ ,  $SD=0.69$ ) respectively agreed that the School Leadership develop mechanisms by which competent teachers share their experiences with their colleagues. The overall  $X=3.9$  shows the agreement of the respondents with the point. Therefore, from the response of the majority, it is possible to conclude that the School Leadership develops mechanisms by which competent teachers share their experiences with their colleagues. The significance level ( $p=0.11$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant significance difference between the opinions of Teachers and Principals regarding the School Leadership develop mechanisms by which competent teachers share their experiences with their colleagues.

Item 2 of table 8 shows that the practices of School leadership's in helping teachers to attend CPD (Continuous Professional Development) at their School. Regarding this 30.4 % of Teachers and 57.14% of Principals rated strongly agree. 51.8% of Teachers and 14.29% of Principals rated agree. The rest 6.3% of teachers rated undecided, 9 % of Teachers, 14.28% of Principals rated disagree and 2.53% of Teachers rated strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.98$ ,  $SD=0.98$ ) and ( $X=4.28$ ,  $SD=1.11$ ) respectively agreed that the School Leadership helps the teacher to attend CPD/continuous professional development. The overall  $X=4.13$  shows the agreement of the respondents with the point. From this the researcher is interested to conclude that there were good attempts of school leadership to improve quality instruction by helping teacher to attend CPD/continuous professional development. The significance level ( $p=0.57$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant significance difference between the opinions of Teachers and Principals regarding the School Leadership helps the teacher to attend CPD/continuous professional development.

Item 3 of table 8 deals with the practices of School leadership's in helping teachers to read different current educational publications. Regarding to this 16.5 % of Teachers and 42.86% of Principals rated strongly agree. 34.2% of Teachers and 57% of Principals rated agree. 23% of Teachers and 14% of principals rated undecided. 20.3% of Teachers rated disagree and 6 % of Teachers rated extremely disagree. The mean value of Teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.36$ ,  $SD=1.14$ ) and ( $x=4.85$ ,  $SD= 1.34$ ) respectively agree that the school leadership helps the teachers to read different current educational publications. The overall  $X=4.09$  shows the agreement of the respondents with the point. Therefore, from the response of the majority, it is possible to conclude that the School Leadership was helping teachers to read different current educational publications. In addition, as was learned from document analysis, the researcher has observed curriculum materials, class room magazines and print references most of them were in their libraries. The significance level ( $p=0.38$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant significance difference between the opinions of Teachers and Principals regarding that the School Leadership helps teachers to read different current educational publications.

#### 4.2.4. Supervision related practices of leadership

**Table 8: Views on Supervision related practice of School leadership**

N	Item	Res- pon	Response[N&%]							x	SD	Over allX	PV(ttes t)
			5	4	3	2	1						
1	The School Leadership visits the classroom to ensure class-room instruction align with the school goal	Teac	F	22	35	11	11	-	3.8	0.9			
			%	28	44.	13.9	14	-			3.93	0.08	
		Prin	F	3	2	1	1		4.0	1.1			
			%	42.	28.	14.2	14.2		0	5			
2	The School Leadership observe teachers for professional development rather than evaluation	Teac	F	19	28	12	18	2	3.5	1.1	3.85	0.06	
			%	24.	35.	15.1	23	2.5	7	6			
		Prin	F	2	4	1	-	-	4.1	0.6			
			%	28.	57.	14.2	-	-	4	9			
3	The School Leadership encourage in built supervision within the school	Teac	F	22	33	14	7	2	3.8	1.0	3.09	0.00	
			%	28	42	17.7	9	2.	1	6			
		Prin	F	3	2	1	1		4.0	1.1			
			%	42.	28.	14.2	14.2		0	5			

Table 8 item 1 deals with the practices of school leadership in visiting the classroom to ensure classroom instruction align the School goal. Accordingly 28% of Teachers and 42.9% of Principals rated strongly agree, 44.3 % of Teachers and 28.6 % of Principals rated agree, 13.9 % of teachers and 14.28 % of Principals rated undecided, 14 % of Teachers and 14.28 % of Principals rated disagree. The Mean value of Teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.86$ ,  $SD=0.98$ ) and ( $X=4.00$ ,  $SD=1.15$ ) respectively agreed that, the school leadership visits the classroom to ensure classroom instruction align with the school goal. The overall  $X=3.93$  shows the agreement of the respondents with the point. This implies that the majority of respondents agree with the issue. Therefore, from the response of the majority, it is possible to conclude that the school Leadership visits the classroom to ensure classroom instruction align with the school goal. The significance level ( $p=0.08$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of teachers and principals regarding the point.

The data obtained through supervision document analysis shows that the feedback which is given to the teacher seems that the supervision that the school made were simply for purpose of data because the document could not tell somebody that what were the plan, what were the level of success and the purpose was not known but simply problems were listed. So from this the researcher tried to conclude that even though teachers and principals were satisfied with the supervision service it lack plan which exactly show what to supervise and when to supervise and its purpose as a result the activities were below the expectation and standard. In addition to this there were inadequate in visiting a classroom to ensure the classroom instruction aligns with the school goal. This implies that school leadership has very limited contact with instructional process of the school. This may be because of school leaderships give great attention to administrative work than instructional practices as suggested by supervisors and WEOs heads.

Item 2 of table 8, Accordingly Item 2, 24.05 % of Teachers and 28.57 % of Principals rated strongly agree, 35.5 % of Teachers and 57.14 % of Principals rated agree, 15.1% of Teachers and 14.28 % of Principals rated undecided, 23 % of Teachers rated disagree and 2.5% of Teachers rated strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.57$ ,  $SD=1.16$ ) and ( $X=4.14$ ,  $SD=0.69$ ) respectively agreed that the school leadership observe teachers for professional development rather than evaluation. The overall  $X=3.85$  shows the agreement of the respondents with the point. This implies

that the majority of respondents agree with the issue. Therefore, from the response of the majority, it is possible to conclude that the school leadership observes teachers for professional development rather than evaluation. The significance level ( $p=0.06$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of teachers and principals regarding the point. The practice of school leadership in observing teachers for professional development is inadequate. Because school leadership has limited contact with instructional processes as they give great attention to administrative work. Unless the school leadership frequently contact with instructional process they cannot observe and supervises teachers for professional development. Since, developing someone (teachers) need the frequent observation of leadership.

Item 3 of table 8 deals with the practice of school leadership in encouraging in built supervision within the school. 28 % of Teachers and 42.85 % of Principals rated strongly agree, 42 % of Teachers and 28.57% of Principals were rated agree, 17.7 % of Teachers and 14.28 % of Principals rated undecided, 9 % of Teachers and 14.28 % of Principals rated disagree and the rest 3.7 % of Teachers rated strongly disagrees. The mean value of Teachers and principals were found to be ( $X=3.81$ ,  $SD=1.06$ ) were not sure about the issue, on the other hand principals with the ( $X=4.00$ ,  $SD=1.15$ ) agreed that the school leadership encourage in built supervision within the school. The overall  $X= 3.09$  shows no response of the respondents with the point. This implies that the majority of respondents said nothing about the issue.

As the researchers attempt to observe and revised the documents and interview made with the PTA leaders WEOs heads revealed that, the responses of principals were lack reality. Therefore, based on the responses of the majority of teachers and the researcher's document analysis, it can be said that the school leadership was not properly encourage in built supervision within the school. The significance level ( $p=0.00$ ) is less than 0.05, this indicates that there is significance difference between the opinions of teachers and principals regarding the school leadership encourage in built supervision within the school. This implies principals agreed and teachers replied no response concerning the school leadership encourage in built supervision within the school. So that the variation of response of teachers and principals show that the school leaderships were deficient in encouragement of in-built supervision. Because developing inbuilt supervision in school needs the knowledge of supervision or training in the area of supervision.

