



COLLEGE OF EDUCATIONAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

**LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN
IMPLEMENTING SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM IN SETO EDDO
GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL**

BY

SHUKARE BOBO

ADVISOR: TADESSE ABERA

MAY, 2016

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to express my heart-felt thanks to my advisor, Mr. Tadesse Abera for his unreserved, critical and constructive comments he gave me for the overall accomplishment of this research and for his excellent approaches. For sure, had it not been his sustainable encouragement, the research would have not been succeeded.

Secondly, my thoughtful thanks also go to all of my instructors who have been supporting and helping me to come up with success and Jimma University, as an institution for its financial support and overall services.

Last, but not least, I would like to express my thanks to sample primary school principals, teachers, external supervisor and PTA representatives of Seto Eddo primary school in Jimma Town for their willingness to give necessary information, through questionnaire, and interview to make the study successfully.

Table of Content

Acknowledgements.....	i
Table of Content	ii
List of tables.....	iv
Abbreviations and Acronyms	v
<i>Abstract</i>	vi
CHAPTER ONE	1
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	2
1.3. Objectives	4
1.4. Significance of the Study	5
1.5. Delimitations of the Study	5
1.6. Limitation of the study.....	6
1.7. Definitions of Key Terms	6
1.8. Organization of the Study	6
1.9. The Study Area Profile (Setting)	7
CHAPTER TW	8
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	8
2.1.The Concept of Leadership.....	8
2.2. Leadership Theories.....	9
2.3. Educational Leadership Models.....	9
2.3.1. Managerial Leadership.....	10
2.3.2. Transformational Leadership	10
2.3.3. Participative Leadership.....	11
2.3.4. Transactional Leadership	11
2.3.5. Postmodern Leadership.....	11
2.3.6. Moral Leadership	12
2.3.7. Instructional Leadership.....	12
2.3.8. Contingent Leadership.....	12
2.4. Leadership Functions	13

2.4.1.	Leadership Skills.....	14
2.4.2.	Leadership Styles	14
2.5.	Leadership in Education.....	15
2.6.	Leadership Effectiveness	15
2.7.	School Leadership and School Improvement Initiatives	16
2.8.	The Concept of School Improvement	16
2.9.	Definition of School Improvement Program.....	17
2.10.	Purpose of School Improvement Program	17
2.11.	The Domains of School Improvement Program	18
2.11.1.	Teaching and Learning Domain.....	18
2.11.2.	Safe and Healthy School Environment Domain	18
2.11.3.	School Leadership and Management Domain	19
2.11.4.	Community Involvement Domain.....	19
2.12.	Creating the Conditions for School Improvement	20
2.12.1.	Staff Development	21
2.12.2.	Involvement	21
2.12.3.	Leadership Practices	21
2.12.4.	Co-ordination	22
CHAPTER THREE		23
THE RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY.....		23
3.1	. Research Design.....	23
3.2.	Sources of Data	23
3.3.	Sample and Sampling Techniques	23
3.3.1.	Sample size and sampling techniques.....	24
3.4.	Data Gathering Tools	24
3.4.1.	Questionnaire	24
3.4.2.	Interview	25
3.5.	Methods of Data Analysis.....	25
CHAPTER FOUR.....		26
4.Presentations, Analysis and Interpretation of Data.....		26
4.1.	Backgrounds of Respondents.....	26

4.2.	Efforts Made By School Leaders in SIP Implementation Preparation Stage of SIP.....	28
4.3.	Teaching and Learning Domain.....	33
4.4.	Safe and Healthy School Environment Domain	38
4.5.	The School Leadership and Management Domain	40
4.6.	Community Participation domain	43
4.7.	Challenges Affecting School Leaders in Implementing SIP.....	46
CHAPTER FIVE		50
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS		50
5.1.	Summary.....	50
5.2.	Conclusion	54
5.3.	Recommendations	56
APPENDIX A		A

List of tables

Table 1.Characteristics of respondents	27
Table-2: Teachers responses on the preparation stages of SIP.	29
Table 3: Teachers responses towards the extent of teaching and learning process	34
Table 4: Teachers responses on safe and healthy school environment affairs	38
Table 5: Teachers responses on school leadership and management tasks	41
Table 6: Teachers response regarding community participation	44
Table 7: Teachers responses to challenges of school leaders	47

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

EDAD:	Educational Administration
ESDP:	Education Sector Development program
ETP:	Education and Training policy
GEQIP:	General Education Quality Improvement Program
ICT:	Information Communication Technology
MoE:	Ministry of Education PTA: Parent Teacher Association
SIP:	School improvement program
TDP:	Teachers Development Program

Abstract

The objective of this study was to assess the school leadership effectiveness in implementing school improvement programs in Seto Eddo primary school in Jimma Town. Among 17 government primary schools found in Jimma Town, Seto Eddo was taken as sample by using purposive sampling technique. From total population of 54 teachers, 26 (48.1%) teachers were selected by using simple random sampling technique. Additionally, 1 primary school external supervisor, 1 school principal and 2 vice principal were selected by census sampling techniques. Finally, 4 PTA representatives were included by using purposive sampling techniques. In this study descriptive survey design was used with both quantitative and qualitative methods. The instruments of data collection were taken questionnaires, and semi structured interview. The quantitative data were analyzed by using frequency, percentages, and mean. The data gathered was interviews were analyzed qualitatively through explanatory method for the purpose of triangulation. The major findings of the study are: low performance of primary school leaders in implementing school improvement program ,low performance in the preparation stage of SIP, Primary school leaders of Jimma Town did at an average level were 'teaching and learning' and 'safe and healthy school environment', primary school leaders was not adequately preparing themselves and other responsible stakeholders with important financial and material resources before implementation of SIP and these problems in turn affected the implementation of SIP in the primary school Seto Eddo .Regarding challenges: inadequate financial resources, inadequate man power in the schools, insufficient and inconsistent communication among leaders and the staff, low level of commitment of school leaders, low support from parents and community, lack of technical skills in school improvement program preparation, scarcity of frameworks and guidelines of SIP in school was some of the challenges of primary school leaders in implementing SIP. In general, as the finding of the study revealed that at Seto Eddo primary school leaders of Jimma Town were not effective in implementing some domains of school improvement program. Therefore, it is recommended that Woreda education Offices in collaboration with Zone Education Offices of Jimma Town would give sustainable technical assistance including training for school leaders and Woreda education offices in collaboration with school leaders need to enhance community participation. Finally, the Woreda education office is advised to promote and sustain the upgrading training system of primary school leaders to capacitate them with adequate technical and administrative skills.

