FACTORS THAT AFFECT LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS IN PRIMARY SCHOOL OF JIMMA TOWN

BY

DEREJE MEKONNEN

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

MAY, 2014

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

BY

DEREJE MEKONNEN

ADVISOR

TADESSE REGASSA (ASS. PROFESSOR)

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

MAY, 2014

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

DECLARATION

I undersigned declare that, this thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university and that all source or reference materials used for the thesis have been dully indicated and acknowledged.

Student's Name_____

Signature_____

Date_____

This thesis, **"Factors that Affect Leadership Effectiveness in Primary Schools of Jimma Town"**, is approved as the original work of DerejeMokonnenunder my supervision as a university instructor.

Advisor's Name _____

Signature_____

Date_____

Place: Jimma University

Institute of Education and Professional Development Studies

Department of Educational Planning and Management Date

of Submissio

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ContentPage

LIST OF TABLES

Contents   **Page**

ACRONYMS

CPD	Continuous Professional Development
CRC	Cluster Resource Center
ESDP	Educational Sector Development Program
ICT	Information Communication Technology
LAMP	Leadership and management Program
MA	Master of Art
MOE	Ministry of Education
PTA	Parent Teacher Association
PTA	Parent Teacher Association
REB	Regional Education Bureau
SPSS	Statically Package for Social Science
SDPRP	Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Program
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WOE	Woreda Education Office

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to my advisor AtoTadesseRegassa. Indeed without his professional guide and advice as well as constructive criticisms this research would not have been realized.

I would also like to express my heartfelt thanks to the Institute of Education and Professional Development Studies of Jimma University for its financial and material support for the completion of this research work.

I would also like to thank Jimma Town Education Office, elementary schools and school clusters for their cooperation and voluntarily rendering necessary information for the successful accomplishment of this research work.

Last, but not least, I would like to extend my sincere appreciation for my wife W/roAlamiShuremu for her moral support, encouragement and efforts in overcoming various challenges I have been facing in the process of conducting this study

Abstract

The main purpose of this study was to explore the major factors that affect the effectiveness of primary school leadership.In order to achieve this objective, a descriptive survey design was employed while the quantitative approach was used by supplementing with qualitative methods. To determine sample, 120 teachers were selected from 7 schools based on their proportion, and then simple random sampling was used to select the targeted teachers by giving independent and equal chances. In addition to this samples 56 school leaders were included in the study by using purposive sampling technique while all the 4 CRC supervisors and 1 Woreda supervision coordinators were selected by availability sampling technique. Questionnaires, interview and document analysis were used for data collection. Quantitative data were analyzed using frequency, percentages and t-tests for independent samples while the qualitative data were thematically analyzed. The finding of the study indicated that lack of awareness on the stakeholders ' involvement in school activities was very low and it is identified as one of the major factors that were affecting school leaders ' effectiveness; the school leadership effectiveness in achieving school objectives is not satisfactory since it is impeded with factors like lack of capacity to define tasks and achievements for school community, lack effective planning forsuccessful school improvement, inability in motivating subordinates to carry out the school objectives and school leaders ' workload. On the other hand, less community participation and lack of employing different strategies to overcome the various factors itself was negatively influencing the school leadership effectiveness since there is deficiency in arranging trainings to leaders/ staff development, disseminating effective learning materials to department, using and establishing guidelines by leaders to manage their work besides the inability to use various information and students' performance result for future improvement. Hence, school leaders fail to discharge their responsibilities effectively through overcoming the challenges. Therefore, the study recommended that Jimma town education office and CRC supervisors to arrange awareness creating workshops and meetings to enhance leadership effectiveness in the school functioning and in achieving school objectives. Regional Education Bureau or Jimma town education office in joint with local education colleges or universities need to arrange training that enhance school leaders ' skills and knowledge to minimize the factors with the main goal of enhancing students' performance in the primary schools. Primary school leaders are also advised to define tasks and objectives of the school successfully for school communities and in participating stakeholders.Conducting further research on the area of school leaders' competence and their effectiveness in enhancing students' performance is part of the recommendations.

CHAPTER ONE

1. Introduction

1.1. Background of the study

Several ongoing education reforms in many countries require school leadership at both system and institutional levels from kindergarten to vocational and higher education (Bush and Bell, 2002). Therefore, it is assumed that organizational goals and tasks are often ambiguous, outdated and not well defined, particularly in a changing environment. Thus, both developments of goals and the process of influencing members are necessary in educational institution when facing challenges from rapidly changing local and global environment.

As illustrated by (Pynes, 2004 & Harris et al, 2003) effectiveness of leaders can be manifested when they create a vision for success, demonstrate high expectations for student achievement, build the capacity of leadership, demonstrate ethical and moral leadership, and involve staff members in decision making. In support of this, Mackenzie (1994) argues that effective school leaders are those in charge of an individual school who are responsible for mobilizing the abilities of and efforts of teachers to provide effective educational programs also those who are anchoring their work on central issues of learning and teaching and school improvement.

In many ways the school leadership is the most crucial and influential body in any school; it is the leadership that sets the tone of the school, the climate for learning the level of professionalism and morale of teachers and the degree of concern for what students may or may not become. If a school is a vibrant innovative, student center place, if it has a reputation for excellence in teaching, if students are performing to the best of their ability, one can almost always point to the school leadership as the key to success (Sargiovanni, 2006).

It is obvious that the purpose of leadership is common to all organizations. This purpose is organizing and influencing every stakeholder of the organization towards the achievement of goals. However, it does not mean that there are no differences in the system of managing different organizations differ from one another in the function or tasks they carry out that require special skill from employees and abilities and skill required by the leader. Oakland (1993) asserts that effective leadership is an approach to improve the effectiveness and flexibility of the whole organization through planning, organizing andparticipation of members at the appropriate level.

Effectiveness is defined in different ways. However, as to Drucker (1972), effectiveness perspective is concerned with whether the [i] things we are doing continue to be appropriate,

particularly in the context of rapidly and increasingly demanding external environment. Effective leaders should acquire and maintain valuable and essential ingredients to score high level of effectiveness in the process of leadership. Scholars have different views on the kinds of these elements. Although different scholars proposed various kinds of elements of leadership, the most common elements are treated in the following discussion.

The first element is empowerment. Different views were delivered by various writers that empowerment is an act which is performed by school leaders to share authority and responsibility with teachers on matters related to classroom instructions. Harris.et. al (2005) stated that empowerment is giving teachers and even students a share in important organizational decisions giving them opportunities to shape organizational goals.

Secondly, school leaders viewed as a change agents. Successful school improvement projects focus specifically upon the teaching and learning processes and the conditions at school and classroom level that support and sustain school improvement. Some literatures give a great deal of attention on the issue that school improvement has to be one of the primary tasks of school leaders. Gamage (2006) pointed that if the educational administrator functions as a change agent is taking the staff with him/her, such a program will give the leader and the teachers more, not less control of the school program. Therefore, school improvement is a systematic and sustained effort aimed at change in effect of students' broad out comes.

Moreover, creating an orderly conducive environment is the other element. School leaders can play a key role in efforts of creation of sustainable and conducive school environment that ultimately promotes effective teacher professional development and student learning. Schlechy (1990) made remark that the leader of the school has a particular responsibility to lead the staff in developing school policies to control student behavior; these are some points of school leadership effectiveness indicators. It seems for these reasons that the Ethiopian government gives a greater emphasis in ESDP - I and ESDP - II to strengthen the managerial leadership in the way that meet the desired cognitive and attitudinal levels of students. In addition, in ESDP - III one of the need for the establishment of efficient school leadership and management capacity building program is to improve quality of education (MoE, 2005). Again, among the various overall strategies under ESDP -IV, more comprehensive capacity development program were developed aiming at improving the functioning of offices at all levels of cluster resource centers and of schools, not only of the individuals. This focuses on improving teachers' performance and school leadership improvement through training (MoE, 2007).

In practice school leaders interpret and enact their role in a variety of ways depending on their individual personalities, the culture of their schools and other factors. As researcher's experiences, school leadership of primary schoolsfaces different difficulties in managing, planning, controlling, organizing, and evaluating the factors that hinders their success. In addition to different barriers, much criticism was made over principle in enhancing students' achievement and school development and improvement. Stakeholders also blame each other for the drawback of students result than improving the leadership effectiveness. Moreover, less attention for effective achievement of school learning, school outcomes, responsibility for students and work consistency throughout the school. Therefore, the preceding attempts would indicate that the conditions of the primary school invite for appropriate education leadership which in turn calls for scientific study of major factors that influence primary school leadership effectiveness in educational leadership. So, the researcher initiated to conduct this study in order to find out the major influencing factors of the effectiveness of primary school leadership.

Therefore the purpose of this study is to investigate factors that affect the effectiveness of school leadership in Jimma town primary schools.

1.2. Statement of the Problems

The success of any school is critically linked to the school leadership effectiveness. Good school leadership protects the school day for teaching and learning. Their activities support learning and motivate their teachers for high academic performance of students' achievement. Research on school effectiveness for instance, identifying strong leadership as one of the important factors that contributes to improve students' academic achievements. Koontz(1990) found that the level of students' academic achievement are better in school where principals undertake and lead a school reform, act as a manager of school improvement and cultivate school vision and make use of students' data to support classroom practices and to provide support for weak students.

Effective school leadership substantially boosts students' achievements (Sisman, 2004). Good school climate, leadership styles and quality institutions are frequently associated with effective schools. Enabling principals should help to assess and evaluate the impact and perceptions of their leadership style, indeed school leaders must deal with the various levels of skills and ability of their facility and continuity of divergent situations with today's complexity of the school environment (Gelila, 2007). Moreover, leaders must have the knowledge and understanding of effective communication strategy to improve students' achievement (Harris et al., 1998).

Moreover, there is skill gap of primary school leaders which can be manifested by many weaknesses. For instance, in some schools, performances were not need based, participatory, during a process of planning and implementation, sometimes not well stated or unavailable. In addition, different researches, educational conferences, annual evaluation and supervision reports indicate that school leadership activities seems to be less successfully executed.

For all these kinds of problem, there might be various factors which are hindering the effectiveness of school leadership. These can be related with the leaders' strategies in handling schools, awareness of stakeholders and their involvement, leaders' communication skills, work load or complexity of functions, lack of training and other leadership skills. Based on that, this study will assess the major factors that affect leadership effectiveness in primary school. In top of that, situation of the primary school looks highly demanding for creative and supportive leadership. Moreover, there seems to be a disparity between the professional requirements and actual performances. So, that is why this study conducted.

In order to minimize the major factors that affect the school leadership effectiveness and to bring solutions including measures in order to enhance the drawbacks, conducting research is necessary. Leader communication and hierarchical work division among school communities, leader strategies in handling schools, community and parents' participation in school improvement and development and the activities of teaching learning process are the major problems in primary school. Beside to that, so far no study was conducted in the area in order to minimize leadership effectiveness influencing factors in primary school of Jimma town. So, that is why, the researcher is initiated to conduct the research on the major factors that influence primary school leadership effectiveness in Jimma town.

This study attempted to answer the following basic research questions:

1. What are the major factors that influence the effectiveness of school leadership in primary schools of Jimma Town?
2. What strategies are being implemented to overcome various factors that affect the leadership effectiveness?

1.3. Objectives of the Study

1.3.1. General Objective of the Study

The general objective of this study was to investigate factors that are influencing leadership

effectiveness in primary schools of Jimma Town.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of this study were:

1. To identify the major factors that affects the school leadership effectiveness in Jimma Town primary schools.
2. To identify the strategies used by school leaders to alleviate the various factors that affects the school leaders' effectiveness.
3. To recommend possible solutions that enable educational leaders alleviate the major factors that affect leaders' effectiveness.

1.4. Significance of the Study

The findings of this study are very crucial in that they have the possibility to:

1. Help MoE and regional experts as well as leaders who participate in policy formulation to gain better insight intothe state of the major factors affecting school leadership effectiveness in the government primary schools so that to give emphases on its improvement;
2. Provide a direction for Oromia Region Education Bureau leaders and Jimma Town Education leadersto alleviate the challenges that affect school leadership effectiveness and identify future training and skills needed for improvement in primary schools.
3. Contribute to the research literature and serve as sound base for other researchers who study any problem related to factors that affect effectivenessof school leadership.

1.5. Delimitation of the Study

The study was delimited both geographically and conceptually. Geographically, it was delimited toJimma town government primary schools because the issue was not assessed by other researchers as far as my knowledge and personal assessment is concerned, and many researchers fail to focus on the town than always preferring to conduct their research on Jimma Zone districts. In this study, private schools were not given emphasis sincethere is lack of resources.

Even though there are many factors that affect primary school leadership effectiveness, this study was conceptually delimited on identifying the factors related to leadership skills and qualification, workload or complex functions, school stakeholders awareness and less community participation ofJimma town, the strategies being implemented in primary school to overcome the factors that

affect leadership effectiveness.

1.6. Limitations of the Study

In conducting this study, some problems encountered the researcher in the way it creates some limitation in the study. Among these, problem of getting all the necessary documents and information on the practical experience of school leaders ofJimma townwas a great limitation since it affects the probability of gaining adequate data. The sample and population of this study were limited to Jimma town primary schools; thus generalization of results and implementing recommendation from this study to other primary schools of Jimma zone is difficult.

1.7. Definition of Key Terms

Educational Leadership - it refers to the principals' influences on school community to setting and accomplishing educational objectives focusing on learning pedagogy and curriculum i.e in diagnosing and solving problems in the teaching learning process.

Leadership Effectiveness - refers to the extent to which strategic constituencies are satisfied, is consistent with a cultural and interpretative view of the organization (Zenebe, 1992)

Primary School: the school division in the education system of Ethiopia comprising primary education i.e grade 1-8 (MoE, 2002)

School Leaders: those persons occupying various roles in the school, which provide direction and exert influence in order to achieve the school goals (principals, unit leaders, department heads and PTA coordinator).

1.8. Organization of the Study

The document of this study was classified in to five chapters. The first chapter focused of the problem and its approach. The review of related literature is discussed in chapter two. Chapter three is about research design and methodology while chapter four deals with the presentation and analysis and discussion of data. The final chapter presents the summery of the major findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER TWO

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURES

2.1. The Concept of Leadership in General

Theconcept of leadership interpreted differently and broadly by different scholars (Yukl, 1998). Leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an organized group towards goal setting and goal achievement. It is initiation of new structure for accomplishing an organizational goal; leadership is a force that can initiate action among people, guide activities and direction towards common goals (Frost, 2000). Similarly, Millet (1996) pointed out that, leadership, occur when everyone influence others behaviour in the group regardless of the reason.Moreover, Pardey (2007) indicate that leaders give something to the followers in exchange for their satisfactory efforts and performance in the task. From these definitions, it is possible to infer that leadership related to the process of influencing others behaviour on one hand,goal achievement and development element on the other hand besides exchange of services between leaders and followers.

Leadership is also the aligning of people to the direction being set, communicating it to people and building commitment to it (Pardey, 2007). Still leaders motivate and inspire people so that they work to achieve the vision, drawing on their needs, values and emotions (Bush and Bell, 2002). Cheng (1997) showed that, leadership is bringing change and transformation by influencing the group and motives it towards the goal. It also promotes organizational vision and mission, shaping members beliefs, attitudes and developing options for the future by removing barriers to enable subordinates work with freedom and independence.