#### 4.2.5. School leadership practices in creating school community relationship

**Table 9: Views of respondents in creating school community relationship**

N	Item	Res- pon- dents	Response[N&%]									
			F	5	4	3	2	1	x	SD	Ov. X	PV(tt est)
1	The School Leadership invite parents and guardians to actively involved in their children's learning	Teachers	F	19	29	10	16	5	3.5	1.2	3.68	0.12
			%	24.1	36.7	14	20.3	6	1	3		
		Principals	F	2	3	1	1	-	3.8	1.0	5	6
			%	29	42.85	14.28	14.28	-				
2	The School Leadership create effective communication between the School and parents	Teachers	F	18	25	11	18	7	3.6	1.3	3.76	0.12
			%	23	32	14	23	8	8	0		
		Principals	F	3	1	2	1	-	3.8	1.2	5	1
			%	42.8	14.3	28.5	14.3	-				
3	The School Leadership encourage community, parents school relationship to bring change in students academic	Teachers	F	19	23	14	18	5	3.4	1.2	3.84	0.28
			%	24.1	29.1	17.72	23	6.3	1	5		
		Principals	F	3	3	1	-	-	4.2	0.7	8	5
			%	42.8	42.8	14.2	-	-				

According to item 1 of table 9, 24.1 % of Teachers and 29% of Principals rated strongly agree. 36.7% of Teachers and 42.85% of Principals rated agree, 14% of Teachers and 14.28% of Principals rated undecided, 20.3% of Teachers and 14.28 % of Principals rated disagree and 4.67% of Teachers rated strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.51$ ,  $SD=1.23$ ) and ( $X =3.85$ ,  $SD=1.06$ ) respectively agreed that the school leadership invite parents and guardians to actively involved in their children's learning. The overall  $X=3.68$  shows the agreement of the respondents with the point. This implies that the majority of respondents agree with the issue. Therefore, from the response of the majority, it is possible to conclude that the school leadership invites parents and guardians to actively involved in their children's learning. The significance level ( $p=0.08$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of teachers and principals regarding the school leadership invite parents and guardians to actively involved in their children's learning. Here it is possible to conclude that school principals in the study area were in better position in involving parents to improve students' learning. In line with this (EIC, 2000) pinpoint that Parental involvement is one of the most significant factors in a child's success, it is crucial that all schools set a goal in their improvement plans for increasing it.

Item 2 of table 9 deals with the practices of school leadership's in creating effective communication between parents and School. Based on this 23 % of Teachers and 42.8 % of principals rated strongly agree, 32% of Teachers and 14.3% of Principals rated agree, 14% of teachers and 28.5% of Principals rated undecided, 23 % of teachers and 14.3% of Principals rated disagree and 5 % of Teachers were rated strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.68$ ,  $SD=1.03$ ) and ( $X=3.85$ ,  $SD=1.21$ ) respectively agreed that the School Leadership create effective communication between the school and parents. The overall  $X=3.76$  shows the agreement of the respondents with the point. Therefore, from the response of the majority, it is possible to conclude that the school leadership creates effective communication between the school and parents. The significance level ( $p=0.12$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant significance difference between the opinions of teachers and principals regarding the school leadership create effective communication between the school and parents.

Item 3 of table 9 deals with the practices of school leadership's in encouraging community, parents, school relationship to bring change in student academic achievement. Regarding

to this 24.1% of Teachers and 42.8% of Principals rated strongly agree, 29.1 % of Teachers and 42.8% of Principals rated agree. 17.72 % of Teachers and 14.28% of Principals rated undecided, 23 % of Teachers and 14.28 % of principals rated disagree. The mean value of Teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.41$ ,  $SD=1.25$ ) and ( $X=4.28$ ,  $SD=0.75$ ) respectively agreed that the school leadership encourage community, parents school relationship to bring change in students academic achievements. The overall  $X=3.84$  shows the agreement of the respondents with the point. Therefore, from the response of the majority, it is possible to conclude that the school leadership encourages community, parent's school relationship to bring change in student's academic achievements. The significance level ( $p=0.28$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant significance difference between the opinions of teachers and principals regarding the school leadership encourage community, parents school relationship to bring change in students, academic achievements.

#### 4.2.6. Curriculum development practice of school leadership

**Table 10: Views on Curriculum Development Practices of School Leadership**

N	Item	Respon dents	Response[N&%]										
			5	4	3	2	1	X	SD	Ov.	PV(t)		
1	The School Leadership identifies students and community need so as to improve Curriculum.	Teachers	F	11	23	21	17	8	3.1	7	1.1	3.51	0.01
			%	14	29.	26.	21.	10		8			
		Principals	F	2	3	1	1	-	3.8	1.0			
			%	28	42.	14	14.	-	5	6			
2	The School Leadership work as a Resource person in curriculum	Teachers	F	8	30	21	15	1	3.4	1.0	3.51	0.09	
			%	10	38	26.	19	1.2	6	1			
		Principals	F	1	3	2	1	-	3.5	0.9			
			%	14.	42.	28.	14	-	7	7			
3	The School Leadership identifies the problems in implementing the existing curriculum as per the education policy	Teachers	F	12	26	19	18	2	3.3	1.1	3.43	0.33	
			%	15.	36.	24	20.	2.5					
		Principals	F	1	2	2	1	-	3.5	0.9			
			%	14.	28.	28.	14.	-	7	7			
4	The School Leadership involves stake holders in curriculum improvement	Teachers	F	12	30	11	22	4	3.3	1.1	3.57	0.18	
			%	15.	38	14	28	5.0	0	8			
		Principals	F	2	2	3	-	-	3.8	0.8			
			%	28.	28.	42.	-	-	5	9			

Item 1 of table 10 deals with the practices of school leadership's in identifying students, and community needs so as to improve curriculum. Based on this 14 % of Teachers and 28 % of Principals rated strongly agree, 29.1 % of Teachers and 42.86% of Principals rated agree, 26.5 % of Teachers and 14% of principals rated undecided, 21.5 % of Teachers and 14.8 % of Principals rated disagree and 10% of Teachers rated strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers were found to be ( $X=3.17$ ,  $SD=1.18$ ) were not sure about the issue and principals with the ( $X=3.85$ ,  $SD=1.06$ ) agreed that the school leadership identify students and community need so as to improve curriculum. The overall  $X=3.51$  shows the neutrality of the majority of the respondents with the point. Therefore, from the response of the majority, it is possible to conclude that the school leadership was not in a good position to identify students and community needs so as to improve curriculum. The significance level ( $p=0.11$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant significance difference between the opinions of Teachers and Principals regarding the school leadership identify students and community need so as to improve curriculum.

Item 2 of table 10 deals the practices of school leaderships' work as a resource person in curriculum improvement. Regarding this 10%of Teachers and 14.3% of principals rated strongly agree, 38% of Teachers and 42.8 % of Principals rated agree, 26.5% of Teachers and 28.57% of Principals rated undecided, 19 % of Teachers and 14% of Principals rated disagree and 1.2%of Teachers rated strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.46$ ,  $SD=1.01$ ) were not sure about the issue and principals with the ( $X=3.57$ ,  $SD=0.97$ ) agreed that the School Leadership work as a resource person in curriculum improvement. The overall  $X=3.51$  shows neutrality of the majority of the respondents with the point. Thus, it is possible to conclude that principals attempt to work as resource person in curriculum improvement were not satisfied teachers, as they expressed not sure about leadership work as a resource person in curriculum improvement. The significance level ( $p=0.09$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant significance difference between the opinions of Teachers and Principals regarding the School Leadership work as a resource person in curriculum improvement. Therefore the effort of School leadership as a resource person in curriculum improvement was not satisfactory.