CHAPTER ONE

1.1. Background of the Study

School Leadership can be understood as a process of influence based on clear values and beliefs and leading to a vision for the school. The vision is articulated by leaders who seek to gain the commitment of staff and stakeholders to the ideal of a better future for the school, its learners and stakeholders (Bush, 2007). A school system is one of the public institutions having its own specific goals and objectives to be achieved and such responsibility is delegated to school leaders. Supporting this idea Sergiovanni (cited in Temesgen, 2011) suggests that the success of a school to accomplish its goals depends largely on the ability of the leaders. Bush (2007) also suggests that the quality of leadership makes a significant difference in school and student outcomes. Moreover, in many parts of the world, including both developed and developing countries, there is recognition that schools require effective leaders and managers if they are to provide the best possible education for their learners.

Leadership effectiveness is believed to be crucial for the overall success of any organization. Accordingly, Oakland, (1993) asserts that effective leadership is an approach to improve the competitiveness, effectiveness and flexibility of the whole organization through planning, organizing and allowing participation of all members at the appropriate level. Effectiveness is defined in different ways. However, as to Drucker (cited in Temesgen, 2011), effectiveness perspective is concerned with whether the things are continuing to be appropriate, particularly in the context of rapidly and increasingly demanding external environment. Moreover, as to Kasambira (cited in Masuku, 2011), effectiveness is providing a decided, decisive, or desired effect and the extent to which an organization achieves the objectives for which it was established.

The prime function of leadership for authentic school improvement is to enhance the quality of teaching and learning. Effective leaders place an emphasis upon teaching and learning as well as building organizational capacity and have a moral obligation to see that students are well served and that teachers are supported in their efforts to improve the quality of learning (Hopkins, 2001). Successful school improvement involves building leadership capacity for change by

creating high levels of involvement and leadership skillfulness. The crucial point is that in order to build leadership capacity there needs to be a focus and continued emphasis on the leadership capabilities of all those within the school community: parents, pupils and teachers (Lambert and Harris, 2003).

School improvement is a strategy for educational change that focuses on the learning and achievement of students by enhancing classroom practice and adapting the management arrangements within the school to support the teaching and learning process (Hopkins cited in Wedling & Early, 2004). In addition to these, Miles *et al.* (cited in Harris, 2005) define school improvement as a systematic, sustained effort aimed at change in learning conditions and other related internal conditions in one or more schools with the ultimate aim of accomplishing educational goals more effectively.

The Ethiopian education system which lasted for a long period is now in a process of implementing the school Improvement Program (SIP) that gives emphasis for quality of education. The most promising objective of the 1994 ETP is increasing access to education and then to work with quality of education. Accordingly, MoE has developed a General Education Quality Improvement Program (GEQIP) which aims at improving quality of education at all levels of the school and this package has six components out of which SIP is one (MoE, 2008). The School Improvement Program (SIP) is one of the components of GEQIP and national programs developed by the Ministry of Education (MoE) in 2007 to improve student results in primary and secondary schools.

In realization of school improvement program school leaders have an indispensable role and responsibilities. Moreover, School leaders expected to lead the school in an appropriate manner so that all the activities and plan of the school goes harmoniously and successfully with goal achievement of the school. Therefore, to know the current status of the school improvement program, it was commendable to assess school leadership effectiveness in implementing SIP and to identify challenges of school principal in primary school of SetEddo in Jimma Town.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Effective leadership is an approach to improve the competitiveness, effectiveness and flexibility of the whole organization through planning, organizing and allowing participation of all

members at the appropriate level (Oakland, 1993). A school system is one of the public institutions having its own specific goals and objectives to be achieved and such task is given to school leaders. Therefore, effective leadership is at the core of every successful organization (Sergiovanni as cited in Temesgen, 2011). Moreover, effective leadership within the school is collegial, student-centered and teacher focused, promoting collective responsibility for improvement (MoE, 2010). In the success of school improvement teachers, parents, community and business partners, administrators, and students must share leadership functions. Similarly, the leadersrole must change from that of a top-down supervisor to a facilitator, instructional leader, coach, and strategic teacher (Senge as cited in Peterson, 1995). For school improvement to be effective commitment support and involvement of staff are the critical components in securing meaningful change and this will not occur unless efforts are made within the school to build the internal capacity and conditions that best foster and support school improvement (Harris, 2002).

In Ethiopia considerable educational achievements have been registered. For instance, access to education and attempt made to optimize equity are some of the achievements registered since the introduction of GEQUIP in 2007(MoE, 2010). However, beside all these achievements there are still many challenges entitled with the implementation of the school improvement program (SIP) which needs future cooperative and sustainable effort for its resolution. In line with this, MoE (2010) identified challenges such as limited capacity of management at sector and school level, limited SIP implementation capacity at both Woreda and school levels, unsustainable monitoring and evaluation system of SIP, less student achievement in relation with low quality were few of the many challenges identified. Therefore, even though the Ethiopian government attempted to give emphasis to promote and strength school leadership capacity in ESDP – I, ESDP – II and ESDP –IV still in many primary schools, school leaders are being assigned at the leadership position without having leadership qualification and with this capacity gap it may be difficult to have successes in the school improvement program and student achievement.

The Jimma town administration, as part of governmental structure, could not be free from such implementation problems. Hence, the implementation of SIP in the primary schools in the town faced several challenges. For instance, low student achievement (particularly primary schools), low community participation, lack of facilities in most schools lack of finance and limited

capacity of school leaders“ were some of the problems in the zone. Particularly, lack of school leadership capacity had been frequently discussed as it was the most prevailing problems that the student researcher experienced from different conferences, workshops and report presented at town, zonal and regional levels at different time in the past.

Thus, the existence of these problems seems to show that there might be problem of leadership effectiveness in implementing of SIP in the zone. Moreover, as the researcher understands, concerning the topic area (SIP), Frew (2010), Lamessa (2012), and Jemal (2013) are some who conducted researches in different regions and zones focusing on implementation of SIP, practices and challenges of SIP but not specifically on school leadership effectiveness in implementation of SIP. But, the researchers’ intention was to see school leadership effectiveness in SIP implementation as school leaders are more responsible and accountable either for the success or failure of the school.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to assess primary school leadership effectiveness in the implementation of the school improvement program in primary school of setoddoin Jimma Town. It was also intended to identify challenges that confront school leaders in the implementation of the school improvement program in SetoEddo primary school.