2.2. The Concept of School Leadership

Educational leaders in traditional concept, tend to serve followers' needs in exchange for the performance of tasks and set achievable goal for them onwards. There seems to be no need for the educational leadership to question the goal of their organizations, expect their followers to perform beyond the ordinary limits (Gronn, 2003). Leaders in educational institutions are one who not only adapts their behaviour to the situation but also transform it.

In the new concept, school leadership is about movement and change, it is about managing risk (knowing what risks can be taken and which should be avoided), about having vision and

willingness to try new ideas to fulfill this vision, by which leadership become having the vision of innovation (Pardey, 2007). Organizations that resist innovations and transformation lack leadership. Transformational leader in the education system is the one who is visionary, shaping members, beliefs, values and attitudes and developing options for the future (Gunter, 2001). School leadership is also the application of reason, logic, and values to the achievement of educational objectives via the development of available resources (Holmes, 1993, p.9).

Innovation need people who are willing to think critically, but it also needs the organizational culture that means giving power to people to make innovation happen (Fesseha, 2008). This is because peoples are only able to innovate and change the way that things are done, if they are allowed to make decision and decision making is about having power (Bush and Bell, 2002).

Leadership is all about making things happen, and leading innovation is a real test of a person's ability as a leader. In leading schools, the challenge is great but the benefit can be enormous. Increasingly, innovation is becoming the critical feature in determining the long term survival of organizations(Teshome, 2007). The role of leader is critical because leader has responsibility for the people who operate the innovative process and provide innovative products and services to customers and users in embracing creative thinking and innovation (Pynes, 2004).

Grace (1996) suggested the development of good home-school relations and establishing mechanisms for parental involvement will facilitate relations. Improvement of school in our world adds good external relations to aid financial and moral support for the school (Davis, 1997). Partnerships with in an educational context can take place in a number of different ways and at different organizational levels. Hall (1999) identified different partnerships level that should be created by school leaders, one of the partnership levels is, external institution that requires alliances to be formed with public, private or informal groups outside the institution. The second level is inter-institutional partnerships between autonomous schools. Intra institutional partnership also focuses on the management of the sections of the school. Interpersonal partnership based on relationship between school in institution and intra personal partnership in which individuals vary in their performances for collaboration (Fessha, 2008).

Educational leaders develop schools by creating special partnership between educational institutions and their communities, especially parents and between educational institution and organizations from the private sectors. Bush and Bell (2002) mentioned, recently different dimensional model of school leadership can give comprehensive frame work for developing leadership strategies and actions to lead and manage fundamental aspects including human,

structural, political, cultural and educational, and leader become transformational.

2.3. Leadership Rolesand Good Qualities of Educational Leaders

2.3.1. Leadership Roles

This is another way to understand leadership through examining the various roles which carried out by leaders. In this context leadership is an expected set of activities or behaviour stemming that form of one job (Dubrin, 2001). Leading is complex activity and the role of leadership is a part of leadership function of management (Millet, 1996). One of the roles of leadership is figure head leaders or higher ranking managers spend some part of their time engaging in ceremonial activities, acting as figure head by making oneself representative of the school (Pardey, 2007).

Educational leaders also play a great role as negotiators. They deal with specific negotiating activities in seeking ways of responding to difficult events/situations in bargaining with superiors, funds, equipment, supports, bargaining with organization for the use of staff facilities and with suppliers for services delivery time (Cheng, 2001c).Leadership role also considered as team builder and player in order to overcome the challenges of changing educational environment through recognizing team members, providing feedback for the members, initiating activities, holding activities in staff meeting and encouraging team members to talk about their accomplishment in displaying appropriate personal conduct and cooperation (Rait, 1995).

An effective educational leader takes the time to coach school team members including informally recognizing team members' achievement, providing team members with feedback in concerning inefficiency performance and ensuring that team members are informed of steps that can improve their performance (Gelila, 2007). Leaders in the organization carry out all organizational tasks including strategic plan. Leadership planning role enable the manager to practice strategic leadership activities including setting the direction for the organization, helping the firm deal with external environment and to develop organization policies (Hood, 1999).

Cheng, (2000a) pointed out that, educational leaders solve problems technically, and is important for supervisors and middle managers to help team members solve problems in the same manner. Some of the activities including in this role serving as technical expert or advisor and performance individuals contributor tasks on a regular basis (Pynes, 2004). Leadership role also give emphasis as speakers person, in answering letters or inquiries and formally reporting to individuals and groups outside the manager's direct organizational unit. Similarly, as speaker's person, managerial leader keeps the activities, plans, capability and possibilities (Cheng, 2000b).

It is possible to state an important practical implication about school leadership role in every level. For example a team leader can make an important contribution to the school thrust for quality by explaining to team members how to minimize duplications in the mailing list.

2.3.2. Good Qualities of Educational Leaders

Pounder (1998) mentioned that, collaboration and participation is the ability to empower others, to share power and human relation attitude (friendly relation empathy and ability of leaders to look at things from others point of view) is one of the important and good qualities of educational leaders. Motivation as inspiring effort and commitment among followers through motivation, intelligent ability to think scientifically and analyse problem with sense of responsibility including vision and for sight having higher degree of imagination tolerating difference through compromise is a core leadership quality (Sergiovan, 2000).

Good leader is good planner with visioning and strategic planning with technique decision making, for efficiency, the ability to produce higher volume with the same or fewer resources is a central leadership quality (Quong and others, 1998). Inter-personal communication is a key leadership and basic quality of school leadership that enhance understanding, sharing of knowledge, information and managing conflict with in school community (Day et.al, 2000).

Good leaders also improve the skills and competencies of all employees regardless of position (Demoze, 2007). Skills deemed to be necessary including the academic basics like proficiency in reading, writing and computation; self-management skills, such as self-esteem, motivation, goal setting ability, and the willingness to participate in career development activities; social skills, such as interpersonal, negotiation and team work skills, communication skills, such as ability to listen and communicate clearly; are influencing skills or leadership ability (Bush and Bell, 2002).

2.4. Leadership Effectiveness in Education

Effectiveness is an expression of a given quality of performance (Zenebe, 1992; p.19). Effectiveness also refers to a level of achievement that result in high employer moral and attainment of organizational goals. In educational institution, particularly in school, leadership effectiveness is defined in terms of the extent to which strategic constituencies are satisfied in consistent with a cultural and interpretive view of the organization. (Birnbaum, 1992) contends that a "leader who is able to command support constituent has met the needs of multiple and conflicting stake holders and has acclaim to be considered a good leader" and thus effective.

In contemporary educational management, there is a strong emphasis on organizational learning

to meet the challenges of the changing educational issues. Staff members' continuously reflect on their action and learning to improve their teaching and daily practices. So the way leadershipfacilitate teacher action learning is crucial, but it needs research and development (Gunter, 2001). Educational leaders inevitably find themselves facing many challenges, uncertainties and ambiguities in their educational practices and management (Cheng, 2000b). All shows leaders lead their educational institution and members more effectively to prepare both internal transformations and pursue institutional effectiveness and educational qualities in such rapidly changing environment are necessary for a leader (Matlas, 2007). Fullan (1996) described that, educational leaders should have a new set of leadership beliefs and competences that can transform the old and traditional constraints, facilitate educational changes and develop an appropriate school environment for staff and students to work, learn and develop effectively.

It is important to underline what effective leadership do in school. Cheng (1997) points out that, defining and communicating the school educational mission by coordinating the curriculum through supervising and supporting the teaching-learning processes in school continuously monitoring students' progress with developing conducive and healthy learning environment brings effective learning.

Furthermore, effective or successful school leadership is one of the key conventional terms where the success of a school is being celebrated. School leadership is a connected and crucial issue of what is meant by successful, quality school for the present and future. In this regard, Sergiovanni, (Cited in Harris, et al, 2003, p.1) indicated that the dependability of school success is on effective leadership. He stated that. "Tomorrows schools success will depend up on the ability of leaders to harness the capacity of locals, to enhance sense and meaning and to build a community of responsibility." Therefore, we can say that effective leadership is at the core of every successful educational institution.

2.5. Leadership SkillsImportant for School Effectiveness

In order to become effective in leading any organization, good personality, attitudes, motivation and emotional intelligence are more important. Leaders should have different skills in order to lead an organization (Hernes, 2000).

Communication skill helps leaders in convey of message, in order to get any information such as; concepts, ideas, and feeling of others (Gelila, 2007). An effective communicator's skill of leader articulates information clearly and creates timely and high quality information that flow smoothly

and effectively between self and others (Pynes, 2004).

Emotional intelligence skill by leaders influences leadership failure effectively. Emotional intelligence refers to quality such as understanding one's feeling, empathy for others and the regulation of emotions to enhance living, flexibility and adaptability facilitates change. Therefore leader should be flexible enough to cope with changes of technology, advances and changing work force (LeithWood, 2001). Crozier (1998) mentioned that, skill of planning and organizing for leaders enhance the efficiency of their work flexible enough to cope with changes of technology, advances and changing work force.

Personal management skills of leaders give awareness to once own strength and weakness as a person (Gelila, 2007). Thinking and learning skills enable leader to think wisely about their organization and followers to learn more from others (Pardey, 2007). A personal management skill of leaders also help to develop the skill of learning to think better and brings rational understanding for achieving the common goal (Hood, 1999).

Decision making skill help leaders to bring change in organization in group or in individually when there is risk or uncertainty by inspiring others to lead in a particular direction (Pardey, 2007). Dubrin (2001) points out that, the skill of motivation (a passion to work for reasons other than money or status such as finding joy in the risk itself), the skill of empathy (the ability to respond to the unspoken feeling of others), and social skills (competency in managing relationships and building network of support), and having positive relationship with people. In addition, a leader with good social skills would develop good relationships with customers, managers of other departments and group members.

Pynes (2004) mentioned that, an excellent leadership competencies such as vision-establishes and maintains a long term, big picture prospective to more organization goal forward, supportive coach monitors others, model integrity-building trust through demonstration of ethical behaviour and personal authenticity, customer focused-discovering and meeting the customer needs, result oriented-focuses efforts on attaining clear, concrete, timely and measurable outcomes of the importance to the organization and use sound judgment-uses common sense and works collaboratively with others to create effective action plans based on appropriate information.

2.6. Approaches of Leadership

In order to determine the character that leader possesses, and effective leader style, it is important to asses' different approaches of leadership (Mosley, 1996).

2.6.1. Traits Approach

One of the approaches called trait approach. Based on this approach, leaders possess certain traits or characteristics that cause them to raise them above their followers. Personal ability of leadership mainly gives emphasis by physical, intellectual and social characteristics of leaders also taken into consideration (Cheng, 2000a).

Trait generally associated with leadership mental and physical energy, emotional stability, of human relations, objectivity, personal motivation, communication skill, teaching ability, social skill and technical competency (Mosley, 1996). The underlying assumptions of the trait approach in which many researchers conducted that, leaders are born, not made. But research has not shown that certain traits can distinguish effective from ineffective leaders since certain characteristics do seem to be important to be effective leadership, such as supervisory activity, need for occupational achievement, intelligence, decisiveness, and self-assurance initiative and like (Pardey, 2007).

Mosley (1996) points out that, the early researches conducted about the traits and it attempted to compare the traits of people who become leaders with those who were followers and identity, the characteristics and traits by effective leaders when it comparing the traits of leaders tends to be more intelligent, more outgoing and more self-confident than other and to have a greater need for power. Limitations are considered in trait approach. Despite the promise of the current research there are some limitations such as there are many cases in which a leader is successful in one situation but may not be in other (Dubrin, 2001).

2.6.2. Behavioral Approach

Behavioural approach is another approach of leadership. In this approach of leadership emphasized favourable treatment of employees rather than their output or performance to trait approach, behavioural approach wondered if there is something unique in the way that effective leaders behave, and based on this approach, leadership behaviour is not in born but can be trained and any individual can be trained to become leader (Hernes, 2000). As cited in Mosley (1996) Mc Gregory's Theory X and Theory Y, in which the leadership strategy of effective using participative management proposed and accordingly:-

> "Theory X the theory that workers dislike work and must be coerced, controlled
> and directed in order to achieve company objective, while Theory Y, the theory
> that workers accept work as nature, tạsk reasonability and self-control to achieve

company objective."

Many researches studied leadership behaviour from the point of motivation. They view leadership behaviour can be positive or negative. In positive behaviour the leaders' emphasis is on rewards to motivate the subordinate; in the negative behaviour the leader emphasis is on penalty and punishment to enforce the subordinate in to higher productivity (Mosley, 1996).

2.6.2.I. Autocratic Leadership

In autocratic leadership style, leaders retain most of the authority for themselves. They make decision confidently and assume that group members will comply: they usually are not concerned with group members' attitude towards decision. Autocratic leaders are considered task-oriented because they place heavy emphasis on getting tasks accomplished. Typical autocratic leader behaviour includes telling peoples what to do, assisting them, and serving as a model for team members (Gunter, 2001).

2.6.2.2. Democratic Leadership

Mosley (1996) described that, democratic type leaders that confer final authority on the group. They function as collector of the group opinion and take a vote before making decision, accepting and in which the entire group involved in making decision, accepting responsibility, achieving common goal; in addition, the group has also freedom, reinforcement including independence rather depending on their leaders (Ivancevich, 1999).

2.6.2.3. Free-rain Leadership

Free rain leadership is laser fair.This leadership is provided to the group indirectly rather than directly, group members are presented a task to perform and are given a free rein to figure out how they perform it best, the leader does not get involvement unless requested, and team members are allowed all the freedom they want as long as they do not violet policy (Cotter, 2000). Leithwood (2000) described that, the free-rain leadership sometimes works effectively with well-motivated and experienced employees and those peoples are self-sufficient.

2.6.3. Contingency Approach

Mosley (1996) points out that, contingency leadership approach prescribe that the style to be used is the contingent on such factors as situation of the people, the task, the organization and other environmental variables. The essence of contingency approach to leadership is that leaders are most effective when they make their behaviour contingent up on situational force including group

members'characteristics, external and internal situations (Dubrin, 2001).

2.7. Leadership and School Effectiveness

The term school effectiveness has been used to describe educational research concerned with exploring differences within and between schools (DeGrauwe, 2004). It also focuses on pupils' progress that might be expected considering their background and initial attainment. Nevertheless, school effectiveness research seeks to describe what an effective school looks like. It was described as "one in which pupils progress further than might be expected from consideration of its intake" (DeGrauwe, 1999). An effective school adds extra value to its student's outcomes in comparison with other schools. The value-added is the concept that used to describe this procedure (OECS, 2000).

2.7.1. Measuring School Effectiveness

School effectiveness mainly measured to its quality (Degmawi, 2010). Moreover, special emphasis was based on the issues of consistency and stability in schools effects upon different kinds of outcome and over time (DeGrauwe, 2004). But the notion of overall effectiveness is highly questionable. Haile (2006) school effectiveness measured based on the pupil control system the school environment provided for pupils, the involvement of pupils, the academic development of pupils, the behavior of teachers, the management in the classroom and the management structure of the school.

De Grauwe (1999) measured school effectiveness based on strong principal leadership and attention to the quality of instruction, a pervasive and broadly understood instructional focus, an orderly, safe climate conducive to teaching and learning, teacher behaviors that convey the expectation that all students are expected to obtain at least a basic mastery of simple skills and the use of measures of pupil achievement as the basis for program evaluation.

As shown above, various scholars tried to show the way the school effectiveness can be measured. However, the main elements that were mentioned in each definition are the students' academic success and the improvement of quality in continuous base through effective management system. The definitions also contain the focus on the effective interaction of the inputs, process, output and outcomes of the system.