Item 3 of table 10 deals with the practices of School leadership's in identifying the problems in implementing the existing curriculum as per the education policy. Based on this

15.2% of Teachers and 14.3% of Principals rated strongly agree, 36.7% of Teachers and 35.71% of Principals rated agree, 24 % of Teachers and 28.5% of Principals rated undecided, 20.3 % of Teachers and 7.14% of Principals rated disagree and the rest 2.5% of Teachers rated strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.30$ ,  $SD=1.13$ ) and ( $X=3.57$ ,  $SD=0.97$ ) respectively agreed that, the School Leadership identifies the problems in implementing the existing curriculum as per the education policy. The overall  $X=3.43$  shows the agreement of the majority of the respondents with the point. Thus, it is possible to conclude that School Leadership identifies the problems in implementing the existing curriculum as per the education policy. This implies that the school leadership in the study area was in a good position to understand and implement education policies. The significance level ( $p=0.33$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant significance difference between the opinions of Teachers and Principals regarding the School Leadership identifies the problems in implementing the existing curriculum as per the education policy. School leadership has become a priority in education policy because it believe to play a key role in improving classroom practice, school policies and the relations between individual schools and the outside world. As the key intermediary between the classrooms, the individual school and the whole education system, effective school leadership is essential to improve the efficiency and equity of schooling (Pont, 2008).

Item 4 of table 10 deals with the practices of School leadership's in involving stakeholders in curriculum improvement. Accordingly 15.3% of Teachers and 28.57% of Principals rated strongly agree, 38 % of Teachers and 28.57% of Principals rated agree, 14% of Teachers and 42.8 % of Principals were rated undecided, 28% of Teachers rated disagree and 5.06 % of Teachers rated strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers were found to be( $X=3.30$ ,  $SD=1.18$ ) were not sure about the issue and principals with the ( $X=3.85$ ,  $SD=0.89$ ) agreed that the School Leadership involves stake holders in curriculum improvement. The overall  $X=3.57$  shows neutrality of the majority of the respondents with the point. Thus, it is possible to conclude that the School Leadership involves stake holders in curriculum improvement were not satisfied teachers, as they expressed they were not sure about the issue. The significance level ( $p=0.18$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant significance difference between the opinions of Teachers and Principals regarding the School Leadership involves stake holders in curriculum improvement.

### **4.3. Challenges of Secondary school Leadership Effectiveness**

Range of educational leadership barriers can be listed depending on the context to which each sampled schools are exposed and the extent to which these factors affect each school performance dependent up on the leader's ability of controlling different situation. Therefore, the study had dealt with some of the major challenges supposed will seriously affect the effective performance of educational leaders. Three groups of hindering factors were selected for the inquiry namely; Lack of Qualification and Experience in the area of educational leadership, Lack of Organizing and Lack of stakeholders Cooperation and Commitment for school Improvement.

The School leadership is the most visible and directly accessible representative of the School management. Moreover, the School leaders retain ultimate accountability for the overall operation of the School. Most studies on educational leadership revealed that the main function of Principals as educational leader is making effective teaching and learning. She/he also expected to practice managerial responsibility as well. In practicing both educational and managerial responsibility in School setting, he/she was facing different challenges. Based on this assumption to identify the challenges that secondary School leadership faces 12 major points were listed in the questionnaire under part IV using the Likert scale strongly agree=5, agree=4, undecided=3, disagree=2, strongly disagree=1. For the purpose of analysis this major challenges were categorized under 3 groups. Finally, to see the effect of the challenges on the practice of School leadership the expected analysis was given accordingly in the section that follows.

#### **4.3.1. Lack of qualification and experience.**

The conceptual, technical and human skills are among the most important components that one educational leader should possess. The extent to which the leaders are equipped with these components determines the level of effectiveness in their goal achievement. Accordingly in table 11 respondents attitudes were presented and analyzed to show that qualification and experience related problems were to be the challenges of School leadership in practicing or implementing School activities or to carry out their duties.

**Table 11: lack of Qualification and Experience of School Leadership**

N	Item	Respon dents	Response[N&%]							SD	Ov.X	PV(tt est)
			5	4	3	2	1	X				
1	Lack of educa- tional back- ground in Pre- paring the school plan	Teach- ers	F	16	27	7	15	14	3.20	1.4	3.38	0.27
			%	20	34. 2	9	18.9	17. 7				
		Prin- cipals	F	2	3	-	1	1	3.57	1.51		
			%	28. 5	42. 8	-	14.3	14				
2	Lack of train- ing on the edu- cational man- agement to give profes- sional support for teacher	Teach- ers	F	22	30	9	8	9	3.57	1.32	3.71	0.55
			%	28	38	11. 3	10.2	11. 3				
		Prin- cipals	F	3	2	-	2	-	3.85	1.34		
			%	42. 8	28. 5	-	28.5	-				
3	Lack of expe- rience to tackle the problem that encounter the school lea- dership	Teach- ers	F	18	35	7	11	9	3.55	1.2	3.41	0.94
			%	22. 7	44. 3	8.8	13.1	11. 3				
		Prin- cipals	F	1	3	-	3	-	3.28	1.25		
			%	14. 28	42	-	42	-				
4	Lack of clear understanding of the educa- tional policy to carry out the leadership ac- tivities accor- dingly	Teach- ers	F	11	29	9	20	9	3.1	1.2	3.36	0.1
			%	14	37	11. 3	25.3	11. 3				
		Prin- cipals	F	2	3	-	1	1	3.57	1.51		
			%	28. 5	42. 85	-	14.2	14. 2				

Item 1 of table 12 deals with the lack of educational background of School leadership's in preparing the School plan. Accordingly 20 % of Teachers and 28.57% of Principals rated strongly agree, 34.2 % of Teachers and 42.86% of Principals rated agree, 9% of teachers rated undecided, 18.9 % of Teachers and 14.3 % of Principals rated disagree and 17.7 % of teacher's and 14% of Principals rated strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers were found to be ( $X=3.20$ ,  $SD=1.42$ ) and ( $X=3.57$ ,  $SD=1.51$ ) show that the neutrality to the point. And the mean value of principals were found to be  $X=3.64$ ,  $SD=1.29$  agree that lack of educational background of the school leadership in Preparing the school plan. The overall  $X=3.38$  shows the neutrality of the respondents with the point. From this the researcher is interested to conclude that even though most of secondary school principals in the study area were qualified with first degree in different field of education rather than in educational leadership they are skilled to develop school plan from the knowledge obtained from short training. The significance level ( $p=0.27$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant significance difference between the opinions of Teachers and Principals regarding lack of educational background of the school leadership in Preparing the school plan.

Item 2 of table 12 deals with lack of training on the educational management of School leadership's to give professional support for Teachers. Based on this 28 % of Teachers and 42.86% of Principals rated strongly agree, 38 % of Teachers and 28.57% of Principals rated agree, 10.2% of Teachers and 28.5 % of Principals rated disagree and the rest 11.3% of Teachers were rated strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.57$ ,  $SD=1.32$ ) and ( $X=3.85$ ,  $SD=1.34$ ) respectively agreed that lack of training on the educational management to give professional support for teacher. The overall  $X=3.71$  shows the agreement of the respondents with the point. Therefore, from the response of the majority, it is possible to conclude that lack of training on the educational management to give professional support for teacher. The significance level ( $p=0.55$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant significance difference between the opinions of Teachers and Principals regarding lack of training on the educational management to give professional support for teacher.

Item 3 of table 12 deals with the lack of experience to tackle the problems that encounter the School leaderships' Regarding the item 22.7% of Teachers and 14.28% of Principals rated strongly agree, 44.3 % of Teachers and 42 % of Principals rated agree, 8.8 % of teachers were rated undecided, 13.1 % of teachers and 42% of Principals rated disagree and the rest 11.3 % of Teachers rated strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.55$ ,  $SD=1.28$ ) and ( $X=3.28$ ,  $SD=1.28$ ) respectively agreed that lack of experience to tackle the problem that encounter the school leadership. The overall  $X=3.41$  shows the agreement of the respondents with the point. Therefore, from the response of the majority, it is possible to conclude that lack of experience to tackle the problem that encounter the school leadership. The significance level ( $p=0.94$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant significance difference between the opinions of Teachers and Principals regarding lack of experience to tackle the problem that encounter the school leadership.