Accordingly, the study was designed to answer the following basic questions:

1. To what extent school leaders make adequate preparations for the implementation of SIP in Seto Eddo primary school?
2. To what extent the four SIP domains are effectively implemented by school leaders in Seto Eddo primary school?
3. What are the major challenges affecting the effectiveness of school leaders in the implementation of SIP in primary school of Seto Eddo of Jimma town?

1.3. Objectives

- 1.3.1.** The overall objective of this study was to assess the school leadership effectiveness in implementing School improvement program in Seto Eddo primary school in Jimma Town.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

1. To identify the extent to which school leaders make adequate preparations for the implementation of SIP in Seto Eddo primary school in Jimma Town
2. To assess the extent to which the four SIP domains are effectively implemented by school leaders in Seto Eddo primary school in Jimma Town
3. To identify the major challenges affecting school leaders effectiveness in implementing SIP in Seto Eddo primary school of Jimma Town

1.4. Significance of the Study

The school improvement program needs to be emphasized by the government, school leaders and educational experts as a whole. As far as SIP program is concerned, the role and contribution of school leaders are indispensable. For the effective implementation of SIP, school leadership effectiveness and active participation are decisive. So, the study aims at assessing the overall school leadership effectiveness in implementing SIP and finally to recommend possible solutions. Thus, the results of the study will have the following contributions: It may provide information about the status of leadership effectiveness in implementing SIP in Seto Eddo primary school to Jimma Town Education Office. The study may contribute to the future quality education improvement by initiating school leaders and other responsible parties in Jimma Town and it may help to initiate other researchers to conduct further study around the topic.

1.5. Delimitations of the Study

In order to make the study more manageable, it is delimited in concepts or issues, geography and time. Regarding the concepts, it is delimited to school leadership effectiveness in preparing and implementing the four SIP domains such as teaching & learning, safe and healthy school environment, school leadership and the community involvement. School leaders can encompass people occupying various roles and functions such as principals, assistant principals, leadership teams, school governing boards and school level staff involved in leadership tasks (Pont et al., 2008). In this study school leader refers to only principals and vice principals as they are the most responsible and accountable bodies for every management and administrative activities in the school. Geographically the scope of this study is also delimited to Oromia Regional state, Jimma Town, specifically one primary school (grade 1-8) school in the Jimma Town.

Concerning the time, the study is confined to school leadership effectiveness in the implementation of SIP during the 2015- 2016 academic year.

1.6. Limitation of the study

The following problem was believed to affect the reliability of the data .Due to time and resource constraint, the study was limited on some PTA members, teachers, principals and 1 supervisor. Some respondents may be give irrelevant response; this may affect its reliability. Therefore, the result of the study should be considered with this limitation.

1.7. Definitions of Key Terms

Effectiveness: A measure of the appropriateness of the goals chosen and the degree to which they are achieved. It is providing the right product for the right person or customer. It is doing the right things at reasonable cost (Drucker, cited in Temesgen, 2011).

Leadership: the behavior of an individual directing the activities of a group toward a shared vision (Hemphill & Coons, cited in yukl, 2008).

School Effectiveness: School is said to be effective if it is doing the right things in a right way and strives to achieve its objectives using its resources optimally, economically, efficiently and sufficiently (Ignathios as cited in Masuku, 2011)

School leaders: people occupying various roles and functions such as principals, assistant principals, leadership teams, school governing boards and school level staff involved in leadership tasks (Pont et al., 2008). But in this study it refers to only principal and vice principal.

SIP: School improvement is a distinct approach to educational changes that enhances students' outcomes as well as strengthens the schools capacity for managing improvement initiatives (Hopkins, 2005).

1.8. Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. The first chapter deals with background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance of the study, the delimitations, limitation and operational definition of terms. The second chapter presents a review of related

literatures. Chapter three presents research design and methodology including the sources of data, the study population, sample size and sampling technique, procedures of data collection, data gathering tools, methodology of data analysis and ethical consideration. Chapter four deals with, data presentation, data analysis and data interpretation. Chapter five presents summary of the findings, conclusion and recommendations.

1.9. The Study Area

Seto Eddo primary school is found in Oromo Regional state of Jimma Town. It was established 1998 E.C. The school was established on an area of 12500m². Students come to this school from two rural Kebles' Yebu Woreda of Jimma Town. This school has 54 teachers, two vice directors, one director and one supervisor. However, as primary school it does not fulfill the necessary facilities. The teaching and learning process and need more participation of the community to meet desired goals.

CHAPTER TWO

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. The Concept of Leadership

Leadership has diversified definitions and different authors also define leadership in different ways. For example Hemphill & Coons (cited in Yukl, 2008) define leadership as it is the behavior of an individual directing the activities of a group toward a shared vision.

Beare, Caldwell and Millikan (1989) also defined that leadership is viewed as a process that includes influencing the task objective and strategies of a group or organization; influencing people in the organization to implement the strategies and achieve the objectives, influencing group maintenance and identification, and influencing the culture of the organization.

Additionally, leadership can be defined as a complex social process, rooted in aspects of values, skills, knowledge as well as ways of thinking of both leaders and followers. Thus, it is all about the continuous process of establishing and maintaining a connection between who aspire to lead and those who are willing to follow (Hersey & Blanchard, 1984).

Despite varied definitions of leadership, a central working definition may help us to have a common understanding. Leithwood and Riehl (cited in Wossenu, 2006) noted that at the core of most definitions of leadership are two functions; these are providing direction and exercising influence. Moreover, leaders mobilize and work with others in order to achieve the common goals. To this end, leadership is an influence process in supporting others to work enthusiastically at the aim of shared goals or objectives. Leadership is a broader concept where authority to lead does not reside only in one person, but can be distributed among different people within and beyond the school. Therefore, school leadership can encompass people occupying various roles and functions such as principals, deputy and assistant principals, leadership teams, school governing boards and school level staff involved in leadership tasks (Pont et al., 2008)

As Bush and Glover (cited in Pont et al., 2008) depending on country contexts, the term school leadership is often used interchangeably with school management and school administration. But

Kotterin, Glover & Law (2000) argues that leadership and management functions can be separated out fairly clearly according to context: for him strategic development is a key function of leadership for change, while day-to-day problem solving is clearly a management function. He sees 'institutionalizing a leadership-centered culture' as essential because it motivates and empowers people. In relation to this, Bennis and Nanus's (as cited in Glover & Law, 2000) identified that a 'range of talents' is central to highly successful leadership, and this includes fostering a culture of trust, developing an openness to learning, encouraging and stimulating staff learning and communicating organizational aims/vision with clarity.