2.7.2. School Leaders' Effectiveness in Promoting School Progress

School leaders are expected to provide the kind of education, the consumer and in particular their

surrogates, including parents (Demoze, 2007). This means that the identification and stimulation of the parents demands for the kind of education the organization can produce most efficiently, become the primary task of the manager which requires primarily school leader has to draw together many different educational, managerial and financial threads in the work of the school as well to stimulate and if possible inspire the professionals for greater achievement (Levavcid, 1999). It is also under developed school management, both the roles of school chief executive and educational leaders attain greater significance (McGinn and Welsh, 1999).

Hernes (2000) indicte that, there is testing external dimensions although leaders have gained more autonomy, they also have to meet increasingly diverse demands from all sides and are often caught in conflict so both directing and co-ordination style are required. There is also a key requirements for school leaders to be effective not work both to promote the school's interest with in the local system and to collaborate productively in partnership mode a kin to that of production manager, organizing the school and its staff to deliver products or outcomes of the request quality (McGinn and Welsh, 1999).

In practice school leaders will interpret and enact their role in a variety of ways depending on their individual personalities, the culture of their schools and other factors (Demoze, 2007). Generalization are frequently made about the factors associated with effective school leadership without taking into account the specific and diverse frame work of policy and governance with in which it is exercised (Gronn, 2003). Beside narrow forms of accountability in which school leaders expected to accept given categories without reflection (Cotter, 2000).

School leaders have the task of successfully managing tensions and ambitions for instance, skilful buffering of the staff from the external pressure that conflict with the school's goals without insulting them from legitimate influences for improvement and it is the most important and difficult task faced in many contexts today (Leithwood, 2001).

School leadership has certain implication in leading the school towards successful achievement (Matlas, 2007). One of the implication is leadership in school should be regarded as an act. With doom and skill related to the leadership act are not necessarily the monopoly of any one individually, teachers, parents and students as well as those assigned as administrators, all have the right to play their part have the right to play their part in leadership (Gunter, 2001). Similarly, leadership in educational institution must be educative and teachers, students, parents and administrators must have a desire to learn to be taught (Levavcid, 1998).

Therefore, leadership must be viewed as critical and reflective activities. All who participate in school activities must have the awareness of the task and of the contexts in which they work. Rules and regulations should be regarded as a means for high ends. The structures and rules should be negotiated, reinterpreted and changed to facilitate factors in the school, for example designing participative structure for teachers, parent's students and community.

18

2.7.3. Leadership and School Improvement Program

School improvement is a program that involves assessment of the status of schools in terms of school domains and carrying out self-evaluation so that the educational inputs and process will be improved in order to improve students' learning outcome (Berhanu, 2010). The main focus of school improvement is students' learning and learning outcome. In order to achieve this purpose, the role of the school leaders is very crucial and needs their effective performance.

The School Improvement Programhas four domains and eleven elements. The first domain i.e. teaching and learning includes teaching practice, learning and assessment, and curriculum. The second domain is safe and conducive school environment: student focus, student empowerment, and student support. The third main domain, school leadership and management with three elements: strategic vision, leadership behavior, and school management. The fourthly domain is community participation with elements of partnership with parents, engaging the community and promoting education. Hence, the following sections briefly treat these domains and how the school leaders play their role to achieve this program to enhance students result (MoE, 2007e).

Teaching and learning is one of the domains of the school improvement program. The quality of education depends largely on the teaching learning process (Degmawi, 2010). Accordingly, the school improvement program of Ethiopia has given a central position to the teaching learning process. The program has given due emphasis for the issues like effective teaching, evaluation of students' learning and curriculum (MoE, 2007a, b, d and e). Hence, the school leaders are expected to ensure the effective implementation of this domain by motivating teachers to respect the instructional time and to use various active teaching learning methods.

According to Riner (2000) successfully teaching is a broad concept that denotes teachers' acquisition of considerable knowledge, skills, attitudes, qualities, and persistence. For him, successful teachers usually attempt to apply what they know with a healthy respect for what they do not know. He further maintains that, effective teachers are those who combine a pervasive caring for children with their teaching so that child's mind and hear are informed, educated and transformed. In order to achieve this, school leaders need to enhance teachers' professional competency, and participate in continuous professional development (CPD), in order to learn new knowledge to apply in the classroom.

On the other hand, UNESCO (2008) viewed effective teaching as a concept that encompasses too many activities that should be practiced by teachers. These activities could be classified under the following categories: belief system and dispositions, knowledge base (subject matter knowledge, subject specific

pedagogy, and political/professional knowledge), and practices and skills. In further elaborating the first category i.e. belief system and dispositions, it stressed that effective teaching is a process characterized by the Pupils learn best in a positive and nurturing environment established by teachers who believe that every pupil is capable of learning (Berhanu, 2010).

All pupils have areas of strengths and interests that can be useful in advancing pupil learning. Effective teachers establish an instructional environment that will draw on these strengths. Derebessa (2004) mentioned that differentiated instruction addresses pupils' diverse abilities, cultures, languages, and cognitive skills. Teachers take into account the whole pupils' cognitive, affective, social, and physical dimensions when developing an instructional program.

Active engagement and interaction facilitate pupil learning (Desta, 2010). New learning is built upon previously learned information. Learning is enhanced when prior knowledge and cultural and social experiences are valued, acknowledge, and leveraged throughout the curriculum. Pupil learning is both individual and socially constructed; it is influenced by cultural, familial, and social context. Meaningful assessment is both formative and summative; it relies on multiple measures, including informal observations (Derebessa, 2006).Therefore, what could be learned from the above ideas is that being an effective teacher means having and practicing a number of qualities, duties and responsibilities with the aim of helping students to learn successfully.

As discussed above and indicated in other research literature, effective leadership has emphasized on curricular decision making as a key dimension of leadership for improved student learning, and effective leaders understand the importance of rigorous program offered by teachers and experienced by students and the effects of a their gains in student achievement.

The Second Domain of School Improvement Program is school leadership and management. There is a belief that leadership and management are closely related but distinguishable functions (Tesfaye, 2010). Therefore, the school principals should act both as leader and manager to be the primary change agent in introducing and implementing the proposed school improvement program to bring real changes in the learning and teaching process (MoE, 2007a). Leadership and management seem to complement each other in order to achieve the intended goals/objectives of a given organizations (Teshome, 2007). Thus, as part of the SIP domain, leadership and management are very crucial to be effective in working as a leader and in achieving school goals or enhancing students result through managing day to day operations.

Safe and healthy school environment is the third domain of the school improvement program (Fesseha,

2008). The conduciveness of the school environment is another major domain in improving students' academic achievement. The concept of safeness and healthiness of school improvement differ from time to time, but the handbook of the school improvement program (MOE, 2007d) has described as an environment where equality, tolerance, and equity are guaranteed; where the security of both students and teachers is protected; where the teaching learning inputs are fulfilled; where students are provided freedom to express their feelings freely, and where students' needs are identified and treated accordingly.

Stocked and Mayberry, in USAID (2008) have classified the school environment in to four generic divisions: the physical environment (Ecology), the social characteristics of individuals and groups in the school (the school milieu), patterned relationship of persons and groups (the social system), and the collectively accepted beliefs, values, and meanings (the school culture). The various school improvement program documents (MoE, 2007a, b and d) have summarized these components in to three major categories as prevalence of learner-centered environment, student empowerment, and student support. Students Empowerment is important for the overall changes that education is aimed to bring up on students need to be related with the national education goal and with its contribution to the country (Demoze, 2007).

To this effect, students at any level of education should take responsibility and engage themselves in activities that the schools undertaken for the betterment of what are going on in the school. However, students' involvement is highly determined by the degree of their empowerment. In the various school improvement program documents (MoE, 2007b; OECS, 2000) and training students empowerment is related with creating students who are selfconfident, self-reliant, are ready to take responsibility and creating a learning environment where gender equality is ensured.

Learner-centered environment play a great role. Currently, educators advocate that learning does not place when the learner is passive recipient of information presented by the teacher. Yalew (2004) also that learning outcomes are affected by the form of instruction, so different instructional activities will differently affect learning outcomes. Basically, learning is a constructive process that occurs best when learner is actively engaged in creating his/her own knowledge and understanding by connecting with prior knowledge (Berhanu, 2010).

Community participation is the fourth domain of school improvement program. Community participation is one of the dominant factors for school improvement and ultimately for improvement of students' learning outcomes (MoE, 2007e). However, it is difficult to exactly tell what community involvement is and how it is to be translated into actual practice. According to DeGrauwe (2004) and Degmawi (2010) community participation in need identification, planning, organizing, monitoring and evaluation and

decision making is crucial not only in terms of ownership but also for its continuity and sustainability.

The experience of many countries too shows that quality education is almost unthinkable without community participation. For example, in the United States, the community through its elected representatives plays a paramount role in this regard (Snawden and Gorton, 1998). The success of alternative primary education mainly depends on strong grass-roots participation at all phases of the program, from design to implementation and evaluation of result (MoE, 2007b).Community participationis needed for identification, planning, organizing, monitoring and evaluation and decision making not only in terms of ownership but also for its continuity and sustainability (Fesseha, 2005). Thus, creating and coding authority to local people with a productive link to technical experts with clearly identified strategies becomes necessary.

2.8. Leadership and Change In School

Quong and Walker (1996) mentioned that, total quality management in school involves examining and changing traditional structures and empowering groups to make real decisions about the purpose, process and product. School development prospective is also valuable in examining particular roles (Matlas, 2007). The principal has often be cited as a key figure in blocking and promoting a change and such representation is a fertile ground for considering the concept of implementation in action.

Leaders take a serious action in exchange of message as whether change has been taken in to consideration and serve to support teachers because, as successful leader in schools and teachers need to be transformational and transactional leader (Gunter 2001). In order to bring change leaders need to help their colleagues and students to cope with change. A key means it through leader promoting the professional development of their colleagues to meet the needs of their students better (Day and others, 2000).

There are various ways in which the need for change can be visible. One of this is through exact evaluation of current practice of exploratory step in action research (Frost and others, 2000).

Using field analysis for deciding what the pressures for and, against change is in particular directions (Gronn, 2003). Devies (1997) suggested that, only when people are engaged with the nature and shape of problem can leader and colleagues begin to initiate and implement changes . However, all leaders whether of school and colleagues or of students in class room, encounter resistance, whether trying to implement change or maintain the statuesque. Resistance as a continuum that ranged from disinterest in a project or lack of the enthusiasm for it to open opposition to its implementation and linked a number of reasons (Matlas, 2007).

2.9. School Leadership Development in Ethiopia.

The history of leadership in Ethiopia, at its early stage was dominated by foreign principals (Ahmed, 2006). In all government owned schools that were opened before and few years after the Italian occupation expatriates from France, Britain, Sweden, Canada, Egypt and India were assigned as school principals. After the restoration of independence in 1941, education was given priority which resulted in opening of schools in different parts of the country. As there was not enough educated Ethiopians to teach and run schools, most of the teachers and principals in schools were from foreign countries such as UK, USA, Canada, Egypt and India (ICDR 1990).

According to MOE (2002), prior to 1962, expatriate principals were assigned in the elementary and Secondary Schools of different provinces of Ethiopia during the 1930's and 1940s'. During this time Indian was given the principalship position which may be for their higher educational level and experiences in principal ship. However, the history had developed in to a new phase where Ethiopians began to replace expatriate which started in 1964 as to Teshome (in Ahmed 2006).

This new phase of leadership started with supervising principal such a person was responsible not only for one school but also for the education system of the community where the school was located from the second half of 1940's,documents prove that Ethiopian school Heads were directly assigned in elementary schools without competition among candidates. Only educational level and teaching experience were given highest priority of principal ship. After 1960 it was known the Ethiopians who graduated with B.A. BSC degree in any field were assigned as principals in schools by senior officials of the ministry of education. The major selection requirements were educational level and work experience (MOE, 2002; p. 42).

However, during the first few years of 1960's it was understood that those graduates of B.A degree in pedagogy were directly assigned in secondary schools. On the other hands career structure, promotion that secondary school principals were those who held first degree, preferably in educational management field and those who had at least worked for a limited time as a unit leader or department head, or teacher. It is also stated in the job description of the MOE issued in 1989 that secondary school administration and supervision including sufficient work experiences.

Currently(MOE)uses different criteria to select School leaders and/or principals to lead primary schools. In the criteria primary school leaders should have BA Degree in Educational Planning and Management or the have long years work experience as department head, unit leader and the like if they are going to be a principal without having educational management qualifications. Moreover, great emphasis is given

to the Educational Leadership and Management in the various documents and programs of the country. For instance, in the current Education and Training Policy (1994), the School Improvement Package, as well as in theGeneral Education Quality Improvement Program (GEQIP) (MOE, 2007) Educational Leadershipis taken as one of the major components to ensure quality education.

In whole, Educational Leadership and Management, the Ethiopian Education and Training Policy (1994; p.29-30) states that educational management should be democratic, professional, coordinated efficient and effective to bring the expected result of education in the country. In addition, the management of teachers and other educational personnel will be organized based on professional principles to achieve the goal of education in a collaborative and organized way.

2.10. Factor Affecting School Leadership Effectiveness

In educational institution including school,there are various factors that affect leadership effectiveness. Among these staff professionalism, complexity of tasks, competence and qualification of leaders, scarcity of resources and situational factors are common. The following discussion focuses on these points.

2.10.1. Staff Professionalism

As stated by (Osborne, 1990) it is widely accepted fact that managing schools is problematic due to many factors. Among the various challenges staff professionalism is one and leading staff with various professions or teachers with specialist qualification and skills, which means that they cannot be managed on strictly hierarchal bases. Professional norm is also another factor that influences school leadership effectiveness. Teachers in primary school are sensitive, intelligent people who feel that their professional preparations and experience have equipped them to do a job skillfully. (Corbally, et al, 1990:P.38).

Such professional norm makes the relationship between teachers and school leaders on the matters of instructional loosely coupled and leave educational decisions to teachers. Consequently, such professional norm limits the frequency and depth of leaders or principal's classroom visits as well as their initiatives of consulting teachers about instructional matters for better students result.

2.10.2. Complexity of Tasks with Scarce Resources

Deal and Kent (1994), argue that it is difficult to manage schools. They say the work of principals and other school administrators is extremely complex, and the way they concern of

their roles as leadership how they think, act and feel primary schools deal with diverse interests of their clients such as students, teachers, parents the communication the government and other stake holders each with its own unique interests. Seymour (1976; p.89).also pointed out that instructional leadership role of the principal is always dwarfed by the long list of administrative duties. So the multiplicity of roles and expectations by parents, students and teachers tend to fragment whatever vision the principal maybe attempting to Shape in the school. (Hallinger& Murphy, 1987; p.57).This will highly affect the leadership style of the principals.

Not only these school leader specially in countries like Ethiopia run their activities with scare resources, money, material facilitates and so on, which will be a headache for money school leadership. Deal and Kent (1994:61) indicate the daily work of leaders is full of problem and inconsistencies. The mix of challenges varies across weeks, seasons, years, and decades. Hence, leadership becomes awkward in rapidly changing situation. These require more refinedunderstanding of the roles of the school leaders and call for competent enough and well qualified school leader to execute challenging education activities. Every school leadership has their own duties and responsibility to carry out their school activities. However, due to many job descriptions and complexity, they fail to discharge their responsibilities as expected, most other, even effective leaders show limited progress in their leading roles because these problem.