Item 4 of table 12 deals with the lack of clear understanding the educational policy of a School leadership's to carry out the leadership activities accordingly. Regarding this 14 % of Teachers and 28.5 % of Principals rated strongly agree, 37 % of Teachers and 42.8% of Principals rated agree, 11.3 % of Teachers rated undecided, 25.3 % of Teachers and 14.2% of Principals rated disagree, 11.3 And 14.29% of Principals rated strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers were found to be ( $X=3.15$ ,  $SD=1.28$ ) were not sure about the issue and principals with the( $X=3.57$ ,  $SD=1.51$ ) agreed that lack of clear understanding of the educational policy to carry out the leadership activities accordingly. The overall  $X= 3.36$  shows the neutrality of the respondents with the point. Thus, it is possible to conclude that the School leadership lack clear understanding of the educational policy, as the respondents expressed not sure about the issue. The significance level  $p=0.1$  is greater than 0.05. This indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinion of teachers and principals regarding the School leadership having clear understanding of the educational policy to carry out their activities accordingly.

### 4.3.2. Lack of cooperation and commitment for school improvement.

Schools effectiveness is contingent to many factors. However, the cooperation of its main stakeholders namely the nature of the community, the teaching staff, and other stakeholders all influence the effectiveness of various kinds of School leadership practices.

**Table12: View of respondents on Lack of Cooperation and Commitment for school Improvement.**

N Item	Respondents	Response[N&%]					X	SD	Ov. X	PV(t test)	
		5	4	3	2	1					
1 Lack of good relationship and support of community to improve the School.	Teachers	F	15	35	5	15	9	3.40	1.30	3.45	0.60
		%	19	44	6.4	18.9	11				
	Principals	F	1	3	1	2	-	3.49	1.13		
		%	14.28	42.85	14.28	28.57	-				
2 Weak initiation of PTA to participate in school leading activities	Teachers	F	8	40	6	17	8	3.21	1.18	3.53	0.50
		%	10.1	50.6	7.5	21.5	10.2				
	Principals	F	2	3	1	1	-	3.85	1.06		
		%	28.5	43	14	14.28	-				

Item	Respon- dents		5	4	3	2	1	X	SD	Ov. X	PV( ttest )	
3	Lack of Pro- fessional support from external	Teachers	F	12	36	7	17	7	3.36	1.23	3.46	0.41
			%	15	45.6	8.8	21.5	9				
	school su- pervisor to provide bet- ter leader- ship in the School.	Principals	F	2	2	1	2	-	3.57	1.27		
			%	29	29	14	28.5	-				
4	Lack of in- ternal and external fa- cilities to	Teachers	F	21	37	5	10	6	3.72	1.2	3.78	0.19
			%	26.5	46.8	6.3	12.6	7.5		0		
	facilitate the instructional process and to provide effective leadership	Principals	F	2	3	1	1	-	3.85	1.06		
			%	29	42.8	14	14.28	-				

As indicated in Table 13, Item 1. 19% of Teachers and 14.28 % of Principals rated strongly agree, 44.3 % of Teachers and 42.86% of Principals rated agree, 6.4 % of Teachers and 14% of Principals rated undecided, 18.9 % of Teachers and 28.57% of Principals rated disagree. The rest 11% of Teachers rated strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.40$ ,  $SD=1.30$ ) and ( $X=3.49$ ,  $SD=1.13$ ) respectively agreed that lack of good relationship and support of community to improve the School. The overall  $X=3.45$  shows the agreement of the respondents with the point. Thus, it is possible to conclude that lack of good relationship and support of community to improve the School. The significance level ( $p=0.41$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant significance difference between the opinions of Teachers and Principals regarding the issue.

Item 2 of table 13 deals weak initiations of PTA to participate in School leading activity influence the School leadership or not. Accordingly 10 % of Teachers and 28.57% of Principals rated strongly agree, 50.6 % of Teachers and 43 % of Principals rated agree, 7.5 % of Teachers and 14% of Principals rated undecided, 21.5% of Teachers and 14.28% of Principals rated disagree. 10.2% of Teachers rated strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.21$ ,  $SD=1.18$ ) and ( $X=3.85$ ,  $SD=1.06$ ) respectively agreed that weak initiation of PTA to participate in school leading activities. The overall  $X=3.53$  shows the agreement of the respondents with the point. Thus, it is possible to conclude that weak initiation of PTA to participate in school leading activities in the study area. The significance level ( $p=0.5$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant significance difference between the opinions of Teachers and Principals regarding weak initiation of PTA to participate in school leading activities. Supporting this (MoE, 2005) suggest that, PTAs and communities still need further capacity enhancement in carrying out quality support to help schools to function as desired.

Item 3 of table 13 deals whether lack professional support from external School supervisor to provide better leadership in the School influence secondary School leadership or not. Regarding this 15 % of Teachers and 29 % of Principals rated strongly agree, 45.6 % of Teachers and 29% of Principals rated agree, 8.8 % of Teachers and 14 % of Principals rated undecided, 21.5 % of Teachers and 28.5% of Principals rated disagree. The rest 9 % of Teachers rated strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.36$ ,  $SD=1.23$ ) and ( $X=3.85$ ,  $SD=1.16$ ) respectively agreed that lack of Profession-

al support from external school supervisor to provide better leadership in the School. The overall  $X=3.46$  shows the agreement of the respondents with the point. Thus, it is possible to conclude that lack of Professional support from external school supervisor to provide better leadership in the School. The significance level ( $p=0.41$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant significance difference between the opinions of Teachers and Principals regarding lack of Professional support from external school supervisor to provide better leadership in the School.

Item 4 of table 13 deals whether lack of internal and external facilities to facilitate the instructional process and to provide effective leadership influence the School leadership or not. Based on this 26.5 % of Teachers and 29 % of Principals rated strongly agree, 46.8% of Teachers and 42.86% of Principals rated agree, 6.3 % of Teachers and 14% of Principals rated undecided, 12.6 % of Teachers and 14.28% of Principals rated disagree. The rest 8% of Teachers rated strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.72$ ,  $SD=1.20$ ) and ( $X=3.85$ ,  $SD=1.06$ ) respectively agreed that lack of internal and external facilities to facilitate the instructional process and to provide effective leadership. The overall  $X=3.78$  shows the agreement of the respondents with the point. Thus, it is possible to conclude that lack of internal and external facilities to facilitate the instructional process and to provide effective leadership. The significance level ( $p=0.19$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant significance difference between the opinions of Teachers and Principals regarding lack of internal and external facilities to facilitate the instructional process and to provide effective leadership. In general, secondary School leadership is accountable for overall operations of the School. According to MoE (2005:50) secondary School leaderships are required to coordinate in and outside of the School community to fulfill the Schools requirement: plan the School improvement program in order to implement successfully; Facilitate the improvements of students achievements and inculcate the support of self confidence and get them motivated to earn good results; assure quality education in the School and create good learning atmosphere in the school. Therefore, this indicates that duties and responsibilities of School leaderships are complex. So that, to be successful in their duties and responsibilities, School leadership expected to have basic knowledge in managerial skills (technical, human and conceptual). Additionally the availability of essential internal and external facilities with active involvement of stakeholders in the School improvement program enhances the success of the School leadership.