2.2. Leadership Theories

The essence of educational leadership has been the ability to understand the theories and concepts and then apply them in real life situations (Morrison, Rha& Hellman, cited in Tigistu, 2012). Siegrist (cited in Tigistu 2012) also hypothesized that people's understanding of leadership has changed rather dramatically as individuals recognize that what leaders do is determined in large part by the nature of those being led and culture of the organization in which they work. Various theories of leadership have emerged, with each theory, producing volumes of literature multitudes of both proponents and opponents. Since that time, a large portion of contemporary leadership has focused on the effects of transformational and transactional leadership (Antonakis, Avolio&Sivasubramaniam, cited in Tigistu 2012)

2.3. Educational Leadership Models

Leadership can be understood as a process of influence based on clear values and beliefs and leading to a „vision“ for the school. The vision is articulated by leaders who seek to gain the commitment of staff and stakeholders to the ideal of a better future for the school, its learners and stakeholders (Bush, 2007). Sergiovanni (cited in Bush, 2007) also suggested that much leadership theory and practice provide a limited view, dwelling excessively on some aspects of leadership to the virtual exclusion of others. Moreover, the western and African models collectively suggest that concepts of school leadership are complex and diverse. They provide clear normative frameworks by which leadership can be understood, but relatively weak

empirical support for these constructs and also artificial distinctions or ideal types, in those most successful leaders are likely to embody most or all of these approaches in their work

2.3.1. Managerial Leadership

Leithwood et al., (Cited in Bush, 2007) defines this model as the focus of leaders ought to be on functions, tasks, and behaviors and that if these functions are carried out competently the work of others in the organization will be facilitated. According to Bush, in the managerial leadership model, the Authority and influence are allocated to formal positions in proportion to the status of those positions in the organizational hierarchy. It is significant to note that this type of leadership does not include the concept of vision, which is central to most leadership models. Managerial leadership focuses on managing existing activities successfully rather than visioning a better future for the school. This approach is very suitable for school leaders working in centralized systems as it prioritizes the efficient implementation of external imperatives, notably those prescribed by higher levels within the bureaucratic hierarchy.

2.3.2. Transformational Leadership

This form of leadership assumes that the central focus of leadership ought to be the commitments and capacities of organizational members. Higher levels of personal commitment to organizational goals and greater capacities for accomplishing those goals are assumed to result in extra effort and greater productivity (Leithwood et al. cited in Bush 2007).

Leithwood (2007) also conceptualizes transformational leadership along eight dimensions: building school vision; establishing school goals; providing intellectual stimulation; offering individualized support; modeling best practices and important organizational values; demonstrating high performance expectations; creating a productive school culture; and developing structures to foster participation in school decisions.

The transformational model is comprehensive in that it provides a normative approach to school leadership, which focuses primarily on the process by which leaders seek to influence school outcomes rather than on the nature or direction of those outcomes. However, it may also be

criticized as being a vehicle for control over teachers and more likely to be accepted by the leader than the led (Chirichello, cited in Bush, 2007).

2.3.3. Participative Leadership

This model is underpinned by three assumptions: participation will increase school effectiveness; participation is justified by democratic principles; and in the context of site based management, leadership is potentially available to any legitimate stakeholder (Leithwood et al., cited in Bush, 2007). Sergiovanni (cited in Bush, 2007) also points to the importance of a participative approach. According to him, Participative leadership will succeed in bonding staff together and in easing the pressures on school principals. The burdens of leadership will be less if leadership functions and roles are shared and if the concept of leadership density were to emerge as a viable replacement for principal leadership.

2.3.4. Transactional Leadership

According to Miller and Miller's (cited in Bush, 2007) definition transactional leadership refers to:

An exchange process and exchange are an established political strategy for members of organizations. Principals possess authority arising from their positions as the formal leaders of their schools. However, the head requires the cooperation of educators to secure the effective management of the school. An exchange may secure benefits for both parties to the arrangement. The major limitation of such a process is that it does not engage staff beyond the immediate gains arising from the transaction. As the Miller and Miller's definition imply, transactional leadership does not produce long-term commitment to the values and vision being promoted by school leaders (p. 398).

2.3.5. Postmodern Leadership

The post-modern model suggests that leaders should respect, and give attention to, the diverse and individual perspectives of stakeholders. They should also avoid reliance on the hierarchy because this concept has little meaning in such a fluid organization. Starratt (cited in Bush,

2007) aligns post modernity with democracy and advocates a more consultative, participatory, inclusionary stance, an approach consistent with participative leadership.

2.3.6. Moral Leadership

This model assumes that the critical focus of leadership ought to be about the values, beliefs, and ethics of leaders themselves. Authority and influence are to be derived from defensible conceptions of what is right or good (Leithwood et al., cited in Bush, 2007)). Sergiovanni (cited in Bush, 2007)) articulated that excellent schools have central zones composed of values and beliefs that take on sacred or cultural characteristics. Subsequently, he adds that administering is a moral craft.

2.3.7. Instructional Leadership

Instructional leadership differs from the other models because it focuses on the direction of influence, rather than its nature and source (Bush, 2007). Southworth (cited in Bush, 2007) stated that instructional leadership is strongly concerned with teaching and learning, including the professional learning of teachers as well as student growth. Bush and Glover's (cited in Bush, 2007) definition stresses the direction of the influence process: Accordingly, Instructional leadership focuses on teaching and learning and on the behavior of teachers in working with students.

2.3.8. Contingent Leadership

The contingent model provides an alternative approach, recognizing the diverse nature of school contexts and the advantages of adapting leadership styles to the particular situation, rather than adopting a "one size fits all" stance. Accordingly, this approach assumes that:

What is important is how leaders respond to the unique organizational circumstances or problems... there are wide variations in the contexts of leadership and that, to be effective, these contexts require different leadership responses... individuals providing leadership, typically those in formal positions of authority, are capable of mastering a large range of leadership practices.