2.10.3. Lack ofCompetence and Experienceof the Leaders

Withoutadequate training and experience leaders' task structuring ability, leadership effectiveness will be lower (Fiedler and Chemers; 1993). It is believed that leaders will have experience on the total work situation, more predictable and adequate experience thatenables them to handle various situations and in trying to accomplish their duties effectively (Connaughtonet, al. 2003). According to these authors, training shows the leaders alternative way doing their job or preparing them to handle specific complications of the new job they are going to resume in the future. Generally training and experience in the areas of leadership can hinder and negatively affect the effectiveness of educational leadership in general and school leadership in particular.

2.10.4. Educational Background or Qualification of the Leaders

The effectiveness of a school cannot be ensured without effective and qualified leadership. Harris (2004) reinforces this view by saying that 'effective leaders exercise an indirect but powerful influence on the effectiveness of the school and on the achievement of students'. School

leadership certainly expected equivalent in educational leadership or specifically management of academic education. It is believed that this formal education gives the school leadership various skills and understanding of leadership role but it is difficult to lead educational institution with only the past qualification (Rose Banch; 2003: Doh, 2003).

Many scholars also suggests, due to continues changes in the speed of change, managers and leaders who lead modern establishments need to be engaged in a constant learning and educational process once they have their formal education (Elmuti, et.al. 2005). Otherwise, the once acquires knowledge can be worn out and resulted in poor leadership performance. Hence educational background can be considered as a major influencing factor on the leadership performance of the school effectiveness.

2.10.5. Situational Factors

The situational factors that influence leadership effectiveness of the school include the nature of the community, the teaching staff, the non-instructional staff and the students' body. Similarly the size, location, topography; climate of the school districts, the large structure of education and the financial resource are all non-human situational factors that influence the effectiveness of leadership (Corbally 1961).

CHAPTER THREE

3. METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

3.1. The Research Design and Method

In this study, the descriptive survey research design was employed. Research designis the plan of action that links the philosophical assumptions to specific methods (Creswell &Planoclark, 2007).This design was employed with the intention to get the general picture of the current status of school leaders' effectiveness in theprimary schools of Jimma town.

The quantitative research approach was used by supplementing with qualitative methods with a more emphasizes on quantitative research approach. The qualitative method was used to triangulate the data gained from the quantitative method. This helps to capitalize on the strengths of each approach and offset their weaknesses and provides a better understanding of the research problems than either approach alone. It could also provide more comprehensive answers to research questions going beyond the limitations of a single approach (Creed, et al.,2004). Furthermore, this enable to confirm cross-validate or corroborate findings within a study.

3.2. The Study Population

In Jimma town there are 14 government primary schools organized under four cluster resource centers. Hence, the populations of this study were 14 government primary schools of Jimma town, 5 CRC supervisors, 451teachers, and instructional leaders (14 principals, 7 unit leaders, and 80 PTA members and senior teachers). All these were taken as a population to be included in the sample and investigate the major factors that affect leadership effectiveness in their school.

3.3. Sources of Data

To find out the major factors that influence the effectiveness of school leadership both primary and secondary data sources were used in this study. The primary data was collected from the teachers, principals, Parent-Teacher Associations, and supervisors. Secondary data was collected for the study from the documents that were recorded in Jimma town primary schools and education office. The documents that were used for the study include school reports, and guideline of the primary schools.

3.4. Samples and Sampling Techniques

This study was conducted in Jimma Town government primary schools. According to Jimma town Education Annual Report (2013), there are 14 primary schools that were organized under four cluster centres. Out of the 14 schools, 7(50%) were selected by simple random sampling. Then, teachers, school leaders and supervisors were identified. To determine the sample size from the total target population of teachers of the sampled primary schools, Cochran's (1977) proportional allocation formula was used and it was calculated as follows.

$$Ps = \frac{n}{} \times N \text{ of teacher in each sample school}$$

Ps = x Noof teacher in each sample school

Where, Ps = proportional allocation to size

n = Total teachers' sample size

N = Total number of teacher in the seven selected sample school (172)

The aim of the calculation is to determine an adequate sample size to estimate the population prevalence with a good precision. Also the ever increasing demand for research has created a need for an efficient method of determining the sample size needed to be representative of a given population (Robert V. Krejcie&Daryle W. Morgan 1970).

Based on the calculation of the above mathematical formula, the total sample size of teachers for this study was 120. Accordingly, 34(70%) teacher's from Hermata; 18(72%) teachers from Jiren no.2; 17(71%) teacher's from Hamle, 15(68%) teacher's from Kito, 15(71%) teacher's from Dilfire, 15(68%) teacher's from Jimma no.2, and 6(67%) teacher's from Medresa school were included in the study.

After determining the sample size from the total population, simple random sampling technique(lottery method) was used based on teachers' proportion found in each sample school, because this technique gives independent and equal chance to the participants to be selected in the samples. Concerning, other participants, by using availability sampling 4 CRC supervisors and 1 Jimmasupervision coordinators were selected while 56 school leaders were selected through purposive samplingfrom the total 89 school leaders found in the sampled schoolssince their role and practical experience is vital; in addition 7 principals interviewed. This is summarized as follows.

Table -1: Population, Samples Size and Sampling Technique

No	Types of Respondents	Total Population	Sample Size No.	%	Sampling Technique	Remark
1.	Teachers	172	120	70	Simple Random	The population indicates the sampled schools& the samples are taken proportionally from each sampled school
2.	School Leaders	96	56	63	Purposive	V.Principals, Unit Leaders, Dep. Heads & PTA Representative from the sampled schools
3.	CRC Supervisors	4	4	100	Availability	Only 4 CRC are found in the town
4.	Woreda Super. Coordinator	1	1	100	Availability	Only 4 CRC are found in the town

3.5.   Data Collection Instruments

To assess the major factors that affect the school leadership effectiveness three instruments were used. These were: questionnaire, interview and document analysis. The purpose and rational to use these instruments is presented as follows.

I. Questionnaire

Questionnaire was used as a major instrument to collect data from teachers and school leaders of the study since it is convenient to conduct surveys and to acquire the necessary information from a large number of study participants in a short period of time. It is helpful for economy of time and expense and also provides a high proportion of usable response (Best & Kahn, 2003).

The instrument was comprised of both open-ended and close-ended questions for both teachers and school leaders. The closed ended question was prepared by Likert type five points scale. The scaling procedure was ranging from as "Very high" to "Very low" for the first variable and from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree". Questionnaires that were administered for the participants were translated to Amharic languages. This is mainly because to make the questionnaires more understandable by respondents.

II. Semi-structured Interview

In quantitative study, interview was one of the tools that were used for collecting qualitative data. This instrument was particularly used to get data on the factors affecting leaders' effectiveness. Cohen and others (2002) stated that, this live form of data collection involves recording data as

the interview takes place or shortly afterwards. In this study, interview was under taken in the form of person to person encounter using semi-structured questions. The interview was prepared for supervisors and school principals by using interview guide. It was prepared for the purpose of cross checking and substantiates the result of the questionnaire.

III. Document Analysis

Jimma Town Education Office and selected schoolswere officially requested permission to access some of the documents vital for the study purpose. Document analysis was made on the strategic and annual plan, previous school records and reports on the major factors that influence the effectiveness of Primary school leadership in Schools and Woreda Education Office. This was done to triangulate the data collected through questionnaire and interview.

3.7. Procedure of Data Collection

Letter of support was written from Department ofEducational Planning and Management of Jimma University to Jimma Town Education Office. Jimma Town Education Office also wrote a cooperation letter to primary school of Jimma town sampled schools. The purpose of the study was informed to every participant before the collection of data after once I get their permission. The researcher gave respect to all school community and collect data from sampled schools based on their full permission. Finally, the participants filled the questionnaires, and the researcher checked all the items were filled properly whilethey returned back to him.

3.8. Method of Data Analysis

To answer the research questions of this study, data was analyzed quantitatively using percent and t-test mean, and qualitatively in narration. Both qualitative and quantitative methods were used to find out the factors that influence school leadership effectiveness. Closed ended questionnaire data were also coded, tabulated, and interpreted, and then it was analysed quantitatively using frequency and percentage of each item.

The t-test was also used to see if there is statistically any significance difference between the responses of teachers and school leaders. Moreover, data gathered through the open ended questions, structured interview, and documents analysis was considered in data interpretation and analyzed by supplementing the qualitative data. In doing this, the qualitative data were thematically analyzed in the way they can answer the basic questions and support the quantitative data.

3.9.   Validity and Reliability Checks

Checking the validity and reliability of data collecting instruments before providing to the actual study subject is the core to assure the quality of the data (Yalew, 1998). To ensure validity of instruments, the instruments were developed under close guidance of the advisors and also a pilot study was carried out on 20 teachers and 1 principals of Hibret primary school to pre-test the instrument. The pre-test was providing an advance opportunity for the investigator to check the questionnaires and to minimize errors due to improper design elements, like question, wording or sequence (Adams et al., 2007). In checking the items validity, necessary modification on 6 items and complete removal and replacement of 6 unclear questions were done.

Additionally the reliability of the instrument was measured by using Cronbach alpha test by participating 21 respondents from the leaders and teachers group. The reliability test is performed to check the consistency and accuracy of the measurement scales. Then an internal consistency reliability estimate was calculated using Cronbach's Coefficient of Alpha for the questionnaires. The researchers found the coefficient of Alpha (a) to be 0.93, which is regarded as strong correlation coefficient by (Jackson, 2009). Supporting this, George and Mallery (2003) and Cohen, L., (2007) also suggest that, the Cronbatch's alpha result >0.9excellent, >0.8good, >0.7acceptable, <0.6 questionable, <0.5poor. As suggested by Cronbach (2011), the reliability coefficients between 0.70-0.90 are generally found to be internally consistent. This is shown in the following table.

Table 2: Reliability Test

No	Variables	No of Items	Cronbach Alpha
1	Awareness towards School Leadership Practices	3	0.80
2	The School Leadership Effectiveness in Achieving School Objectives.	5	0.94
3	Stakeholders Participation in Enhancing Students Result.	8	0.97
4	Community Participation and Leadership Characteristics and Effectiveness	9	0.98
5	Strategies to overcame leadership effectiveness influencing factors	9	0.98
	Average Cronbach's Alpha result	34	0.93

3.10. Ethical Consideration

To conduct this study, emphasis was given to every important ethical issue. First, before entering into the actual data collection, a formal letter was received from the department and handed to the education office of Jimma town. Similar, procedure was followed in the schools to get data based on their permission. Also, people were participated in the interview with their full permission. Every effort was made to keep participants anonymous and confidentiality. Moreover every source was acknowledged.

CHAPTER FOUR

5. Data Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation

In this part, the data obtained from the groups of the participants using questionnaire, interview and document analysis were presented. In addition to questionnaire and interview, document analysis was made in the selected primary schools and Woreda Education Office to get more pertinent information.Data were collected from 120 sampled teachers and 56 school leaders with 100% response rate for both groups and the following analysis was made based on this.

4.1. Characteristics of Respondents

All respondents of the selected primary school were asked to indicate their background information. Hence, their sex, age educational level and experience were summarized as follows.

Table - 3: Distribution of Respondents' Characteristics

| Item | | Current Positions | | | | | |
| | | Teachers | | School Leaders | | Total | |
		F	%	F	%	f	%
1. Sex	Male	55	45.8	45	80.4	120	56.8
	Female	65	54.2	11	19.6	56	43.2
	Total	120	100	56	100	176	100
2. Age (Years)	>20	1	0.8	0	0	1	0.6
	21-25	7	5.8	2	3.6	9	5.1
	26-30	18	15	1	1.8	19	10.8
	36-40	24	20	24	42.9	48	27.3
	41-45	46	38.3	17	30.4	63	35.8
	46 & above	24	20	12	21.4	36	20.5
	Total	120	100	56	100	176	100
3. Education Qualification	Below Certif.	0	0	0	.0	0	0
	Certificate	2	1.7	3	5.4	5	2.8
	Diploma	101	84.2	43	76.8	144	81.8
	Degree	17	14.2	10	17.9	27	15.3
	Total	120	100	56	100	176	100
4. Experience (Years)	6-10	3	2.5	2	3.6	5	2.8
	11-15	17	14.2	6	10.7	23	13.1
	16-20	61	50.8	9	16.1	70	39.8
	31-35	39	32.5	39	69.6	78	44.3
	Total	120	100	56	100	176	100

As table 3 shows the majority of teachers' respondents, 65 (54.2%) were females and 55 (45.8%) were males. This indicates that female participation seems to be courageous. But, regarding school leaders sex 45(80.4%) and 11(19.6%) were males and females respectively. Therefore, as the data indicated the number of females in leadership position was very low and it needs encouragement.

Concerning the age, majority of teachers (respondents) 46(38.3%) had an age of 41- 45 years and at this level of age they might expected to contribute more for the improvement of instructional process. Regarding the age of school leaders, the majority 24(42.9%) fall in the age range of 3640 years. Therefore, being at this age level might help school leaders to have more experience and also help them to play leadership role in appropriate manner.

With regarding to the respondents qualification, majority of the teachers 101(84.2 %) were diploma, and the rest 2(1.7%) and 17(14.2%) were certificate and degree holders respectively. According to the new education policy desire all primary schools teachers should have a minimum qualification of diploma and the current qualification level of most teachers of primary schools of Jimma town seems to be in line with the education policy needs and it is also courageous.

Regarding the qualification of school leaders the majority 43(76.8%) had diploma and the rest 3(5.4%) and 10(17.9%) had certificate and 1st degree respectively. But, in principle out of school leaders, all principals and supervisors of primary schools should have a qualification of 1st degree. Therefore, in this aspect there might be a gap as some of the school leaders' qualification was below the requirements.

As depicted in item 4, Table 3 above, the majority 61(50.8%) of teachers had a service of 16-20 years. Similarly, 39(69.6%) of school leaders had a service of 31- 35 years. Thus, as the data indicated both teachers and school leaders of primary schools of Jimma town seem to have adequate experience in promoting the teaching learning process and facilitating the leadership role as well.

4.2. Analysis of Dataon Leadership

4.2.1. Respondents' Awareness on School Leadership Practice

Teachers' and school leaders' respondents were asked to respond their level of awareness about school leadership functions, duties, responsibilities and to what extent stakeholders involved in school function or activities. The questionnaires on this theme were prepared having five point Likert scale range from Very High (=5) to Very Low (=1). Percentage, overall mean scores, and the p-value of t-test result were used to analyze quantitative data. Within the five point ranges, three trisecting scores were used to make the analysis clear as suggested by Anbessa (2012); these scores were 2.49, 3.49 and 4.49. Thus, the level of respondents awareness for the questionnaire items were analyzed based on the responses of the respondents with a mean value from <1.49 were very low, 1.5 to 2.49 were low, from 2.5 to 3.49 were moderate, from 3.50 to 4.49 were high, and from 4.50 to 5.00 were very high. Results from open-ended items and interview questions were also analyzed to supplement and validate the findings from each close-ended item as necessary.Basing on the responses of teachers and school leaders, table 4 presented the issues as follows.