### 4.3.3. Lack of organizing

Table 13: lack of respondents on Organizing

N	Item	Res- pon- dents	Response[N&%]						x	SD	Over all X	PVal ue( ttest )	
			5	4	3	2	1						
1	Lack of delegating the job to the staff member to carry out their responsibility	Teachers	F	11	36	9	17	6	3.3	1.18	3.46	0.43	
			%	13	45.6	11.3	21.5	8	6				
		Prin- cipals	F	2	3	-	1	1	3.5	1.51	7		
			%	28	42.8	-	14.2	14.28					
			F	11	24	9	29	6	3.0	1.24		3.54	0.11
			%	14	30.4	11.3	36.4	7.5	8				
Prin- cipals	F	3	2	1	1	-	4.0	1.15	0				
	%	42.	29	14.	14.2	-	0						
	F	11	33	9	15	11	3.2	1.31		3.19	0.41		
	%	14	42	11.3	18.9	13	5						
Prin- cipals	F	1	2	1	3	-	3.1	1.21	4				
	%	14	29	14	42.8	-	4						

Accordingly to table 14, Item 1 shows that 13 % of Teachers and 28 % of Principals rated strongly agree, 45.6 % of Teachers and 42.8 % of Principals rated agree, 11.3% of Teachers and 14% of Principals rated undecided, 21.49% of Teachers and 14.29% of principals rated disagree. The rest 8 % of Teachers and 14% of Principals rated strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.36$ ,  $SD=1.18$ ) and ( $X=3.57$   $SD=1.51$ ) respectively were not sure about the issue. The overall  $X=3.46$  shows the neutrality of the respondents with the point. Thus, it is possible to conclude that delegating the job to the staff member to carry out their responsibility were not satisfied teachers, as majority of teachers expressed they were not sure about the issue. The significance level ( $p=0.43$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant significance difference between the opinions of Teachers and Principals regarding delegating the job to the staff member to carry out their responsibility.

Item 2 of table 14 deals with whether work over loaded in the School enables the School leadership or not to the success of the School practices. Based on this 14% of Teachers and 42.8 % of Principals were rated strongly agree, 30.4% of Teachers and 29 % of Principals rated agree, 11.3 % of Teachers and 14% of Principals rated undecided, 36.4 % of Teachers and 14.2% of Principals rated disagree. The rest 7.5 % of Teachers rated strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers and Principals were found to be ( $X=3.08$ ,  $SD=1.24$ ) and ( $X=4.00$ ,  $SD=1.15$ ) respectively agreed that Work over loaded in the school unable the success of School practices. The overall  $X=3.54$  shows the agreement of the respondents with the point. Thus, it is possible to conclude that Work over loaded in the school unable the success of School practices. The significance level ( $p=0.11$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant significance difference between the opinions of Teachers and Principals regarding the issue.

Item 3 of table 14 deals whether unable to create team building for collaborative work in the School influence the School leadership or not. Accordingly 14 % of Teachers and 14.28% of Principals rated extremely agree, 42 % of Teachers and 29 % of Principals rated agree, 11.3% of Teachers and 14% of Principals rated undecided, 18.9 % of Teachers and 42.86% of Principals rated disagree. The rest 13% of Teachers rated strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers were found to be ( $X=3.25$ ,  $SD=1.31$ ) were not sure about the issue and principals with the ( $X=3.14$ ,  $SD=1.21$ ) also were not sure about the issue. The overall  $X=3.19$  agreement of respondents that shows the uncertainty of the respondents with the

point. Thus, it is possible to conclude that create team building for collaborative work in the School were not satisfied teachers as they expressed they were not sure about the issue. The significance level ( $p=0.41$ ) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant difference between the opinions of Teachers and Principals regarding the issue.

## 5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter deals with the summary of major findings, the conclusion drawn from the findings and recommendations that the researcher suggests and assumes operational in improving the status of educational leadership practices and challenges in government secondary schools of Babile Woreda.

### 5.1. Summary

The main purpose of the study was to assess the practices and challenges of educational leadership in government secondary schools of Babile Woreda. To this end, an attempt has been made to assess the school leadership plays great role in the improvement of teaching learning process by giving continuous professional support to teachers, which in turn results in improved students learning. Finally, the study made an effort to come up with suggestions and forwarded recommendations. In order to achieve the objective of the study, the following basic questions were stated and answered.

1. How are schools leaders selected and assigned in secondary schools for the positions?
2. What are the current practices of school leadership in secondary school of Babile Woreda?
3. What are the major challenges that faced the secondary school leadership in the Babile Woreda?

Descriptive survey design was employed to conduct this study and a survey method was found suitable. The researcher employed both qualitative and quantitative data gathering instruments to collect data pertinent to the issue under researched. That is, closed ended and open ended questionnaire, semi-structured interview related to educational leadership were used as data collection instruments. Pilot study was conducted to check the reliability of the questionnaire using Cronbach Alpha. Questionnaire was distributed and its results were tabulated and analyzed with the help of both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. The total samples of respondent were 100 respondents, which include 79 teachers, 7 school principals, 12 PTAs and 2 Woreda education head.

Accordingly, questionnaires (closed and open-ended questions) were used to collect data from principals and teachers. Interview made with PTA and Woreda education officials of

the sampled woreda and in some instances document analysis and observation were undertaken.

The data obtained through questionnaire were tabulated and analyzed using percentage, mean and t-test. Whereas the data obtained through interview, observation and document analysis were analyzed qualitatively by using narration in line with the data obtained from closed and open ended questions. As a result the following findings were drawn from the analysis.

1. With regarding to the characteristics of the respondents, it has been found that there was no female participant in both principals and woreda education office head leadership levels. In the teaching position, still female participation low 3(3.8 %) as compared to male 76(96.2%)
2. In terms of qualification 100% of the principals were first degree holders and there were no principals who trained in Educational Planning and Management and WEOs heads were not qualified for the position. They were assigned the post without having management training, skills and knowledge in their respective schools.
3. The majority of school leadership 71.43% of principals and 60.7% of Teachers was assigned by competition on the basis of their merit only without following the directives set by MoE. However majority of the school leadership do not fulfill the prerequisite criteria, like educational qualification, experiences and training in educational leadership. So the school leadership selecting and assigning for the position to other direction, likes politics criteria.
4. Concerning to the involvement of educational leaders (principals, vice principals and WEO heads) in capable in providing clear vision, skilled in developing the School mission, goals and objectives, communicating the vision in order to have common understanding with staff and community, can brought change based on School vision and capable in setting directions toward the implementation of School vision was in a good position.

5. As far as the supervision practices of School leadership concerning the encouragement of inbuilt supervision the overall mean value of teachers and principals (3.07) shows majority of the respondents were not sure about the issue. But as the researcher attempts to serve, revised the document and interview made with PTA and focus group made with supervisors and woreda education officials school leadership were deficient in encouraging inbuilt supervision within the school and supervising teachers to improve instructional practices.

6. Sharing leadership among stakeholders; were responded that the School leadership were in a good position in inviting parents in School affairs, creating effective communication between parents and School, encouraging community, parents School relationship and strengthen PTA and allow them to take part in School leadership. However, as the data collected from teachers and school leaders revealed the practice of parents and community activities is low.

7. Concerning curriculum development practices of the School leaderships, the majority of the respondents show that the school leadership was deficient in identifying students and community needs so as to improve curriculum, working as a resource person in curriculum improvement, in identifying the facing challenges in implementing the existing curriculum and in involving all stakeholders in curriculum improvement.

8. Concerning the major challenges that secondary school leadership faces the study shows that a school leadership was lack experience to tackle the problems, lack of educational background in preparing the school plan, were not trained in the area of educational leadership and lack of commitment in implementing educational policy to carry out the leadership activities.

9. One of the serious challenges of organizing is lack of delegating the job to the staff members. In addition work overload and unable in creating team building were raised as the facing challenges of school leadership.

10. Concerning factors that hinder educational leadership were weak in initiating PTA to participate in school affairs and lack of community support to improve the school, lack of professional support from external school supervisors and lack of internal and external facilities to facilitate the instructional process where the challenges that secondary school leadership faces.