Their influence will depend, in large measure, on such mastery (Leithwood et al., cited in Bush, 2007).

According to (Morgan, cited in Bush, 2007), leadership requires effective diagnosis of problems, followed by adopting the most appropriate response to the issue or situation. This reflexive approach is particularly important in periods of turbulence when leaders need to be able to assess the situation carefully and react as appropriate rather than relying on a standard leadership style.

But, it is obvious that there is no monopoly of a particular style of leadership claiming to be the perfect one leading to improved school performances and student achievements. School principals are required to be more flexible in adapting appropriate leadership styles with the creation of collaborative working environments with higher-levels of commitment, motivation, ownership, development, trusting and healthier school cultures, facilitating higher productivity and increased student achievements (McComack, Adams & Gamage (2009).

2.4. Leadership Functions

Leadership functions are basic elements that could create development and change within a given institution. To keep in a better way, a leader maintains high morale among the members of the group being led by him. As Moshal (cited in Tigistu, 2012) stated the common function of leaders may be enumerated as: Motivating members Moral is boasting, Support function, Satisfying the needs of members, Accomplishing common goals, Representing members ,Creating confidence and Implementing change and resolving conflicts. Moreover, Moshal suggested that influence based on personal power is associated with greater effectiveness. Furthermore, the authors identified the following six important leadership functions such as Develop goals, policies, and direction; Organize the school and design programs to accomplish the goals, Monitor progress, solve problems, and maintain order; Procure, manage and allocate resources; Create a climate for the personal and professional growth and development; Represent the school to the district office and the outside world. Therefore, the above mentioned functions that facilitate effective school leadership have been used as a benchmark for evaluating effectiveness.

2.4.1. Leadership Skills

Leaders would be successful only when they are equipped with certain managerial skills in getting things done through people. Katz (cited in Wossenu, 2006) identified three kinds of skills as technical, human, and conceptual. Actually, an effective leader appears to rest on three personal and basic skills such as technical skills, human skills and conceptual skills. Technical skill refers to the proficiency and understanding of a specific kind of activity involving process, procedure or technique and this skill is primarily concerned with working with things. Human skills are the managers' ability to work with others and build a cooperative effort with the group he/she manage sand this skill is primarily concerned with working with people. Conceptual skills imply the ability to visualize the organization as a whole and this skill enables the leader to perceive and recognize the interrelationships of various factors operating within the total organization. The importance of the above mentioned skills may be appropriate at two levels of organizations. At the higher levels, the managers' effectiveness depends more upon conceptual and human skills. Technical and human skills are fit for the lower levels.

2.4.2. Leadership Styles

The development of institutions depends on the relationship between leaders and followers. There are different factors that have no impact on developing a choice in leadership styles and particularly on leadership between leaders and followers. Leadership, in a classic study that attempted to find out whether a different group behaviors result of different styles of leaders behavior that appeared to characterize three known styles: a) Authoritarian b) Democratic, and c) Laissez – faire styles. According to Lewn's in Sosik& Dinger experiment, the most effective style is democratic. However, excessive autocratic style led to the revolution while under Laissez – faire approach people were not coherent in their work and didn' t put energy that they did when being actively led. Moreover, effective leadership depends on the leaders' styles and the school level leaders should be experienced and trained in leadership to cope up with the necessary skills to utilize the appropriate styles (Sosik and Dinger (2007).

2.5. Leadership in Education

A school system is one of the public institutions having its own specific goals and objectives to be achieved. Such tasks are given to school leaders. Nowadays, the success of a school to accomplish its goals depends largely on the ability of the leaders. Here, principals are prominent figures to lead the school community for improvement. Educational researches on school effectiveness have recently been dominated by the concept of principals as leaders. As to Sergiovanni (cited in Temesgen, 2011) Principals' key functions in effective schools in establishing goal consensus among staff and developing an institutional identity. Therefore, it is a fact that a school principal leadership behavior has a subtle influence on the progress of the school.

2.6. Leadership Effectiveness

The clear 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 functions or tasks they carry out that require special skill from employees and abilities and skill required by the leader. On the other hand, leadership effectiveness is believed to be crucial for the overall success of any organizations. Oakland (1993) asserts that effective leadership is an approach to improve the competitiveness, effectiveness and flexibility of the whole organization through planning, organizing and allowing participation of all members at the appropriate level. Additionally, Macbeath (cited in Harris (2005) identified six core characteristics of effective leaders. These are: having a clear personal vision of what you want to achieve; working along with colleagues; respecting teachers' autonomy, protecting them from extraneous demands; anticipate change and prepare people for it; able to grasp the realities of the political and economic context and they are able to negotiate and compromise; informed by and communicate clear sets of personal and educational values which represent their moral purposes of the school.

2.7. School Leadership and School Improvement Initiatives

For the past decades, school leadership was believed as a single task of a school director or a person who was responsible for the activities of the school. Gradually, however, it took a comprehensive meaning. Focusing on a single persons decision becomes no more valid, rather it has become a broader and more inclusive of various stakeholders who have the concern for the benefit of their children are willing to take an active participation in schools yet hold the key position in school leadership. On the other hand, the issue of leadership for the improvement is an approach of the day on the research and policy agendas of many developing countries. In this regard, researchers and practitioners have a great deal to say about the significant role of school leadership in the process of school improvement program (SIP).

2.8. The Concept of School Improvement

The basic idea behind school improvement is that its dual emphasis on enhancing the school capacity for change as well as implementing specific reforms, both of which have their ultimate goal of increasing student achievement. Hence, school improvement is about strengthening schools' organizational capacity and implementing educational reform. Another major notion of school improvement is that, school improvement cannot be simply equated with educational change in general. Because many changes, whether external or internal, do not improve students' outcome as they simply imposed. They should rather focus on the importance of culture and organization of the school (Hopkins, 1994). In addition, school improvement is about raising student achievements through focusing on the teaching learning process and the conditions which support it. It is about strategies for improving schools capacity for providing quality of education. Moreover, the notion that school improvement is not an event or incident rather it is a process that takes time (Hopkins cited in Dalin, 1998). When we are talking about school improvement as a process, it is a continuous activity of fulfilling different inputs, upgrading school performance and bringing better learning outcomes at school level (MOE, 2005). This improvement is not a routine practice which can be performed in a day-to day activities in schools. Educational institutions have different settings and capacity in providing their services to the needy. In general, as it was explained by different scholars, the term improvement is

familiar to all and it simply means reforming, transforming or upgrading the quality of inputs, process, service or product.