Table 5: Respondents' Awarenesstowards School Leadership Practice
Note: N=176 i.e. 120 teachers and 56 School Leaders

ns	Respondents	Responses										T-test	
		Very Low		Low		Moderate		High		Very high		Overall mean	P-Value
		F	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Your level of awareness about school leadership practice.	Teacher	1	0.8	18	15	1	0.8	87	72.5	13	10.8	3.73	.487
	S/Leaders	1	1.8	8	14.3	1	1.8	44	78.6	2	3.6		
	Total	2	1.1	26	14.8	2	1.1	13	74.4	15	8.5		
Your level of awareness about school leadership duties and responsibilities.	Teacher	3	2.5	5	4.2	2	1.7	63	52.5	47	39.2	4.07	.010
	S/Leaders	1	1.8	1	1.8	2	3.6	49	87.5	3	5.4		
	Total	4	2.3	6	3.4	4	2.3	112	63.6	50	28.4		
Your level of awareness on stakeholders' involvement in school function	Teacher	2	1.7	84	70	25	20.	7	5.8	2	1.7	2.25	.046
	S/Leaders	1	1.8	51	91.1	1	1.8	1	1.8	2	3.6		
	Total	3	1.7	135	76.7	26	14.8	8	4.5	4	2.3		

Note: p-value at a = 0.05, df =174

Response to item 1, table 4, focused on identifying the level of awareness of respondents

regarding school leadership practice. On this item, the majority 100 (83.3)of teachers and 46 (82.1%)of leaders responded that their level of awareness is high respectively and the rest 19 (15.8%) and 1(0.8%) and 9 (16.1%) and 1(1.8%) of leaders responded as low and moderate respectively. When the independent t-test is conducted to see if there is a significant difference in theopinions of teachers and school leaders on this item, the overall mean of the two groups3.73 shows the presence of high level of awareness. The p-value .487 > 0.05 indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents opinion towards the item. This shows that, the majority of teachers and school leaders of the sampled schools have batter awareness on school leadership role and responsibilities. Supporting this idea, Cotter (2000) described that leadership in educational institution must be educative and teachers, students, parents and administrators must have a desire to learn to be taught. Therefore, leadership and management must be viewed as critical and reflective activities; all who participate in educational activities in school, must become more aware of the task and of the context in which they work. To substantiate the data, interview was made with CRC supervisors. Hence, CRC supervisor of one sampled school explained that "school stakeholders seem to have adequate awareness and understanding about the school activities, but the problem is that they cannot change their theoretical knowledge in to practical as much as required". Therefore, this indicates that there was good awareness of the respondents about school leadership practice in the selected primary schools.

As indicated in the table 4, item 2, respondents were asked about school leadership duties and responsibilities. Accordingly, the majority 110(91.6%) of teachers and 52(92.8%) of leadersresponded as they were highly aware of the school leadership duties and responsibilities. The result of the t-test showed that there is a statistically significance differences between the teachers and school leaders opinion on this item since the p-value .010 < 0.05. This is because teachers' mean score is greater than school leaders. The overall mean score of the two groups 4.07 shows high level of awareness on this item.From this it is important to understand that the respondents were aware of school leadership duties and responsibilities. In light of this Pardey (2007) described that understanding leadership practices, duties and responsibilities by subordinates help to achieve organization objective.

The respondents' awareness was almost low about the stakeholders' participation in school functions in item 3, in the Table 4. i. e. the majority 84 (70%) of teachers and 51(91.1%) of school leaders responded as low. The reports of the participants show that there was gap in

stakeholders' involvement in school function. The result of the t-test showed that there is a statistically significance differences between the teachers and school leaders opinion on their awareness of the stakeholders' participation in school functions since the p-value .046 < 0.05. This is because teachers' mean score is greater than school leaders. The overall mean score of the two groups 2.25 shows low level of awareness on this item.In contrast, almost all selected primary schools, in their strategic plan, school leaders and all stakeholders functions were clearly defined, in which and what activities each stakeholder will be involved. This indicates that, the school functions were included in the school plan but there was a problem of clear understanding and practical implementation of the school plan.

4.2.2. School Leadership Effectiveness in Achieving School Objectives

There are different effectiveness measuring factors of primary school leadership. According to MoE (2007a) the effectiveness measuring factors of school leaders include their achievement of school objectives such as task achievements, defining school plan successfully, motivating subordinates, and planning to reduce students' overload in relation to quality education, school instructional activities and participating stakeholders in decision making. To check the effectiveness of the school leaders within these parameters respondents were asked to respondto the five Likert scale items as presented in table 4, and discussed as follows. The t-test results also presented to check the presence of any statistical significance differences in opinion. The overall mean scores were used to show the level of respondents' agreement to each item with three trisecting scores 2.49, 3.49 and 4.49as suggested by Anbessa (2012).

Table 5: Responses on the School Leadership Effectiveness in Achieving School Objectives
Note: N=176 i.e. 120 teachers and 56 School Leaders

ms	Respondents	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly agree		Overall mean	P-Value
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	f	%		
Tasks and achievements of school defining successfully for school communities.	Teacher	1	0.8	63	52.5	36	30	17	14.2	3	2.5	2.97	.867
	S/Leaders	2	3.6	31	55.4	12	21.4	11	19.6	0	0		
	Total	3	1.7	43	24.4	92	52.3	33	18.8	5	2.8		
Because of brief school planning, school improvements achieved successfully	Teacher	32	26.	63	52.5	17	14.2	4	3.3	4	3.3	2.18	.051
	S/Leaders	2	3.6	41	73.2	8	14.3	3	5.4	2	3.6		
	Total	34	19.	10	59.1	25	14.2	7	4	6	3.4		
Motivation of subordinates based on school objectives carried out effectively	Teacher	25	20.	76	63.3	12	10	1	0.8	6	5	2.00	.026
	S/Leaders	5	8.9	42	75	2	3.6	5	8.9	2	3.6		
	Total	30	17	11	67	14	8	6	3.4	8	4.5		
Students' achievement used as a base for instructional objective evaluation.	Teacher	7	5.8	6	5	4	3.3	25	20.8	78	65	4.20	.144
	S/Leaders	3	5.4	3	5.4	6	10.7	19	33.9	25	44.6		
	Total	10	5.7	9	5.1	10	5.7	44	25	103	58.5		
School instructional activities in achieving the intended objectives are affected by school leaders' workload.	Teacher	5	4.2	5	4.2	16	13.3	67	55.8	27	22.5	3.75	.095
	S/Leaders	4	7.1	5	8.9	1	1.8	44	78.6	2	3.6		
	Total	9	5.1	10	5.70	17	9.7	111	63.1	29	16.5		

Note: p-value at a = 0.05, df = 174

Scales; < 1.49 = Strongly Disagree, 1.5 -2.49 = Disagree, 2.5 -3.49 = Undecided,

3.5 - 4.49 =Agree, > 4.5 =Strongly Agree

As per table 5, item 1, tasks and achievements of the primary school were not defined effectively and visibly for school communities. Regarding this item, the majority 64 (53.3%) of teachers and 33 (59%) of school leaders responded as they were disagreed. Whereas the rest 36 (30%) of teachers and 12 (21.4%) of leaders responded as undecided. The result of t-test showed that there is no statistically significance difference between the responses of teachers' and school leaders' since the p-value .867 >0.05 level. However, the overall mean score 2.97 showed that the respondents unable to decide on this item. This shows that there was a gap in achieving and defining the tasks for school communities and this might affect school leadership effectiveness. The result of the interview with supervisors verified this response "one of the problems of the primary school principals is their inability to participate school communities in school activities to achieve the intended goal". In connection to this, MOE (2007a) argued that, to achieve the objectives of the school, first of all task should be defined clearly for all school communities. But the responses were different from this idea. Based on the responses of the respondents school activities were not defined successfully and clearly for school communities. As a result school communities were not participated actively in school activities.

Regarding item2 of table 5, respondents indicate thatthere was problem of planning for successful school improvement. The majority 95 (79.2%)of teachers and 43 (76.8%) of leaders responded as disagreed and the rest 17 (14.2) and 8 (6.6%) of teachers and8 (14.3%) and 5 (9%) of leaders were responded as undecided and agreed respectively. This clearly shows that there was gap in planning for achieving school improvement successfully. When the independent t-test is conducted the overall mean score 2.18 shows the disagreement of the two groups on this item whileno significant difference was observed between theopinions of teachers and school leaders since the p-value .051 > 0.05 level of alpha. This indicateslack of skill on brief, reliable and applicable planning and organizing by the school leaders of Jimma town primary schoolsand this might have negative impact on school objective achievement and school leaders' effectiveness. In connection to this, Day and others (2000) describe that, skill of planning and organizing of leaders enhance the efficiency of their work flexible enough to cope with changes of technology, advances and changing work force.

Item 3 of table 5 shows, motivation of subordinates in carrying out the school objectives were very less as indicated by the majority 101(84.1%) of teachers and 47(83.9%) of school leaders

asresponded disagree while the rest 12 (10%) and 7 (5.8%) of teachers and 2 (3.6%) and 7(12.5%) of school leaders were responded as undecided and agreed respectively. The result of the independent t-test showed thatthere is statistically significance difference since the p-value .026< 0.05 level of alpha with the overall mean score of 2.00 which shows disagreement of the respondents. Regarding motivation, Sergiovanni (cited in Temesgen, 2011) explain that effective school leaders provide motivation and encouragement that lead to success and they manage effectively in a changing educational environment. From this analysis, it is possible to say that subordinates were not motivated in Jimma town primary schools adequately to enhance their active participation and great contribution to the successful attainment of school objectives.

As illustrated in item 4, Table 5 above, respondents were asked to respond whether or not students' achievement used as a base for instructional objective evaluation in the schools. Hence,the majority 103 (85.8%) of teachers and 46(82.2%) of leaders responded as they were agreed and the rest 10(8.4%) and 16(13.3%) of teachers and 6(10.8%) and 1(1.8%) of leadersresponded as they were disagreed and undecided respectively. The mean score 4.20 shows the respondents' agreement on this item and the result of the t-test with the p-value.144 > 0.05 level showed that there is no statistically significance difference between the responses of teachers' and school leaders'. Thus, it is possible to say that the trend of using students' achievement as a base for instructional objective evaluation in the primary schools of Jimma town was appreciable and contribute to the enhancement of student achievement.

As indicated in item 5, Table 5 above, respondents were asked to respond whether or not school instructional activities are affected by school leaders' workload. Accordingly, the majority 94(78.3%) and 46(82.2%) of leaders responded as they were agreed and the rest 10(8.4%) and 16(13.3%) of teachers and 9(16%) and 1(1.8%) of leaders responded as they were disagreed and undecided respectively. The result from open ended item also assured that there was a work load on school leaders. As two school leaders of the sampled schools explained particularly principals were required to be engaged in many community activities and they were frequently busy due to meeting and other issues. Therefore, the school instructional activities and the achievement of the objectives were affected by school leaders' workload in primary schools of Jimma town.

4.2.3. Effectiveness of School Leadership on Students' Result

There are different effectiveness measuring factors for leadership performances. Some of the factors are based on leadership support for students and teachers, appreciation of communities as a valuable resource in increasing students result, informing teachers, shared collective

responsibilities for all students' instructional decision and using data analysis to plan next steps for student's instruction (Leithwood, 2001). Here is the empirical data gained from the schools.

Table 6: Responses on Stakeholders Participation in Enhancing Students Result
Note: N=176 i.e. 120 teachers and 56 School Leaders

ms	Respondents	Responses										T-test	
		Strongly		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly		Overall	P-
		f	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	f	%	mean	Value
All Students achieve high standard because they got enough support.	Teacher	3	2.5	59	49.2	41	34.2	17	14.2	0	0	2.66	.305
	S/Leaders	6	10.7	10	17.9	35	62.5	3	5.4	2	3.6		
	Total	9	5.1	69	39.2	76	43	20	11.4	2	1.1		
All teachers teach high standard because they got high assistance.	Teacher	6	5	9	7.5	3	2.5	53	44.2	49	40.8	3.56	.000
	S/Leaders	6	10.7	18	32.1	1	1.8	30	53.6	1	1.8		
	Total	12	6.8	27	15.3	4	2.3	83	47.2	50	28.4		
All students informed about instructional decision.	Teacher	2	1.7	4	3.3	12	10	38	31.7	64	53.3	4.32	.975
	S/Leaders	1	1.8	4	7.1	2	3.6	18	32.1	31	55.4		
	Total	3	1.7	8	4.5	14	8	56	31.8	95	54		
Data analysis on students' result informs next step for instructional improvement	Teacher	45	37.5	47	39.2	6	5	16	13.3	6	5	1.99	.235
	S/Leaders	19	33.9	31	55.4	1	1.8	3	5.4	2	3.6		
	Total	64	36.4	78	44.3	7	4	19	10.8	8	4.5		
Teachers are well informed about how to enhance student's results	Teacher	5	4.2	5	4.2	4	3.3	41	34.2	65	54.2	4.32	.051
	S/Leaders	0	0	1	1.8	1	1.8	32	57.1	22	39.3		
	Total	5	2.8	6	3.4	5	2.8	73	41.5	87	49.4		
Resources are organized to support all learners to promote performance.	Teacher	48	40	42	35	5	4.2	18	15	7	5.8	2.14	.847
	S/Leaders	29	51.8	10	17.9	2	3.6	9	16.1	6	10.7		
	Total	77	43.8	52	29.5	7	4	27	15.3	13	7.4		
Teachers shared collective responsibilities for the improvement students result.	Teacher	35	29.2	46	38.3	8	6.7	22	18.3	9	7.5	2.37	.969
	S/Leaders	18	32.1	22	39.3	1	1.8	7	12.5	8	14.3		
	Total	53	30.1	68	38.6	9	5.1	29	16.5	17	9.7		

Note: p-value at a = 0.05, df = 174

Scales; < 1.49 = Strongly Disagree, 1.5 -2.49 = Disagree, 2.5 -3.49 = Undecided,

3.5 - 4.49 =Agree, > 4.5 =Strongly Agree

According to table 6, item 1, students have not given enough support to achieve high standards as indicted by 61 (51.6%) of teachers while 35(62.5%) of the leaders and 41(34.2%) of teachers unable to decide with this regard. When the independent t-test is conducted the overall mean score 2.66 similar interpretation of inability to decide on this item while no significant difference

was observed between theopinions of teachers and school leaders since the p-value .305 > 0.05 level of alpha. In the interview the CRC supervisor indicated that school leaders try to support teachers in order to benefit students besides discussing with students to solve problems. But, there is limitation to perform this continuously. From this idea it is possible to say that school leaders lack to provide adequate support for students.

In Table 6 item 2, teachers and school leaders were asked to give their response regarding the support provided to all teachers teach to high standards because of high assistance from leaders. Accordingly, the majority 102(89%) of teachers and 31(55.4%) of school leaders showed their agreement. Hence, the support from school leaders to teachers in this regard is adequate. In the same table, item 3, the majority 102(85%) of teachers and 49(87.5%) of school leaders reported that they agreed with the presence of informing all students about instructional decision in the study schools. The mean scores for the second and the third item 3.56 and 4.32 showed a similar verbal interpretation or agreement of the respondents on the items. From this it is possible to infer that school leaders are informing students about instructional decisions satisfactorily.

With regard to item 4 in the same Table above, the response of teachers and school leaders aboutdata analysis on students' result informs next step for instructional improvement, the majority92(76.7%) of teachers and 50(89.3%) of school leaders showed their disagreement. The mean score 1.99 shows the respondents' disagreement on this item and the result of the t-test with the p-value.235 > 0.05 level showed that there is no statistically significance difference between the responses of teachers' and school leaders'. Based on the consequences of the responses, data analysis on students' result informs next step for instructional improvement has been given less attention in primary schools of Jimma town. With this regard, Pynes (2004) argued that, an excellent leadership competency bring improvements and take sound judgment based on tangible data and appropriate information for future improvement.