## **5.2. Conclusions**

The purpose of this study was to assess the practices and challenges of educational leaderships in government secondary schools of Babile Woreda. The researcher found both positive and negative quantitative and qualitative results about the practices and challenges educational leadership. It is possible to conclude that:

1. The school leadership to assign or select for position of the school, the assigning bodies keep the directives set by MoE. Even though the school leaderships in sampled secondary schools assigned to their current position through competitions they were not selected and assigned according to the directives of MoE and the regional educational bureau. They were assigned the post without having management training, skills and knowledge in their respective schools.
2. The school leaderships are accountable for the overall operations of the school. That is, they should show good leadership practices that currently ensure efficiency and effectiveness in the provision of quality education. However, from the study it can be concluded that inspiring the school vision, preparing an actionable plan, participating the staff member in decision making, creating school community relationship, staff development and curriculum development are the current practice of school leadership in which the school leadership practices to facilitate the instructional processes. The school leadership practices in giving academic and administrative guidance follow up (supervision) and giving support, evaluation and giving feedback are also the current practices of school leadership.
3. The school leadership practices in supervision and curriculum development practices the school leaderships were deficient to play their respective practice and re-

sponsibility. So that it can be concluded the principals in their leadership activities were not in academic activities, as much of their time was spent on administrative tasks. This could be resulted from heavy work load carried on by the principals, lack of supportive staff and inability to delegate tasks to teachers and department heads; which in turn affect the teaching learning process and lastly influence the academic achievement of the students.

4. The school leadership challenges that encountered it can be concluded that lack of training, lack of experience, lack of delegating the job properly, work overload, unable to build team and cooperation and commitment (lack of good relation and support of community, weak initiation of PTA, lack of professional support from external supervisors and lack of external and internal facilities were the challenges that affected the practices of school leadership in the sampled secondary schools. Because of these challenges the leading practices given at the schools by the school leaderships were found to be insufficient. So that insufficient leading practices of school leader affects the teaching learning process.

### **5.3. Recommendations**

Based on the findings and conclusion reached the following possible solutions are recommended.

1. This study has shown that all of school principals did not have previous knowledge and skills in educational leadership (EDPM). They were assigned the post without having management training, skills and knowledge in their respective schools. Thus, the directives for selecting and assigning school leadership are prepared at Regional or Zonal level and implemented at Woreda or School level and it is important for the Babile Woreda Education office in collaboration with Babile Woreda Civil Service office to give special attention in the implementation of professionalization of educational leadership by providing training to principals in the field of Edpm by preparing a plan of action and work it in collaboration with educational institutions.
2. In this study, it was revealed that the practices of School leadership in visiting the classroom, observing teachers for professional development and encouraging built supervision were inadequate. They only assigning teacher development committee

and department heads for supervision practices. Therefore it is recommended that the school principals included themselves in supervision practice of the school and also as they are head teachers and leaders of their respective schools they give administrative guidance and educational leadership to teachers.

3. The other serious problem is the belief that school management activities are done by only school principals. This attitude is dangerous to get the involvement of stakeholders on school activities. Therefore, secondary school leader with woreda education offices should prepare trainings to create and raise awareness for teachers and the community to enhance their participation in school activities.
4. Concerning to practices of school leader affects the teaching learning process, the educational leaders should be strengthen their relationship with teachers and school community by spending more time in classroom instructional observation, support teachers by indicating necessarily respect for each others, telling and participating and by minimizing showing negative direction in the school by working with woreda education offices nearby to improve the quality of classroom instructions or teaching learning process as well as others school stakeholders.
5. This study has also shown that the principals did not effectively communicated school vision within the school community to translate the vision into agreed objectives and operational plans. Thus, it is recommended that the school principals needed to follow opened or policy and participatory leadership in order to create communication channel such as through notice board, mini media and arranging festivals. In doing so, the principals can share school vision and mission that develop a sense of shared responsibility of stakeholders towards realization of educational goals.
6. To avoid the facing challenges related to lack of experience and training on area of leadership, it is recommended that the woreda education office in collaboration with the nearest education institutions likes Haramaya University and Zone education office has to arrange short and long term training to equip the school leaderships with basic knowledge and skills of leading.
7. Sharing leadership among stakeholders; were responded that the School leadership were in a good position in inviting parents in School affairs, creating effective communication between parents and School, encouraging community, parents School relationship and strengthen PTA and allow them to take part in School leadership. However, as the data collected from teachers and school leaders revealed

the practice of parents and community activities is low. Therefore, the Woreda education offices and schools should do together to strengthen stakeholders involvement in all school affairs and activities.

8. Regarding to challenges that impede effectiveness of educational leadership in this study were a need for adequate skill and training of leadership, high cooperation and commitment from concerned bodies, provision of educational resources and knowledge, will and courage were motioned. As the findings witness that availability of resource, allocating too many resources by itself does not improve school outcome. However, inadequacies of financial and material supply can endanger effective performance of schools. The finding in the study reveals that schools were not working with their full capacity for the lack of adequate finance and educational materials. Therefore, educational office heads at Zonal and Woreda level need to show their professional commitment to improve the quality of school outcomes by devoting much of their time, finance and material resource for the schools with severe shortage of these items were observed.

## 6. REFERENCES

- Airasian, Gay, L. and Mills. 2006. *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications (8th ed.)* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Ayalew Shibeshi. 2000. *Theories of Educational Management* EdAd 611, AAU (unpublished).
- Babyegeya. 2002. *Educational planning and administration*; Dares Salaam, The Open University press.
- Barnett and McCormick. 2004. Leadership and individual principal-teacher relationships in schools: *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 406-34.
- Best and Kahan. 2004. *Research in Education*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall.
- Blasé. 2004. *Handbook of instructional leadership: how successful principals promote teaching and learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Botha, R. J. 2013. Epistemological beliefs and leadership approaches among South African school principals. *Educational Studies*, 39(4), 431-443.
- Brundrett, M. 2003. *Education leadership*. London: SAGE publication.
- Bush, T. 2007. *Educational and Management: Theory, Policy and Practice*: South African Journal of education 3, 391-40.
- Bush, T. 2008. *From Management to Leadership*. UK: University of Warwick.
- Bush, T. 2011. *Theories of Educational Leadership and Management*, 4th end. London: SAGE.
- Clement and Vandenberg. 2001. How school leaders can promote professional development. an account from the field, *School Leadership and Management*.
- Cooley and Shen. 2010. School accountability and professional job responsibilities: A perspective from secondary principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 10-25
- Daresh. 2001. *Supervision as a proactive leadership*. Long Grove, Illinois: Wave land Press.
- Decman, Grigsby, Schumacher and Simieou .2011. A Principal's Dilemma: Instructional leader or manager. *The Online Journal*, 8(3).
- Dimmock. 2000. *Designing the Learning Centred Schools*. London: Falmer Press.