2.9. Definition of School Improvement Program

There are many definitions and various interpretations of school improvement as a process. Miles et al., (cited in Harris, 2005) defined school improvement as a systematic, sustained effort aimed at one or more schools with the ultimate aim of accomplishing educational goals more effectively. They also suggested that, there are two senses in which the term school improvement is generally used. The first is a common sense meaning which relates to the general efforts to make schools better places for students to learn. The second definition is that in which school improvement is defined as a strategy for educational change that enhances student outcomes as well as strengthening the schools capacity for managing change. This definition highlights the importance of school improvement as a process of changing school culture and it views the school as the center of change and teachers as an intrinsic part of the change process. As elaborated by van Velzenet al., (cited in Walten&Blankford, 2005), the central definition of school improvement is that of a systematic, sustained effort aimed at change in learning conditions and other related internal conditions in one or more schools, with the aim of accomplishing educational goals more effectively.

2.10. Purpose of School Improvement Program

According to Hussein and Post let white (cited in Firew, 2010), the purpose of most school improvement policies is improving the educational process that includes instruction or subject matter. It helps schools to improve their organizational functioning that are indirectly linked to students' achievement, such as school climate, staffing and school organization. Besides, SIP encourages schools to conduct self-enquiry regarding the strengths and weakness of their performance. Moreover SIP helps schools to get a collaborative effort of several stakeholders at different levels of the education system, as the success of an improved policy largely requires the interaction between many participants

2.11. The Domains of School Improvement Program

According to MOE (2007) school improvement program is developed based on the result of the review of the best practices of the schools all over the country. Accordingly, The SIP has four domains in which every domain links to each other and aims at improving students' learning outcomes.

2.11.1. Teaching and Learning Domain

Quality of teaching is at the heart of successful schooling (Sammons et al., in Harris, 2005). In successful schools, teachers are well organized and lessons are planned in advance, are well structured and have clear objectives which are communicated to the students and successful teachers are sensitive to differences in the learning style of the student and adapt their teaching style accordingly. According to Leu (2005), the characteristics of good teachers are: sufficient knowledge of subject matter to teach with confidence knowledge and skills in a range of appropriate and varied teaching methodologies, knowledge of the language of instruction, ability to reflect on teaching practice and children's responses, ability to modify teaching/learning approaches as a result of reflection, ability to create and sustain an effective learning environment, understanding of the curriculum and its purposes, particularly when reform programs and new paradigms of teaching and learning are introduced, general professionalism, good morale, and dedication to the goals of teaching ability to communicate effectively, ability to communicate enthusiasm for learning to students, interest in students as individuals, sense of caring and responsibility for helping them learn and become good people, and a sense of compassion, good character, sense of ethics, and personal discipline, and ability to work with others and to build good relationships within the school and community.

2.11.2. Safe and Healthy School Environment Domain

As indicated in Estyn (2001), healthy school environment for teaching and learning reflect confidence, trust and mutual respect for cooperation between staff, students, government, parents and wider community is essential for purposeful effort and achievement. Best school leaders encourage good working relationships and overcome the worst effects of contrasting on

developing positive environment, high achievement and progress. Effective schools share a set of characteristics that add up to an environment that raises student achievement. By setting goals to improve a schools environment, principals, teachers, school councils, parents, and other community members can make their schools more effective places in which to learn. Effective schools share the following characteristics. These are: a clear and focused vision; a safe and orderly environment; a climate of high expectations for student success; a focus on high levels of student achievement that emphasizes activities related to learning; a principal who provides instructional leadership; frequent monitoring of student Progress; and strong home school relations (EIC, 2000).

2.11.3. School Leadership and Management Domain

According to Harris and Muijis (2005), Leadership can be defined as providing vision, direction and support towards different and preferred state-suggesting changes. School leadership has become a priority in education policy because it believe to play a key role in improving classroom practice, school policies and the relations between individual schools and the outside world. As the key intermediary between the classrooms, the individual school and the whole education system, effective school leadership is essential to improve the efficiency and equity of schooling (Pont et al., 2008).

The school leadership and management domain are concerned with communicating a clear vision for a school and establishing effective management structures. The structures and processes exist to support shared leadership in which everyone has collective responsibility for student learning and School polices, regulations and procedures are effectively communicated and followed. In addition to this, the school decision-making and administrative processes (including data collection and analysis, and communicating with parents) are carried out effectively MoE (2010).

2.11.4. Community Involvement Domain

There are always interaction and interdependence wherever society exists. The major roles that community could perform in the development of education is effective participation in school construction and encouraging parents to send their children to school and motivate children to stay in school. However, some parents are indifferent about their children' s progress and

failure in school work and throw away their responsibilities on school. On the other hand, schools are in no way meant to control the pupils out of school activities. It is the parents who should follow up their children were about and what they do. In this regard, Assefa (1991) has noted that a school is not an island speared from the rest of the community that it serves. When the participation of community members in the school program is active, the objective of school will be much more facilitated. If school community interaction operates as a continuation and strengthening of the formal education program, the success of projects will be supplemented by the knowledge acquired in the formal academic program.

Communities and PTAs are playing important roles in all aspects of education from raising resources to managing schools. Resources are mobilized for building classrooms and schools. PTAs and community members are active in advising on the benefits of education and in encouraging parents to send their children to school so as to increase access and reduce dropout. Financial resources are raised and used to purchase basic equipment and materials, to hire and even to pay contract teachers. PTA involved in school management, preparing annual plans, follow-up disciplinary cases. Hence, communities are funding new school buildings, building teachers' houses, running non-formal education initiatives, and encouraging girls to go to school and be retained in school until they complete a given education level. However, PTAs and communities still need further capacity enhancement in carrying out quality support to help schools to function as desired (MoE, 2005).