As can be seen in Table 6 item 5, teachers are well informed about how to enhance student's results as reported by 106(88.4%) of teachers and 54(96.4%) of school leaders.The mean score 4.32 shows the respondents' agreement on this item and the result of the t-test with the p-value .051 > 0.05 level showed that there is no statistically significance difference between the responses of teachers' and school leaders'. From this, it is possible to infer that teachers are satisfactorily informed how to promote students results.

Concerning item 6 of table 6, respondents were asked whether there is resources are organized to

support all learners in promoting their performance or not. With regard to this, 90(75%) teachers and 39(69.6%) school leaders disagreed with this item. The mean score 2.14 shows the respondents' disagreement on this item and the result of the t-test with the p-value .847> 0.05 level showed that there is no statistically significance difference between the responses of teachers' and school leaders'. As the data shows the use of resources and their organization for high students performance was unsatisfactory, so it is possible to say that the leaders are less effective in encouraging the use of educational resources for better students' performance.

The last item of table 6 showed that the majority 81(67.5%) of the teachers and 40(71.4%) school leaders respondents disagreed that there is lack of sharing collective responsibilities by teachers for the improvement of students result. The independent t-test result showed no statistical significance difference between the two groups since the p-value .969> 0.05 level of alpha with overall mean score of 2.37 disagreement. Hence, it is possible to say that the sharing of collective responsibilities by teachers for the improvement students' result is unsatisfied.

4.2.4. Community Participation in School Leadership Effectiveness

School leadership effectiveness can be affected by different factors. One of the factors is school organization system. Grace (1996) described that school leadership effectiveness was affected by school environment, behavior of teachers and students, school leadership style, teaching learning environment, communication barriers between school communities, problem in parents' teachers' relationship and instructional achievement problems.

To assess this issue, the selected primary school teachers and leaders were asked to prove the factors that were influencing the effectiveness of primary school leadership.Accordingly, in the respondents were asked to their level of agreement on the extent to which the community participation affects the school leadership effectiveness on the basis of a five point Likert scale item questionnaires. These five point scales range from Strongly Agree (5) to Strongly Disagree (1). As previously used, within the five point ranges, three trisecting scores were used to make the analysis clear as suggested by Anbessa (2012); these scores were 2.49, 3.49 and 4.49. Consequently, the results from the questionnaire items were analyzed with a mean value of <1.49 were strongly disagree; from 1.5 to 2.49 disagree; from 2.5 to 3.49 were undecided; from 3.50 to 4.49 agree and from 4.50 to 5.00 strongly disagree. Still the results from Open-ended items and interview questions were also analyzed to supplement and validate the findings from each close- ended item as necessary.

In doing the analysis, the data were first presented in frequency distribution table or percentage, and then the overall mean scores and the p-value of each item were calculated through the use of t-test results. The use of the t-test was see the presence any statistically significance difference between the responses of teachers and school leaders on each item. The responses of the teachers and school leaders were presented in the following table (7) and discussed accordingly.

Table 7: Respondents' view on Community Participation
Note: N=176 i.e. 120 teachers and 56 School Leaders

ns	Respondents	Responses										T-test	
		Strongly disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly agree		Overall mean	P-Value
		F	%	F	%	f	%	F	%	f	%		
Strong community and home school relationship, because of strong leadership.	Teacher	41	34.2	56	46.7	2	1.7	12	10	9	7.5	2.29	.092
	S/Leaders	16	28.6	23	41.1	1	1.8	6	10.7	10	17.9		
	Total	57	32.4	79	44.9	3	1.7	18	10.2	19	10.8		
Great appreciation of communities as a valuable resource in increasing students' achievement	Teacher	12	10	73	60.8	7	5.8	24	20	4	3.3	2.38	.303
	S/Leaders	1	1.8	47	83.9	2	3.6	2	3.6	4	7.1		
	Total	13	7.4	120	68.2	9	5.1%	26	14.8	8	4.5		
There is involvement of communities in ongoing teaching learning.	Teacher	81	67.5	18	15	2	1.7	16	13.3	3	2.5	1.73	.610
	S/Leaders	41	73.2	1	1.8	3	5.4	7	12.5	4	7.1		
	Total	12	69.3	19	10.8	5	2.8	23	13.1	7	4		
4. There is good students' discipline because of parent/community follow up on pupils.	Teacher	57	47.5	35	29.2	6	5	12	10	10	8.3	1.79	.026
	S/Leaders	42	75	5	8,9	2	3.6	5	8.9	2	3.6		
	Total	99	56.2	40	22.7	8	4.5	17	9.7	12	6.8		
There is good management in the school because of strong community	Teacher	22	18.3	81	67.5	3	2.5	10	8.3	4	3.3	2.20	.170
	S/Leaders	0	0	48	85.7	1	1.8	5	8.9	2	3.6		
	Total	22	12.5	12	73.3	4	2.3	15	8.5	6	3.4		
Community involvement in creating positive climate for teaching learning.	Teacher	77	64.2	24	20	3	2.5	11	9.2	5	4.2	1.93	.049
	S/Leaders	35	62.5	2	3.6	2	3.6	8	14.3	9	16.1		
	Total	11	63.6	26	14.8	5	2.8	19	10.8	14	8		
Positive relationship developed between parents and teachers.	Teacher	24	20	49	40.8	23	19.2	15	12.5	9	7.5	2.54	.452
	S/Leaders	2	3.6	38	67.9	2	3.6	8	14.3	6	10.7		
	Total	26	14.8	87	49.4	25	14.	23	13.1	15	8.5		
Community participation in school decision making.	Teacher	61	50.8	40	33.3	2	1.7	11	9.2	6	5	2.01	.156
	S/Leaders	34	60.7	2	3.6	2	3.6	12	21.4	6	10.7		
	Total	95	54	42	23.9	4	2.3	23	13.1	12	6.8		

Note: p-value at a = 0.05, df = 174

Note: Scales; < 1.49 = Strongly Disagree, 1.5 -2.49 = Disagree, 2.5 -3.49 = Undecided,

3.5 - 4.49 =Agree, > 4.5 =Strongly Agree

When respondents asked about the strength of community and home school relationship because of strong leadership, in Table 7, item 1 the majority of teachers 97(81%) and school leaders 39(70%) showed their disagreement.In the open ended item one teacher said that our school administrators sometimes forget this role. They only try to create such relation when they need to get immediate support from the community and the cooperation of the two parties. When the independent t-test is conducted the overall mean score 2.29 shows the disagreement of the two groups on this item while no significant difference was found between theopinions of teachers and school leaders since the p-value.092 > 0.05 level of alpha. Therefore, it is possible to infer that school leaders fail to create strong community home school relationship in their schools.

Concerning item 2 of table 7, respondents were asked whether there is great appreciation of communities as a valuable resource in increasing students' achievement or not. With regard to this, 85(70%) teachers and 48(86%) school leaders disagreed whereas 28(23.3%) teachers and 6 (10.7%) school leaders agreed on the presence of such appreciation. The mean score 2.38 shows the respondents' disagreement on this item and the result of the t-test with the p-value .303> 0.05 level showed that there is no statistically significance difference between the responses of teachers' and school leaders'. As the data indicated the appreciation of communities as a valuable resource in increasing students' achievement was unsatisfactory, so it is possible to say that the leaders could not increase students' achievement through great appreciation of communities as a valuable resource.

Regarding item 3, 99(82.5%) of the teachers and 42(75%) school leaders respondents disagreed that there is lack of involvement by the community in the ongoing teaching learning.The result of the independent t-test showed thatthere is no statistically significance difference since the p- value .610< 0.05 level of alpha with the overall mean score of 1.73 which shows disagreement of the respondents. Based on the consequence of the responses, there was difficulty of student discipline in primary school. This indicates that the community's participation in supporting the ongoing teaching learning is not adequate.

On the other hand, Table 7 of item 4 illustrates whether the there is good students' discipline because of parent/community follow up on pupils. Consequently, the majority of both teachers 92(76.6%) and school leaders 47(83%) revealed that there is a problem in the involvement of

community in ensuring good students follow up. The result of the independent t-test showed thatthere is statistically significance difference between the responses of teachers and school leaders since the p-value .026 < 0.05 level of alpha with the overall mean score of 1.93 which shows disagreement of the respondents.It was true that, when the researcher analyzed the school discipline documents of students in two primary schools (Hermat and Bada Buna) in the year 2011 - 2012, three students were charged (dismissed) for one-two years and 14 students were given warning in the first semester. Dilfire and Kitto schools also planned in their annual plan to reduce students discipline case. From this it is possible to say discipline case as one of the problem for good management in the primary schools of Jimma town.

As shown in item 5 of table 7, the respondents were asked whether or not there is good management in the school because of strong community participation. Accordingly, the majority respondents 101(84.1%) of teachers and 48(85.7%) of school leaders showed their disagreement on this item. However, 14(11.6%) of teachers and 7(12.5%) of principals agree to similar item. The result of the independent t-test showed thatthere is no statistically significance difference between the responses of teachers and school leaders since the p-value .170> 0.05 level of alpha with the overall mean score of 2.20 that shows disagreement of the respondents. From this data analysis it is crystal clear that community participation in strengthening the school management is unsatisfactory.

When respondents were asked if there is community involvement in creating positive climate for teaching learning, in Table 7 item 6 the majority of teachers 101(84.1%) and principals 34(61%) reported that the provision of school atmosphere for students' safety and needs were not provided well for pupils' learning as shown in their strong disagreement. The overall mean score 1.93 also shows similar verbal interpretation or respondents' disagreement on this item and the result of the t-test with the p-value .049> 0.05 level showed that there is statistically significance difference between the responses of teachers' and school leaders' because teachers mean rank was higher than school leaders on this item. As the responses of the majority respondents indicates, primary school environment was not such well provided for pupils learning.

Moreover, primary school principals agreed to the response of the questionnaire during the interview. Thus, proper consideration is very important for the community involvement in creating positive climate for teaching learning. The behavior of teachers and students was not that much comfortable for ongoing teaching-learning activities in primary school.

As shown in Table 7 of item 7, respondents were asked whether positive relationship developed between parents and teachers or not.Also, there was enormous gap in rising positive relationship between parents and teachers by school leaders in primary school as revealed by 73(61%) of teachers and 40(71.4%) of school leaders disagreement tothis item. This left the rest of the respondents 24(20%) of teachers and 14(25%) of school leaders to have an agreement with the presence of such relationship. In the principals' interview, parents were not participating actively in urgent school problems even if they are called for urgent issue itself. According to the responses of the majority of the respondents one can see that, there was enormous gap in increasing positive relationship between parents and teachers by school leaders in primary school.

In item 8 of table 7, respondents were asked whether there is community participation in school decision making or not. Accordingly, the majority of teachers 101(84.1%) and school leaders 36(64.2%) respondents disagreed on the presence of such practice in their school. Using the t-test for independent sample, it was not found any statistically significant difference between teachers and leaders responses with an overall mean 2.01disagreement and the p-value .156> 0.05 level. Hence, this can be seen as one factor for leadership effectiveness in primary schools since it is difficult to be successful without passing various decisions through the participation of the school community. In the interview respondents indicate that lack of strong participation of the school community in decision making is great problem in school improvement. They can hinderthe school leaders' work. Moreover, in the interview with principals, it was indicated that not only parents but also school board committee members from the local community were not actively participatingand/or available at school meeting to pass decision even in urgent school problems. Therefore, it is possible to say that there is lack of participation by the community in decision making.

4.2.5. School Leaders' Competence and Skills

Table 8: Responses on Leaders' Competence and Skills
Note: N=176 i.e. 120 teachers and 56 School Leaders

ms	Respondents	Responses										T-test	
		Strongly disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly agree		Overall mean	P-Value
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	f	%		
Leaders have adequate communication skill.	Teacher	7	5.8	11	9.2	6	5	42	35	54	45	4.04	.975
	S/Leaders	2	3.6	6	10.7	3	5.4	22	39.3	23	41.1		
	Total	9	5.1	17	9.7	9	5.1	64	36.4	77	43.8		
Leaders have deep understanding about students learning.	Teacher	24	20	67	55.8	3	2.5	19	15.8	7	5.8	2.34	.819
	S/Leaders	2	3.6	45	80.4	1	1.8	3	5.4	5	56		
	Total	26	14.8	11	63.6	4	2.3	22	12.5	12	6.8		
In-service professional training provided for school leaders to discharge their responsibility.	Teacher	22	18.3	60	50	5	4.2	26	21.7	7	5.8	2.65	.056
	S/Leaders	1	1.8	34	60.7	3	5.4	9	16.1	9	16.1		
	Total	23	13.1	94	53.4	8	4.5	35	19.9	16	9.1		

Initem 1 of table 8, respondents were asked whether leaders have adequate communication skill.Accordingly, the largest number of both teachers 96(80%) and school leaders 45(80.3%) respondents agreed on the presence of such communication skill by leaders with the school community. Using the t-test for independent sample, it was not found any statistically significant difference between teachers and leaders responses with an overall mean 4.04 agreement and the p-value .975 > 0.05 level. Hence, this can be seen as on positive factor for leadership effectiveness in primary schools since it is vital to facilitate leadership work successfully and create good relationship and/or communication with the school community. The interview result also confirmed that there is good communication with the school community (teachers, students, parents and others); however, it is difficult to get them at school as frequent as needed. Therefore, it is possible to say that there is satisfactory communication skill used by leaders between them and the school community.

Regarding leaders' deep understanding of students learning, in Table 8 item 2, it was shown that there is lack of deep understanding about students learning as revealed by 91(75.8%) of teachers and 47(84%) of school leaders disagreement. Using the t-test for independent sample, it was not found any statistically significant difference between teachers and leaders responses with an overall mean 2.34 disagreement and the p-value .819 > 0.05 level. Hence, it is possible to say that leaders fail tounderstand adequately about students learning in the study schools. In this regard, leaders develop

deep and structured understanding about students learning and considering students as critical participants in instruction and in informing teachers about how to enhance student's results (Hernes, 2000).

As shown in item 3 of table 8, respondents were asked whether in-service professional training provided for school leaders to discharge their responsibility to bring the intended result or not. With regard to this, 82(68%) teachers and 35(62.5%) school leaders disagreed whereas 33(27.5%) teachers and 18(32.2%) school leaders agreed. However, the result of the independent t-test overall mean score 2.65 shows that the groups unable to decide on this item while no significant difference was found between theopinions of teachers and school leaders since the p- value .056> 0.05 level of alpha. As the data indicated the in service training provided for the school principals in order to discharge the authorities to the lower subordinates were unsatisfactory, so it is possible to say that the training provided to the school principals could not achieve the intended objectives.

4.2.6. Strategies to Overcome Leadership Effectiveness Influencing Factors

Primary school leadership effectiveness was influenced by different factors such as school environment, behavior of teachers and students, school management styles, teaching learning environment, communication barriers between parents and teachers, and instructional achievement problems were some of them. To overcome the problems, designing strategies were important. Based on this, Hood (1999) mentioned community mobilization, capacity building of institution, in-service professional training, developing good governance and school selfevaluation as strategies to overcome school leadership effectiveness influencing factors. Moreover, MOE (2007d) described establishing guidelines rules, regulations and standards, continuous staff development and restructuring teachers' preparation as strategies to overcome leadership effectiveness influencing factors in primary school. Based on this, selected primary school teachers and school leaders were asked to show their responses as indicated in table 8 and discussed below that hereafter. In doing the analysis the following classification is used as suggested by Anbessa (2012).