- Dinham. 2005. Principal leadership for outstanding educational outcomes. *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 43 No. 4, pp. 338-56.
- Elliot. 2001. *Change Agent play book: Coaching teachers for excellence*. California: Claremont.
- Friedman. 2016. *Thank you for being late: An optimist's guide to thriving in the age of accelerations*. New York: Farrar, Strauss, and Giroux.
- Fullan, M. 2010. *Motion leadership: The skinny on becoming change savvy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Fullan. 2001. *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Glanz. 2006. *what Every Principal should know About Instructional Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, California state.
- Glatthom, and Jailal. 2009. Importance of the Principal. *In The Principal As curriculum Leader: Shaping What is Taught and Tested* (Third ed. p. 37). Thousand Oaks, California: crown press.
- Gupton, S. L. 2003. *The instructional leadership toolbox: a handbook for improving practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Hallinger and Chen. 2015. Review of Research on Educational Leadership and Management in Asia: A Comparative Analysis of Research Topics and Methods, 1995–2012. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* 5–27.
- Hallinger. 2003. Leading education change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*. 33 (3).
- Hallinger. 2005. Instructional leadership and the school principal: a passing fancy that refuses to fade away”, *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, Vol. 4, 221-39.
- Harris. 2003. *Effective leadership for school improvement*. London: New York, RoutledgeFalmer.
- Hilliard and Jackson,. 2011. Current trends in educational leadership for student success plus facilities planning and designing. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 4(1), 1-8.
- Hopkin, D. 2003. *Instructional Leadership and School Improvement* In Harris et al (Eds) *effective Leadership for school improvement*. New York: Routledge flamer.
- Hull. 2012. *The principal perspective: Full report*. Retrieved from Center for Public Education website: <http://www.centerforpubliceducation.org/principal-perspective>.
- Kornig and Loeb. 2010. New Thinking About Instructional leadership. *Kappen Magazine*. org.vg2, v3 p.69.
- Krug, S. 1992. Instructional leadership: *a constructive perspective*. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28(3), 430-443.

- Kruger, M.L, Witziers, B. and Slegers. 2007. The impact of school leadership on school level factors: validation of a causal model; *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 1-20.
- Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., Harris, A. and Hopkins, D. 2006. *Successful School Leadership. What It Is and How It Influences Pupil Learning*, Department for Education and Skills, Nottingham.
- Leithwood, Louis, Anderson and Wahlstrom .2004. *How leadership influences students' learning: Review of Research*. Ontario: The Wallace Foundation. London: Allyn and Bacon.
- Lunenburg, F.C.2010. The Principal as Instructional Leader. *National Forum of Education and Supervision Journal*. Samouston State University.27(4).
- Lunenburg. 2006. *The Principalship: Vision to action*. Belmont, USA: Wads Worth. 54.
- Mamabolo.2002. *A phenomenological reflection on the role the school principal as an educational manager and instructional leader in Limpopo Province*.D.Ed Thesis. Pretoria: UNISA.
- Mbise. 2012. *The Impact of School Management On Provision Of Quality Secondary Education In Tanzania: The Case Study of Four Secondary Schools inTemeke District*. (An unpublished Masters dissertation), Open University ofTanzania.
- McEwan. 2003. *Seven steps to effective instructional leadership*. Thousand Oaks: Crowin Press, Inc.
- McNeill and Engelke. 2014. *The great acceleration: An environmental history of the anthropocene*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- McNergney and Robert.2004. *Foundations of Education: The Challenge of Professional Price (4thed) boton*: Pearson Education. Inc.
- Ministry of education(MOE). 2012. *Ethiopian National Professional Standards: framework for School Principals*. Addis Abeba.
- Ministry of Education. 2002. *Responsibility and Practice of School Principals*.
- Ministry of Education. 2005. *Education Sector Development*. Addis Ababa.
- MOE (ministry of education). 2002. *Directive for educational management, organization, public participation and Finance*. Addis Ababa: EMPDA.
- MoE (ministry of education).1994. *Education and Training Policy of Ethiopia*, Addis Ababa MoE.
- Moorman, Nusche, and Pont. 2008. *Improving School Leadership, Volum 1: Policy and Practice*. Published by Secretary-General of the OECD.
- Mpondo .2005. *Leadership and Management Training Programme for Heads of Schools*, Bagamoyo, ADEM.

- Mulford and Silins. 2003. Leadership for organizational learning and improved student outcomes .what do we know; Cambridge Journal of Education.
- Murphy, J., Elliott, S. N., Goldring, E., and Porter. 2007. Leadership for learning: A research-based model and taxonomy of behaviors. *School Leadership and Management*,179-201.
- Murphy.1995. *Reshaping the Principal ship*: New York.
- Nettles, S.M. and Herrington. 2007. Revisiting the importance of the direct effects of school leadership on student achievement: the implications for school improvement policy; *Peabody Journal of Education*, 724-36.
- Nirav, S. 2012. what is the relationship between a school and Community. Preserve Articles. Retrieved from <http://www.preservearticles.com/2012011020535/>
- Pashiardis, Papanoum, Z. and Johansson. 2003. European Educational Leadership. A Search for Consensus in Diversity, Digiword Limited, Nicosia.
- Quinn, D. M. 2002. The impact of principal leadership behaviors on instructional practice and student engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration*,447-467.
- Robinson. 2007. The impact of leadership on student outcomes: making sense of the evidence: paper presented at the ACER Conference “The Leadership Challenge-Improving Learning in Schools”, Melbourne, August.
- Scott. 2015. *The Futures of Learning 3: What kind of pedagogies for the 21st century?* UNESCO Education Research and Foresight, Paris.[ERF Working Papers Series, No. 15].
- Seifert and Vornberg. 2002. *The new school leader for the 21st century: The principal*. Lanham: The Scarecrow Press.
- Sergiovanni. 2001. *The principal ship: a Reflective practice perspective* (4th ed).
- Shields and Carolyn. 2004. *Dialogue Leadership for Social Justice.Educational*.
- Smith. 2009. *Human Resource Administration: A School Based Perspective (4thed)*. USA; Eye on Education.
- Smylie. 2010. *Continuous school improvement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Spillane, Camburn and Pareja. 2007. Taking a distributed perspective to the school principal’s workday. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*,103-125.
- Spillane, Halverson and Diamond. 2004. Towards a theory of leadership practice: a distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 36 (1), 3-34.
- State University. 2013. Supervision of Instruction: the history of supervision, Roles and Responsibilities of Supervisor, issues trend and Controversies.

- Tatum. 2013. *What is Strategic vision?* Retrieved from (<http://www.wisegeek.com/what-is-strategic-vision.htm>). Accessed on 6th March 2013.
- Tesfaye Nigussie, (2010). *The Role of Instructional leadership in Building Organizational Climate of Secondary School*. (AAU, Unpublished MA Thesis).
- TGE (Transitional Government of Ethiopia). 1994. *Education and Training Policy*. EEP 86, Addis Ababa.
- Tigist Bogale. 2018. *Factors affecting principals' instructional leadership performance*.
- Ubben and Hughes .1997. *The Principal Creative Leadership for Effective School (3rded)*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- UNESCO. 2005. *Education for All; Literacy for Life*, Paris: Graphoprit.
- UNESCO. 2009. *Approaches to Monitoring the Quality of Education in Developing Countries*. New York: UNESCO Publications.
- Youngs and King. 2002. *Principal leadership for professional development to build school capacity*, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 38 No. 5, pp. 643-70.
- Yukl. 2002. *Leadership in Organizations*, 5th ed., Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Zulu. 2004. *The instructional leadership role of school principals*. University of Zulu Land (Unpublished Master's Thesis).

## **APPENDICES**

### **APPENDIX-A**

#### **HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY**

#### **POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE**

**College of Education and Behavioral sciences**

**Department of Educational Planning and Management**

**A questionnaire to be filled by Teachers and Principals / Vice Principals**

**Dear Respondents**, the main purpose of this questionnaire is to gather information on the practices and challenges of school leadership. Therefore you are kindly requested to fill the questionnaire in order to give necessary information on the issue related to the study. The success of this study depends on your honest and genuine responses. The information that was obtained from the responses to these questionnaires was used only for the purpose of the study. All the information will be kept confidential and was used only for the academic purpose.

#### **Directions**

- Write your brief response in the blank spaces.
- Give only a single answer to each item unless you are requested to do so.
- No need to write your name in any part of the questionnaire.
- Give your own candid response without consulting others.
- Please try all questions and do not leave a question unanswered.