2.12. Creating the Conditions for School Improvement

Hopkins, (2001), identified six internal conditions and suggested the importance of enhancing internal conditions of the school. According to his suggestion:

It is classroom practice that has the most direct impact on student learning. If the enhancement of student achievement and learning is to be taken seriously, however, then work on the internal conditions of the school has to complement the focus on teaching and learning. Authentic school improvement is best achieved when a clear and practical focus for development is linked to simultaneously work on the internal conditions within the school. Conditions are the internal features of the school, the 'arrangements' that enable it to get work done. Without an equal focus on conditions, even initiatives that directly address classroom practice quickly become

marginalized. Authentic school improvement designs emphasize the importance of enhancing the internal conditions of the school while undertaking innovations in curriculum and instruction in the pursuit of enhanced levels of student achievement (p. 93).

2.12.1. Staff Development

A systematic and integrated approach to staff development, that focuses on the professional learning of teachers and establishes the classroom as an important center for teacher development is central to authentic school improvement. Staff development is the central strategy for supporting teachers as they engage in improvement activities. Attention to teacher learning has direct spin-offs in terms of pupil learning.

2.12.2. Involvement

In the literature on effective schools, there is strong evidence that success is associated with a sense of identification and involvement that extends beyond the teaching staff. This involves the pupils, parents and, indeed, other members of the local community. It does seem that those schools that are able to create positive relationships with their wider community can create a supportive climate for learning. Referring to a series of studies carried out in Wales & Reynolds (cited in Hopkins, 2001) refers to the existence of what he calls an „„incorporative approach““ which incorporates two major elements: incorporation of pupils into the organization of the school, and incorporation of their parents through supportive roles.

2.12.3. Leadership Practices

Studies of school effectiveness affirm that leadership is a key element in determining school success (Mortimore, cited in Hopkins, 2001). Recently, studies of leadership in schools have moved away from the identification of this function exclusively with the head teacher, and begun to address how leadership can be made available throughout the management structure and at all levels in the school community (Gronn, cited in Hopkins, 2001). This shift in emphasis has been accompanied by a shift in thinking about leadership itself. Hence, there is an increasing call for „transformational“ approaches which distribute and empower, rather than „transactional“

approaches which sustain traditional, and broadly bureaucratic, concepts of hierarchy and control.

2.12.4. Co-ordination

The schools capacity to coordinate the action of teachers behind agreed policies or goals is therefore an important factor in promoting change. At the core of such strategies are communication systems and procedures, and the ways in which groups can be created and sustained to co-ordinate improved effort across a range of levels or departments. Of particular importance are specific strategies for ensuring that all staff is kept informed about developments priorities and activities, as this is information vital to informed self-direction. Communication is vital to overall school co-ordination. In order for a school to organize itself to accomplish its goals, maintain it in good working order and, at the same time, adapt to changing circumstances and sound procedures are essential for communication. Meetings must be scheduled, reports from task groups distributed, departmental meetings organized, and summaries of various activities written and sent round to all staff (Hopkins, 2001:100).

CHAPTER THREE

THE RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 . Research Design

Research designs are plans and procedures for research that span the decisions from broad assumptions to detailed methods of data collection and analysis (Creswell, 2009). In this study a descriptive survey was employed with the intention to get the general picture of the current status of school leaders' effectiveness in implementing SIP in Seto Eddo primary school in Jimma Town. In supporting this idea, Abiy et al., (2009) suggested that descriptive survey is used to gather data at a particular point in time with the intention of describing the nature of existing conditions or identifying standards against which existing conditions can be compared or determining the relationships that exist between specific events. Moreover, the descriptive survey is more effective in assessing the current practices in its natural setting.

3.2. Sources of Data

To accomplish the study primary sources were used. The primary sources include questionnaire and interview. The data gathered from 3 school principals, 26 teachers, 4 PTA members, 1 supervisor.

3.3. Sample and Sampling Techniques

There are 17 primary schools in Jimma Town government administration. However, from these, Seto Eddo primary school is selected purposively to secure maximum efficiency with relatively short period of time. In this school total population is 62 (3 school principals, 54 teachers, 7 PTA members, 1 cluster supervisor).

Therefore, 1 supervisor, 3 school principals and 26 teacher's and 4 PTA respondents were selected using simple random sampling technique followed by: census (supervisor and principals) and lottery method techniques for 26 teachers and 4 PTA members. Thus, 34 respondents were participated in the study.

3.3.1. Sample size and sampling techniques

School	Teachers			director			Vice directors			External supervisor			PTA		
	population	Sample	%	population	Sample	%	population	Sample	%	population	Sample	%	Representative	Sample	%
Seto-eddo	54	26	48	1	1	100	2	2	100	1	1	100	7	4	57

3.4. Data Gathering Tools

3.4.1. Questionnaire

A questionnaire with items was collected quantitative and qualitative data from selected teachers. This is because the questionnaire is convenient to conduct surveys and to acquire the necessary information from a large number of study subjects in a short period of time. Furthermore, it makes possible an economy of time and expense and also provides a high proportion of usable response (Best & Kahn, 2003). The questionnaire will be prepared in English language, because all of the sample teachers could have the necessary skills to read and understand the concepts in the questionnaire,

The questionnaires have two parts. The first part of the questionnaire described the respondents' background information, which would include: Sex, age, experience, Position and name of the school. The second part incorporated closed items. The closed ended items are prepared by using Likert scales and the value of the scale is between one and five.

3.4.2. Interview

Semi-structured interview was used to gather in-depth qualitative data from director, vice director, external supervisor and PTA representatives. Employing semi-structured interview is quite important, because interview has great potential to release more in-depth information, provide opportunity to observe non-verbal behavior of respondents; gives opportunities for clearing up misunderstandings, as well as it will be adjusted to meet many diverse situations (Abiyi et al., 2009). The interview questions were translated in to the local language (Afan Oromo) for PTA representatives to minimize communication barriers.

3.5. Methods of Data Analysis

For this study, both quantitative and qualitative methods of data analysis were employed. Thus, the data obtained through questionnaire was analyzed by using percentage, and mean is followed by discussion of the most important points. The data gathered through open ended questions and interview was analyzed qualitatively through descriptive explanatory for the purpose of triangulation.