Note: Scales; < 1.49 = Strongly Disagree, 1.5 -2.49 = Disagree, 2.5 -3.49 = Undecided,

3.5 - 4.49 =Agree, > 4.5 =Strongly Agree

Table 9: Responses on strategies to overcame leadership effectiveness influencing factors
Note: N=176 i.e. 120 teachers and 56 School Leaders

ns	Respondents	Responses										T-test	
		Strongly disagree		Disagree		Undecide		Agree		Strongly agree		Overall mean	P-Value
		F	%	F	%	F	%	f	%	f	%		
Effective learning materials developed and disseminated in each department in school	Teacher	19	15.8	72	60	3	2.5	15	12.5	11	9.2	2.37	.828
	S/Leaders	1	1.8	45	80.4	2	3.6	5	8.9	3	5.4		
	Total	20	11.4	117	66.5	5	2.8	20	11.4	14	8		
There are established guidelines for leaders to lead their work successfully	Teacher	40	33.3	52	43.3	4	3.3	15	12.5	9	7.5	2.1	.371
	S/Leaders	21	37.5	16	28.6	2	3.6	11	19.6	6	10.7		
	Total	61	34.7	68	38.6	6	3.4	26	14.8	15	8.5		
There is continuous staff development program for the improvement of classroom instruction	Teacher	38	31.7	57	47.5	2	1.7	17	14.2	6	5	1.82	.738
	S/Leaders	18	32.1	27	48.2	3	5.4	5	8.9	3	5.4		
	Total	56	31.8	84	47.7	5	2.8	22	12.5	9	5.1		
There is great mobilize of public concern and political support to make improvement on education quality.	Teacher	66	55	33	27.5	3	2.5	13	10.8	5	4.2	2.54	.632
	S/Leaders	39	69.6	1	1.8	3	5.4	7	12.5	6	10.7		
	Total	105	59.7	34	19.3	6	3.4	20	11.4	11	6.2		
School leaders mobilize the community's resources for overall education improvement	Teacher	3	2.5	95	79.2	1	0.8	17	14.2	4	3.3	2.54	.044
	S/Leaders	1	1.8	36	64.3	3	5.4	10	17.9	6	10.7		
	Total	4	2.3	131	74.4	4	2.3	27	15.3	10	5.7		
Information helps school leaders to participate stakeholders in school improvement	Teacher	26	21.7	78	65	3	2.5	9	7.5	4	3.3	2.31	.044
	S/Leaders	3	5.4	37	66.1	4	7.1	5	8.9	7	12.5		
	Total	29	16.5	115	65.3	7	4	14	8	11	6.2		
Information from evaluation of pupil performance used for school improvement	Teacher	9	7.5	74	61.7	12	10	14	11.7	11	9.2	2.57	.602
	S/Leaders	1	1.8	38	67.9	3	5.4	9	16.1	5	8.9		
	Total	10	5.7	112	63.6	15	8.5	23	13.1	16	9.1		
Pupils achievement used as a base for program evaluation for future improvement.	Teacher	45	37.5	53	44.2	4	3.3	14	11.7	4	3.3	2.05	.513
	S/Leaders	16	28.6	29	51.8	3	5.4	5	8.9	3	5.4		
	Total	61	34.7	82	46.6	7	4	19	10.8	7	4		

Note: p-value at a = 0.05, df = 174

As shown in item 1 of table 9, there was a need to know whether or not effective learning

materials developed and disseminated in each department in school. As to this, 91(75.8%) teachers and 46(82.14%) school leaders reported their disagreement, whereas 26(21.7%) teachers and 8(14.3%) school leaders agreed. The result of the independent t-test showed thatthere is no statistically significance difference between the responses of teachers and school leaders since the p-value .828 > 0.05 level of alpha with the overall mean score of 2.37 that shows disagreement of the respondents. Based on the data researcher tried to conclude that the effort that the school principals used to develop and disseminate the department head was satisfactory.

In their reaction to item 2 of table 9, i.e., whether there are established guidelines for leaders to lead their work successfully or not. 92 (76.67%) teachers and 37(66.07%) school leaders expressed their disagreement whereas 24(20.0%) teachers and 17(30.35%) school leaders disagreed. The result of the independent t-test showed thatthere is no statistically significance difference between the responses of teachers and school leaders since the p-value .371 > 0.05 level of alpha with the overall mean score of 2.10 that shows disagreement of the respondents. It can' thus, be concluded that there were no established guidelines for leaders to lead their work successfully. In connection to this,Hernes (2000) argued that,rules and regulations should be regarded as a means to high ends and structures and rules restrictive, which need to be negotiations, reinterpretation and change to become facilitating factors in the school, for example designing participative structure for teachers, parent's students and community.

Item 3 of table 9, relates to whether or not there was continuous staff development program for the improvement of classroom instruction. Accordingly, 95 (79.16%) teachers and 45(80.35%) school leaders reported their disagreement whereas 23(19.17%) teachers and 8(14.28%) school leaders showed their agreement. Using the t-test for independent sample, it was not found any statistically significant difference between teachers and leaders responses with an overall mean 1.82 disagreement and the p-value .738> 0.05 level. From this it is possible to conclude that the effort made to provide continuous staff development program for the improvement of classroom instruction were weak and unsatisfactory.

With item 4 of table 9, respondents were asked whether or not there was great mobilization of public concern and political support to make improvement on education quality. Accordingly, the majority 99(82.5%) of teachers and 40(71.42%) of school leaders confirmed their disagreement whereas 18(15.00%) teachers and 13(23.21%) school leaders showed their agreement. However, the p-values.632 > 0.05 significant level shows that there is no statistical significance difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents. This indicates that the school trend to

mobilize public support and get support political support from peoples holding position was poor and unsatisfactory.

With regard to item 5 in table 9, that is whether or not school leaders mobilize the community's resources for overall education improvement. 98(81.67%) teachers and 37 (66.07%) school leaders expressed their disagreement. On contrary, 21(17.50%) teachers and 16(28.57%) school leaders agreed. The p-values.044 > 0.05 significant level shows that there is no statistical significance difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents. Respondents believed that the extent to which School leaders mobilize the community's resources for overall education improvement was unsatisfactory. Based on this, thus, one can conclude that the effort of school leader made to obtain resources from the community in order to improve and provide quality education was poor.

Item 6 of table 9, indicates whether or not information helps school leaders to participate stakeholders in school improvement. To this end, 102(85.0%) teachers and 40(72.14%) school leaders asserted their disagreement. The result of the independent t-test showed thatthere is statistically significance difference since the p-value .044< 0.05 level of alpha with the overall mean score of 2.31 which shows disagreement of the respondents. Hence, according to both groups of respondent school leader's practice in ability of using information to participate stakeholders in school improvement was supposed to be poor. Thus, it is possible to conclude that school leaders attempt o to use information to participate stakeholders in school improvement were unsatisfactory.

In their response to item 7 of table 9, 83(69.16%) and 39(69.64%) teacher and school leaders respectively were not agreed information obtained from evaluation of pupil performance used for school improvement. As the data indicates the schools under investigation had poor trend and practices of using pupil's evaluation results for school improvement purpose. Thus it can be concluded that the school leaders could not give credit for evaluation result to improve learning. Pynes (2004) argued that, an excellent leadership competencies such as vision-establishes and based on tangible data, big picture prospective to more organization goal forward, customer focused-discovering and meeting the customer needs, result oriented-focuses efforts on attaining clear, concrete, timely and measurable outcomes of the importance to the organization and use sound judgment- collaboratively with others to create effective action plans based on appropriate information is necessary.

With regard to item 8 in table 9, that is whether or not school leaders used pupils' achievement as

a base for program evaluation for future improvement. 98(81.67%) teachers and 45 (80.35%) school leaders expressed their disagreement. On contrary, 18(15.00%) teachers and 8(14.28%) school leaders' agreed. Using the t-test for independent sample, it was not found any statistically significant difference between teachers and schools leaders responses with an overall mean 2.05 disagreement and the p-value .513 > 0.05 level.Respondents believed that the extent to which school leaders used pupils' achievement as a base for program evaluation for future improvement was unsatisfactory. Based on this, thus, one can conclude that the effort of school leader made to use Pupils achievement as a base for program evaluation for future improvement was poor.

Consolidated Responses from the Open ended Items of the Questionnaire

In the open ended items teachers and leaders were asked to show what factors are affecting school leadership effectiveness, and the following were raised repeatedlyalmost by fifty three respondents.

The leaders' response for the question that was asked to indicate the factors that they assume to affect the effectiveness of school leaders, they indicated the presence of the following factors.

^ Lack of adequate and continuous leadership training;

^ Complicated leadership roles and many administrative job descriptions and responsibilities than pedagogical;

^ Lack of adequate and continuous professional support from the Jimma town Education Office than conducting evaluation meeting.

^ Shortage of adequate facilities/material to provide quality education in a good environment;
^ Lack of autonomy and interference from some political leaders; and ^ Teachers' resistance to change and commitment to accept innovations that comes from the government and prepared by school principals or leaders to bring change.

The teachers'response for the question that was asked to indicate the factors that they assume to affect the effectiveness of school leaders, they indicated the presence of the following factors.

^ Lack skilled and qualified leaders;

^ Lack of confidence by leaders in their leadership position;

^ Less community participation in the school affaires;

^ Leaders workload and different responsibilities on administrative areas;

^ Lack of recognition for teachers' work;

^ In appropriate intimateness of school leaders with some teachers in the way it creates isolation and despair in other teachers, and ^ Lack of adequate instructional resource and facilities.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This chapter deals with the summary of major findings, conclusions drawn and recommendations forwarded on the basis of the findings and conclusions of the study.

5.1. Summary

The main purpose of this study was to explore the major factors that influence the effectiveness of primary school leadership inJimma towns. To this end the descriptive survey method was employed while the quantitative approach was used by supplementing with qualitative methods.

Data were collected from 120 sampled teachers and 56 school principals with 100% response rate for both groups. In order to get pertinent information, data were collected through questionnaire, interview and document analysis. The data collected through these instruments were analyzed by using frequency table, percentage and independent sample t-test with the main goal of addressing the following basic research questions:

1. What are the major factors that influence the effectiveness of the primary school leadership?

2. What are the remedial strategies used to overcome the problems of school leadership?

In light of the basic research questions, the major findings of this study are summarized as follows:

1. In the study, it was identified that lack of leaders' competence in terms of qualification and practical performance was identified as one major factor for school leaders' effectiveness.

2. The finding of the study revealed that the level of participants' awareness on leadership practice and school leadership duties and responsibilities was high although the awareness on the stakeholders involvement in school activities was very low as revealed by the majority 84 (70%) of teachers and 51(91.1%) of school leaders besides the overall mean score of the two groups 2.25 confirmed the same level (low level) of awareness on the stakeholders participation. Hence, this can be seen as on major factor that can affect the school leadership effectiveness. This is because without having good awareness on the stakeholders' participation, leaders can do little to be effective.

3. Concerning the school leadership effectiveness in achieving school objectives, findings

showed that there was a gap in explaining tasks and achievements for school community as revealed by the majority 64 (53.3%) of teachers and 33 (59%) of school leaders' disagreement on this item. The majority 84% and more than 76% of both groups showed their disagreement on the presence of effective planning forsuccessful school performance and motivating subordinates in carrying out the school objectives. The overall mean score 2.18 for the second item and 2.00 for the third item shows disagreement of the respondents. Moreover, the overall mean scores 4.20 and 3.75 shows the agreement of the respondentsthat students' achievement used as a base for instructional objective evaluation, and school instructional activities in achieving the intended objectives are affected by school leaders' complexity of tasks respectively.

4. Regarding the effectiveness of school leaders in improving students result, it was evident from the empirical data that the majority of teachers61(51.6) disagreed that all students achieve high standard because they got enough support from the school leaders while the majority of the leaders unable to decide on this item. Still respondents disagree with use of data analysis on students' result to informs next step for instructional improvement as revealed by 92(76.7%) of teachers and 50(89.3%) of school leaders. The overall mean scores 2.34, 2.14 and 2.37 showed respondents disagreement on the presence of deep understanding of students learning by leaders, organizing resources to support all learners to promote good performance and the engagement of teachers in sharing collective responsibilities for the improvement students result respectively. Hence, school leaders are not effectively achieving the goal of improving students result as expected of them.

5. With regard to the community participation for school leadership effectiveness, findings of the study disclosed the existence of problem in terms of creating strong home school relationships, appreciating parents and communities roles and involvement for the improvement of students result and good discipline as revealed by the overall mean scores 2.29, 2.38, 1.7 respectively with a verbal interpretation of disagreement. Moreover, the participation of the community in school decision making was very low as indicated by 84% of teachers 36(64.2%) school leaders response and the mean score 2.01 which shows the respondents disagreement on this item.

6. The finding of the study further identified that there is lack of employing different strategies to

overcome the various factors that were influencing the school leadership effectiveness. The majority of the respondents from both groups (more than 60% or with the overall mean scores of less than 2.5) revealed that there is deficiency to use various strategies such providing training to leaders to discharge their responsibility, disseminating effective learning materials to department, establishing guidelines for leaders to lead their work, continuous staff development program, mobilizing the community and using various information and students performance result for overall improvement.

5.2. Conclusion

On the bases of the findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Leaders lack adequate competence to lead their school effectively.

2. The finding of the study revealed that there is awareness problem on the school stakeholders' involvement in school activities, and it is identified as one of the major factors that were affecting school leaders' effectiveness since without such awareness leaders can do little in achieving the educational goals and the improvement of quality education in the primary schools of Jimma town.

3. The school leadership effectiveness is not satisfactory since it isimpeded with various factors like lack of defining tasks and achievements for school community, lack effective planning forsuccessful school improvement,inability tomotivate staff toachieve school objectives and school leaders' workload.Therefore, school leaders are not effective in achieving the school objectives through enhancing students' achievement in the primary schools.

4. The study result further revealed thatthe school leaders are less effective in improving students result through adequate support to students and teachers to achieve high standards; use of data analysis on students' result to informs next step for instructional improvement; deep understanding of students learning by leaders, organizing resources to support all learners to promote good performance and teachers collective responsibilities for the improvement of the students result. In all, leaders' performance in the improvement of students' result is not satisfactory.

5. In the findings of the study, less community participation in various aspects was identified as

one major factor that is affecting school leadership effectiveness. Therefore, school leaders lack to improvethe overall school functioning and students' performance.

6. The finding of the study showed that lack of employing different strategies to overcome the various factors itself was negatively influencing the school leadership effectiveness. This is because there is deficiency in arranging trainings to leaders, disseminating effective learning materials to department, using and establishing guidelines by leaders to manage their work, continuous staff development program, mobilizing the community and using various information and students' performance result.Thus, school leaders fail to discharge their responsibilities through employing the strategies to overcome the challenges and achieve the intended school goals.

5.3. Recommendations

In light of the major finding and conclusions, the following recommendations are forwarded:

1. Continuous training and support is needed from the Education Office and Regional Education Bureau to enhance the capacity of the leaders in discharging their responsibilities.