**Thank you in advance for your cooperation!**

### Part One: Background Information

Please indicate your answer by using a “√” mark in the given boxes or by giving short answer on the space provided

1. Administrative Zone \_\_\_\_\_ Woreda/Town \_\_\_\_\_

2. School \_\_\_\_\_

#### 3. Sex:

Male  Female

#### 4. Age

21-30 years  31-40 years  41-50 years  51 and above

#### 5. Your qualification

BA/BSC/BEd  Diploma  MA/MSc

6. Your major area of study: Major \_\_\_\_\_ Minor \_\_\_\_\_

#### 7. Total Experience

1-5 years  6-10 years  11-15 years  16-20 years  21 and above

#### 8. Position attainment of your school leaderships

By competition based on your merits

By competition based on directives set by MoE

By close involvement in supporting government policy

If any other specify \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## Part Two: practices of school leadership

The following items are designed to get your response on secondary School leadership activities (**practices**). They are supervision, curriculum development, staff development and creating relation with community. Please show the extent to which these functions are performed by your school leadership (Principals). You are kindly requested to Show your degree of agreement or disagreement by putting “√ “mark in the appropriate using the likert scale.

1=strongly disagree    3 =Undecided  
2= Disagree    4 =Agree    5= strongly agree

### A. How the School Leadership works in line with School vision

No	Item	5	4	3	2	1
1	The School Leadership is capable in setting directions to word the implementation of School vision.					
2	The School Leadership is capable in providing clear vision.					
3	The School Leadership is communicating the vision in order to have common understanding with staff and community.					
4	The school principal brought change based on school vision which is perceived by the school community.					
5	The School Leadership is skilled in developing the school mission, goals and objective.					

### B. School leadership performance related to planning function

No	Item	5	4	3	2	1
1	The principles Coordinate the curriculum evaluation process of the school to address problems related to the curriculum.					
2	The School Leadership plans and work toward changing the school.					
3	The School Leadership is making the school plan flexible.					
4	The School Leadership is encouraging the staff to in school planning					

### C. Staff development practices of the School Leadership

No	Item	5	4	3	2	1
1	The School Leadership works with the staff members to improve the School.					
2	The School Leadership have the ability to delegate and share responsibility					
3	The School Leadership provide opportunity for shared decision making.					
4	School Leadership making relationship based on collegiality and mutual trust					
5	The School Leadership develops mechanism by which competent teachers share their experiences with their colleagues.					
6	The School Leadership encourages teachers towards using innovative teaching methods.					
7	The School Leadership helps the teachers to read different current educational publications.					

### D. Supervision Related Practices of School Leadership

No	Item	5	4	3	2	1
1	The School Leadership visits the classroom to ensure classroom instruction aligns with the school goal.					
2	The School Leadership observes teachers for professional development rather than evaluation.					
3	The School Leadership encourage in built supervision within the school.					
4	The School Leadership supervises teachers to improve instructional practices.					

### E. School leadership practices in creating school community relationship

No	Item	5	4	3	2	1
1	The School Leadership invite parents and guardians to actively involved in their children's learning.					
2	The principles Create positive environment in which good working relationship exist					
3	The School Leadership encourages community, parents school relationship to bring change in students academic.					
4	The School Leadership works to strengthen PTA and allows them take part in school leadership					

### F. Curriculum development functions of the School Leadership

No	Item	5	4	3	2	1
1	The principles Coordinate the curriculum evaluation process of the school to address problems related to the curriculum					
2	The School Leadership identify students and community need so as to improve curriculum					
3	The principles Check periodically students result in order to ensure the effective implementation of the curriculum					
4	The School Leadership identifies the problems in implementing the existing curriculum as per the education policy					

❖ **Below are some open-ended questions related to the practices and challenges of secondary school leadership? Please state them as much as Possible in the space provided.**

1. What problem you observed with the conditions like **Politics, Economy, Social and Culture?**

---

---

---

---

4. What solution do you suggest to solve the problem mentioned above?

---

---

---

---

5. Please write any other problem that secondary School Leadership (principals) faces during their School Leadership and suggest solution to solve the problem you mentioned.

---

---

---

### Part Three. Challenges of school Leadership Effectiveness

The following issues are assumed to be the common challenges of schools that hinder the practices of school leadership. 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.

Based on this assumption to identify the challenges that secondary School leadership faces 12 major points were listed in the questionnaire under part IV using the Likert scale strongly agree=5, agree=4, undecided=3, disagree=2, strongly disagree=1.

#### 1. Lack of qualification and experience of School Leadership

No	Item	5	4	3	2	1
1	Lack of qualified school leaders in the area of education					
2	Lack of training on school leadership					
3	Lack of in-service training and teachers development program					
4	Lack of clear understanding of the educational policy to carry out the leadership activities accordingly					

#### 2. Lack of cooperation and commitment for school improvement.

The numbers indicated: strongly agree=5, agree=4, undecided=3, disagree=2, strongly disagree=1.

No	Item	5	4	3	2	1
1	Lack of good relationship and support of community to improve the School.					
2	Weak initiation of PTA to participate in school leading activities.					
3	Lack of Professional support from external school supervisor to provide better leadership in the School.					
4	Lack of internal and external facilities to facilitate the instructional process and to provide effective leadership					

### 3. Lack of organizing.

The numbers indicated: strongly agree=5, agree=4, undecided=3, disagree=2, strongly disagree=1.

No	Item	5	4	3	2	1
1	Lack of delegating the job to the staff member to carry out heir responsibility					
2	Work over loaded in the school enables the success of School practices					
3	Unable to create team building for collaborative work in the School					

❖ Below are some open-ended questions related to the practices and challenges of secondary school leadership? Please state them as much as Possible in the space provided.

1. How do you evaluate the success of your educational leadership roles?

---



---



---



---

2. What major problems hinder your effectiveness as educational leader?

---



---



---



---



---



---

3. What solutions do you suggest?

---



---



---



---

**APPEDIX-B****HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY****POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE**

**College: of Education and Behavioral Studies**

**Department: Educational Planning and Management**

**Interview guide for Woreda Education Office Heads**

**Section 1: Personal Information**

1. Name of the Woreda /city.....

2. Sex: A. Male  B. Female

3. Age: A. 20-25  C. 31-35

B. 26-30  D.36-40  E. 41 and above

4. Level of educational or qualification:

A. Diploma  B. B.A/BED/BSc Degree  C. M.A/MSc Degree

5. Area of specialization or field of study:

A. Subject Major  B. EDPM/ Pedagogical Science

C. Other specify.....

6. Total work experience or service year:

A. under 5years  B. 6-10 year's  C.11-15 year's  D.16-20 year's

E.21 year's above

7. Service year in current position:

A. under 5 years  B.6-10 years  C.11years and above

**Section 2: Interview questions**

1. What are the criteria use to assign school leaders in principalship positions?
  - A. How do you evaluate the effectiveness of the criteria?
  - B. How do you evaluate the professional skill development practice in schools?
2. Do you believe that your office is giving the necessary support to all school leaders to enhance their leadership effectiveness? If yes, how?
3. Are you giving training to enhance the capacity of school leadership? If yes .How often?
4. Is there school based supervision practice in the secondary schools? If yes. how do you evaluate its effectiveness?
5. How often do woreda supervisors monitor secondary schools?
6. What are the major challenges that hinder the effectiveness of school leadership activity and what mechanism do you use to solve the problem?

## **APPEDIX-C**

### **HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY**

#### **POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE**

**College: Education and Behavioral Studies**

**Department: Educational Planning and Management**

**Interview for PTA Leaders**

**Part I.** You are kindly requested to give your response for each of the following interview question

1. How school leaderships are assigned at your school?
2. How do you see the practices of this School?
3. To what extent PTA members are involved in secondary school leadership?
4. Does the school leadership encourage the PTA members to mobilize the community to participate in secondary school leadership?
5. Does the secondary School leadership promote participatory decision making process?
6. Can you suggest the major challenges that principal's faces during their secondary school leadership related to conditions like Politics, Economy, Social, and cultural conditions?
7. What possible solution you suggest to tackle the challenges facing the school principals in their school leadership?