2. In order to create adequate awareness on the stakeholders' involvement in school activities, Jimma town education office and CRC supervisors are recommended to arrange awareness creating workshops and meetings to enhance leadership effectiveness in the school functioning. They also need to encourage and support school leaders to clearly define school vision and mission through the involvement of all stakeholders so that everyone can have better awareness and understanding on their role in achieving the educational goals and the improvement of quality education in the primary schools of Jimma town.

3. The school leadership effectiveness in achieving school objectives is unsatisfactory and entangled with various factors as indicated in the findings of the study. Therefore, Regional Education Bureau or Jimma town education office in joint with local education colleges or universities need to arrange training that enhance school leaders' skills and knowledge in achieving the school objectives by enhancing students' performance in the primary schools.Primary school leaders are also advised to define tasks and objectives of the school successfully and clearly for school communities and stakeholders.

4. In order toimprove students' result, the school leaders in combination with CRC supervisors need to provide planned and adequate support to students and teachers so that they can achieve high standards of performance. Teachers and students are also recommended to take collective responsibilities for the improvement of pupils result.

5. The findings of the study identified that less community participation as one major factor that is affecting school leadership effectiveness and expose school leaders not to improve the overall school functioning and students' performance as expected of them. Therefore, primary school leaders are also recommended to participate and initiate the community and all the stakeholders in decision making, planning, organizing and managing the school activities so that to increase school performance and leaders effectiveness.

6. In order to alleviate the various factors that can affect school leaders' effectiveness, the use of different strategies is vital and a must. Therefore, Jimma education office, CRC supervisors and school principals are advised to use various strategies like disseminating effective learning materials to department, using and establishing guidelines for leaders to manage their work, continuous staff development program need to be promoted, mobilizing the community and using various information and students' performance result are very significant to increase the effectiveness of the school leaders.

7. In order to minimize problems that arise from school leaders' competence and skills, Jimma town education office and decision makers are also expected to initiate and establish systems for technical support and capacity building through continuous professional development for school leaders. The provision of important guidelines and written policies has great values since they can support school leaders to be effective in discharging their responsibilities.

8. Conducting detail and further research on the area of school leaders' competence and their effectiveness in enhancing students' performance is part of the recommendations.

REFERENCES

AbiyZegeye, AlemayehuWorku, Daniel Jefera, MeleseGetu and YilmaSilashi (2009)..Introduction to research methods .Graduate studies and research office: AddisAbaba University.

Adam E. N., 2003. The impact of school based management instructors' professional consideration. School of education.The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. International Journal of educational management, volume 17.

Aghenta, J. A., 2006. Human Resource Development and Planning in Nigeria. Second Faculty of Education Distinguished Lecture series, University of Benin, Benin City.

Akpa, G. O., 1999. The teacher factors as a challenge to the success of UBE in Nigeria. A paper presented at the inter-University collaborative workshop on Teacher Education in Nigeria at the University of Jos.

AmareAdeme, 2006. Evaluation of the implementation of grade eight Social Studies syllabus in Illubabore Zone, in the case of Metu Town and MetuWoreda A.A.U. A.A. Unpublished M.A thesis.

Anderson, L.W., 1990. Fundamentals of educational research. The Flamer Press, London.

Baker, J., Rechards, S., Trevor, H., and Robyn, R. 2006. Professional Partnership Program: Participant Perceptions of Changing Roles in the Practicum, Deakin University, Australia.

BerhanuBekele, 2010. Factors Affecting Principals Effectiveness in Implementing School Improvement Program in Primary School of North Show Administrative Zone. AAU, Master Thesis.

Brady, L., 2000. Australian Journal of Teacher EducationVol. 25, no.1. 2000. Journal of Teacher Education, 50(2):106-107.

Bogaln, R. C.and S. K. Biklen, 1992. Qualitative Research for Education an Introduction to Theory and Methods.Boston, Allyn and Bacon.

Bush, T. and Bell, L., 2002.The principles and practices of educational management. Cromwell press, Wiltshire.

Cheng, Y. C. and Townsend, 2000. Educational Change and Development in the Asian Pacific Region: Challenges for the Future, Hong Kong University Press.

Cheng, Y. C., 1997. 'Multi models of quality in education; Quality Assurance in Education.Hong Kong University Press.

Cheng, Y. C., 2000a. 'Strategic leadership for educational transformation in the new millennium, Chulaongkorn Education Reviews, 6(2):15-32.

Cheng, Y.C., 2000b. 'ACMI- Triplization Paradigm for reforming education in the new millennium, International Journal of Educational Management, 14(4):156-74.

Cheng, Y. C., 2001c. A Paradigm shift in school leadership: the layer theory for transformational and strategic leadership; paper presented at International congress for school Effectiveness and school Improvement, 5-9 January, in Toronto, Canada.

Cohen, L. Manion. L. and Morison, K. 2002. A Guide To Teaching Practice (4th ed.) London and New York, Rutledge Flamer.

Cotter, R., 2000. 'Accountability in Education and beyond', Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the British Educational Management and Administration Society (BEMAS), Bristol.

Creed, C., Freeman, R., Robinson, B. & Woodley, A. (2004).Mixed research methods:

Prest Practitioner Research and Evaluation Skills Training in Open and

Distance Learning. Commonwealth of Learning (COL). Website (www.

col.org/prest

Creswel, J. W., 2003. Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Approaches (2nd). London: sage publication Inc.

Creswell, J. W. (2006). Research design, quantitative and mixed approaches (2nd Ed):London, Sage Publication Inc.

Crozier, G., 1998. 'Parents and Schools: Partnership of Surveillance?', Journal of Educational Policy, New York, Rutledge Flamer. 16(4):122-54.

Day, C., Harris, A., Hadfield, M., Tolley H. and Beresford, J., 20000. Leading Schools in Times of Change, Buckingham and New York, Rutledge Flamer: Open University press.

DagmawiWondem, 2010. The Contribution of School Principals for the Implementation of Continuous Professional Development Program in Secondary School of DebereMarkos Town. AAU, Master Thesis.

DeGrauwe, A., 2004. "Improving quality of reforming school management in Asia" IIEP

Newsletter, 22(4), pp. 5-6.

DeGRAUWE, A., 1999. Improving school efficiency : The Asian experience. An ANTRIP report.Paris:IIP/UNESCO.

DemozeDegefa, 2007. The Current Practices of Instructional Leadership in Enhancing the Quality of Education in Government Primary Schools of Addis Abeba. AAU, Master Thesis.

DestaKaweti, 2010. Practices and Problems of Principals, leadership and Teachers Performances of secondary schools in West Arsi Zone Oromia. AAU, Master Thesis.

Devies, L., 1997. 'The rise of the school effectiveness movement, in J. white and M. Barber (eds), Perspectives on school Improvement, London: University of London, Institute of Education.

DerebssaDufera, 2006. "Tension between Traditional and Modern Teaching-Learning Approaches in Ethiopian Primary Schools." Journal of International Cooperation in Education, vol.9, No.1, P123-140.A.A.
                                                                                 pd
Dubrin, 2001. Leadership, Research Findings, Practice, and skills, 3 eds, Houghton, Miffilin Company.

Duncan, W. J., 1995. Essentials of Management.Illionis: The Dryden press, New York.

Ebrahim Mohammed, 1997. Supervision and its current value for the Effectiveness of TeachingLearning process (unpublished senior Essay A.A.U).

Elliott, S. N., T. R. Kratoach Will, J. L Cook, and J, F. Travers., 2000. Educational
                                                                          rd
Psychology: effective Teaching Effective Learning 3 (ed).Mc G rows hill Campaniles, Inc, United State of America.

FesshaFentaye, 2008. An Assessment of Instructional Leadership Practices in the Secondary School the SNNPR. AAU, Master Thesis.

Feseha H/Selassie, 2005. Major Problems of Secondary Principals in Educational Leadership in Tigray Region. AAU, Master Thesis.

Frost, D., Durrant, J., Head, M., and Holden, G., 2000. Teacher led school Improvement, London: Rutledge /Flamer.

Fullan, M., 2002. The Meaning of Educational Change (3[rd]ed). New York: Teachers College

Press.

Fullan, M., 1996.,, Leadership for change; in K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. New York: Teachers College Press.

GelilaTesfaye, 2007. Factors Affecting the Participation of Women in Educational Management in Government Primary Schools of Addis Ababa.Unpublished Master thesis, AAU, Addis Ababa.

GetachewMitiku, 2007. An Assessment of Principal Instructional Leadership Effectiveness and Influencing Factors in TVET (Oromiya Zone). AAU, Master Thesis.

Grace, G., 1995. School Leadership: Beyond Educational Management: An Essay in Policy Scholarship, London: Falmer press.

Gronn, P. 2003. The New Educational Leaders: Changing Leadership Practice in an Era of School Reform. London: Paul Chapman Publishing

Gunter, H., 2001. Leaders and leadership in education: London Paul Chapman publishing.

HaileselassieWoldegerima and Girmaw Abeb,2008. The Ethiopian Constitution and its Implication of Education. A Training Module on Educational Leadership for secondary school principals and supervisors, A.A: MoE (unpublished).

Haile Abay, 2006. Practice and Problems of School Based Supervision in Selected Government Secondary School of Central Zone in Tigrai National Regional State.(un published M.A. Thesis).

Hall, V., 1999. 'Partnerships, alliances and competition defining the field', in J. Lumby and N. Foskett(eds), Managing External Relation in Schools and Colleges. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Harris, S. L., 2002. A View from the Classroom: Educational leadership, London, 59(8): 64-65.

Hernes, G., 2000. 'Editorial: head way for head teachers', IIEP Newsletters, Perris: International Institution for Educational planning.

Hitchcock, G. and Hughes D., 1995. Research and the teacher: a qualitative introduction to school based research (2nded). London and New York: Rutledge Flamer.

Hood, S., 1999. 'Home School Agreement: a True Partnership? School Leadership and Management: London: Rutledge

Hornby, G. 2000. Improving Parental Involvement: New York: Cassel.

Hugh, R., R. Ginnott and G.Curphy, 1999. Leadership-Enhance the lessons of experience, 3 ed, McGraw Hill, Inc.

Kagiso, 2000. The Skeleton House Project, New York: Guggenheim Museum

Kouzes, J. M., and Posner, B. Z. 2002.Leadership Challenges. (3rd ed.). Jossey Bass San Francisco.

Leithwood, K., 2001. School leadership in the context of accountability policies: International Journal of leadership in Education. London. PP 11, 23-45.

Levavicd, R., 1998. „Local Management of Schools in England: results after six Years', Journal of Educational Policy. London. May 13.

Livingston, G., 2001.The Practicum in Teacher Education: Its Nature and Nature of Teachers. A.A. MOE.

Lovell, J. T. and K. wiles, 1983. Supervision for Better Schools.5th Edition. New Jersey: Engle Wood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Matlas Baharu, 2007. Qualification and Managerial Practices of Secondary School principals in Awassa Town. AAU, Master Thesis.

McCombs, B. and J. Whisler, 1997. The Learner Centered classroom and Schools: strategies for Increasing Students' Motivation and Achievements. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Pub.

McGinn, N. and Welsh.T., 1999. Decentralization in Education: why, when, what and how?, Paris: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.

Millet, A., 1996. 'A head is more than a manager', Times Educational Supplement, 15 July.London: Rutledge.

MoE, 2007a. School Improvement Program: Frame work, Amharic Document. Addis Ababa, EMPDA.

MoE, 2007b.The Blue Print of School Improvement Program, Amharic Document. Addis Ababa, EMPDA.

MoE, 2007d. Hand Book on the Implementation of School Improvement, Amharic Document. Addis Ababa, EMPDM.

MoE, 2007e. School Improvement Program: Framework, Amharic document. Addis Ababa,

EMPDA.

MoE, 1995.Supervision Manual.Ethiopia; EMPEDA.

MoE, 1994. Education Training and Policy, Addis Ababa.

Mosley, 1996. Management Leadership in Action, 5[th]eds Harper Collins.

OECS, 2000. The Organization of the Eastern Caribbean States Education Reform Strategy. Castries: Education Reform Units.

Pardey, D., 2007. Introducing leadership, Elsevier, Dividino of Reed Elsevier Indian.

Polard, A., 2002. Reflective Teaching: Affective and Evidence Informed Professional practice: London and New York: Continuum. Pp.10, 28-29

Pounder, D., 1998. Restructuring schools for collaboration, Albany, Ny: University of New York Press.

Pynes, E. J., 2004. Human resource management for public and non-public organizations, 2[nd]eds, San Francisco,Jossey-Bass.

Quong, T. Walker, A., and Sott.K., 1998. Values-Based strategic planning: Dynamic Approach for Schools, Singapore: Prentice-Hall.

Rait, E., 1995. 'Against the current: organizational learning in school', in S.B. Bacharach and B. Mundell (eds), Images of schools: Structures Roles and organizational Behaviour, Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

RetaNegewo, 2008. A Study of practices and Problems of School Leadership in Secondary Schools of HorroGuduruWellega Zone (HGWZ). AAU, Master Thesis.

Riner, P. S., 2000. Successful Teaching in the Elementary Classroom. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Russell, R.F. 2001 'The Role of Values in Servant Leadership', Leadership and Organization Development Journal, Ankara: Pegema Publication 22(2): 76-83.

Savenlye, W. C. and Robinson. R. S., 1996. Quantitative Research Issues and Methods: An Introduction to Educational Technologies. In D.H. Jonasse (eds).Hand book of Research for Educational Communication and Technology. New York: Simon and Schuster Macmillan.

Saari, L. and Judge, T., 2004 'Employee Attitudes and Job Satisfaction', Human Resource Management,San Francisco: Jossy-Bass. 43(4): 395-407.

Sergiovan, T., 2000. The life of leadership: Creating culture, community and personal meaning in our schools. San Francisco: Jossy-Bass.

Sisman, M., 2004.Instructional Leadership. Ankara: Pegema Publication.

Snowden, P. and R. Gorton, 1998.School Leadership and Administration. 5th ed.. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc.

Sugimine, H., 1998. 'Primary Schooling in Japan', in J. Moyles and L. Hargreaves (eds).

The primary curriculum: Learning from International prospective, London: Rutledge.

TesfayeNegussie, 2010. The Role of Instructional Leadership in Building Organizational Climate of Secondary Schools of Bale Zone. AAU, Master Thesis.

TeshomeTefera, 2007. The Role of Principals, Teachers and parent Teachers Union in Maintaining School Discipline in Addis Abeba General Secondary Schools. AAU, Master Thesis.

Thornton, N., 2000. School leadership in a challenging time. Presentation made at the ANTRIEP Seminar, Shangahai, September 19, 2000.

USAID, 2008. Review of the Ethiopian Education Training Policy and its Implementation.Addis Ababa, Andante Printers.

Vancevich, J.M. and Matteson, M.T., 1999. Organizational Behaviour and Management: Boston, MA: Irwin McGraw-Hill.

Wellington, J., 1996. Methods and Issues in Educational Research; London: impact.

Wilcox, B., 2000. Making school inspection visits more effective: The English Experience. Paris: UNESCO. \International Institution for Educational Planning.

World Bank. (2007). What is school based management system? Washington, D.C., USA: The World Bank.

YalewEndawoke, 2004. "Teachers Beliefs, Knowledge and Practice of Learner Centered Approach in Schools of Ethiopia" The Ethiopia Journal of Education 24 (2), 17-42.

Yin, R., 2003.Case Study Research: Design and Methods (3rd ed). London: Sage Publisher.

Yukl,G.andFalbe, C.M., 1998. The importance of different power sources in down ward and lateral relations; Journal of applied psychology, 75, 132-40