Quantitative Data: - With regard to the quantitative data, responses were categorized and frequencies were tallied. A percentage and frequency count is used to analyze the characteristics of the population as they help to determine the relative standing of the respondents. The items in the questionnaires were presented in tables according to their conceptual similarities. The scores of each items organized, statistically was compiled from the respondents. Likert Scale was employed to identify to what extent the respondents high or low. **Qualitative Data:** - The data that was collected from interviews were analyzed and interpreted qualitatively. Finally, the overall course of the study is summarized with findings, conclusions, and some possible recommendations.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. PRESENTATIONS, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The purpose of this research was to assess the school leaders' effectiveness in implementing School improvement program in Seto Eddo government primary school in Jimma Town of the Oromia Regional State. To this end, a total of 26 questionnaires were distributed to 26 teachers. The returned questionnaires were also 26 (100%). Moreover, 3 school directors, 1 external supervisor and 4 PTA representatives were interviewed.

4.1. Backgrounds of Respondents

Overall, the chapter comprises of two major parts. The first part presents the characteristics of respondents in terms of sex, age, academic qualifications and service year. The second part deals with the results of findings from the data which were gathered through the questionnaire, and interview.

Table 1.Characteristics of respondents

Item s	Characteristics	Teachers		director		vice directors		External Supervisor		PTA	
Sex	Male	10	38.5%		-		-	1	%	3	75%
	Female	16	61.5%	1	100%	2	100%	-		1	25
	Total	26	100	1	100%	2	100	1		4	100
Age	20-30	8	30.7								
	31-40	14	53.8			1	50			-	
	41-50	4	15.3	1	100	1	-	1	100	2	50
	Above 50	-	-			1	50			2	50
	Total	34	100	1	100	2	100	1	100	4	100
Qualification	Under Certificate	-	-								
	Certificate	6	23								
	Diploma	8	30.7							2	50
	1 st degree	12	46.3	1	100	2	100	1	100	2	50
	2 nd degree	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	26	100	1	100	2	100	1	100	4	100
Service years	1-4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	5-8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	9-12	4	15.5	-	-						
	13-16	6	23	-	-					2	50
	Above 16	16	61.5	1	100	2	100	1	100	2	50
	Total	26	100	1	100	2	100	1	100		100

The characteristics of the respondents in terms of sex revealed that 16(61.5%) and 10 (38.5%) teachers were females and males respectively. From this, one could understand that, the number of females in the in this primary school is much higher compared to males. Similarly, the interviewee participant1 (100%) CRC supervisor and 3 (75%) A PTA representative of primary school was males. Regarding principals and vice principals 3(100%) were females. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that; females were above represented in the primary school leadership position in the Seto Eddo primary school in Jimma Town. Hence, there is a need to encourage males to the position of leadership to keep gender equity.

As Table 1, item 2 above showed, 8 (30.7%), 14 (53.8%), and 4 (15.3%) of teachers’ age fall in the range of 20-30 years ,31-40 years, , 41-50 years respectively. This showed that the majority of teachers in this primary school of the sample schoolwas in20-30 years age and younger. Therefore, being in these age categories might help the teachers to work actively and facilitate

the teaching learning process. Similarly, 2 (75%), and 1 (25%) of principal and vice principals age and 1 (100%) of supervisory fall in the range of 31-40 years and 41- 50 years. Hence, this might indicate that at this age level, they might have sufficient experience to play the leadership role.

Table 1 item 3 above also depicted qualification of respondents. Accordingly, 12 (46.3%) and 8 (30.7%) of teachers have 1st degree and diploma respectively. But there were no teachers having a 2nd degree in the sample of this school. One of the important indicators of quality of education is the number of qualified teachers. According to the education and training policy, the minimum qualification requirement for teachers at primary school (5- 8) is that teachers should have obtained a diploma and first degree in the subject they are assigned to teach (MoE, 1994). Also, as depicted in the table 1 above, 1 (75%) and 2 (25%) of principal, 100% of vice principals and 1 (100 %) of CRC supervisor had 1st degree respectively. From these facts, it is possible to deduce that the majority of primary school principal and CRC supervisor in primary school of Seto Eddo of Jimma Town not lacked the appropriate qualification (first degree) required for the position they currently assigned .

Therefore, it could be not difficult for primary school leaders to regulate and monitor quality education with having appropriate qualification. Regarding qualification of PTAs, the majority 4 (50%) of the PTA representatives had diploma and 2 (50%) of the PTA representatives had first degree respectively. This less qualification PTAs might have a positive impact on the school activities because as the qualification increase awareness of education might also increase.

4.2.Efforts Made By School Leaders in SIP Implementation Preparation Stage of SIP

Teachers were asked to rate the extent to which efforts made by school leaders in the preparation of SIP Implementation. For the respondents' questionnaire which had five rating-scales were dispatched. The result was summarized in the following table.

Table-2: Teachers responses on the preparation stages of SIP.

No	Items	Very Low		Low		Mode rate		High		Very High		Total		mean
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
1.1	The extent to which school leaders make self-assessment with stakeholders before the planning of School improvement program.	6	16.7	19	54.5	4	11.5	3	10.9	2	6.4	34	100	2.35
1.2	The extent to which school leaders identify priority areas before the planning school improvement program.	6	15.4	20	59.6	3	9	3	9	2	7	34	100	2.32
1.3	To what extent school leaders“ work with the school improvement committee during the preparation of the school improvement plan?	7	19.2	17	50	5	14.1	3	10.3	2	6.4	34	100	2.34
1.4	To what extent school leaders get support from different stakeholders?	8	20.5	19	54.5	3	10.9	2	7	2	7	34	100	2.32
1.5	The extent to which school leaders are able to give clear orientation on the regulations of the school.	6	15.4	5	14.1	19	55.1	2	7	2	8.3	34	100	2.69
1.6	To what extent school leaders are performing well in arranging adequate resources needed for school improvement?	5	14.7	6	17.9	16	46.2	4	11.5	3	9.6	34	100	2.63
1.7	To what extent school leaders are capable in setting directions towards achieving the expected educational goals?	6	15.4	5	14.1	15	44.2	5	13.5	4	12.8	34	100	2.86
1.8	The extent to which school leaders are capable of providing clear vision in order to have a common understanding.	4	12.2	20	59.6	6	17.9	2	5.8	2	4.5	34	100	2.33
1.9	The extent to which school leaders encourage stakeholders to prepare the collaborative plan	7	18.6	18	52.6	4	11.5	3	9	2	8.3	34	100	2.38
1.10	To what extent school leaders get technical support from higher administrative bodies such as woreda education office?	6	17.9	19	53.8	3	9.6	3	9	3	9.6	34	100	3.39
Overall mean													2.77	

Scale: ≤ 1.49 - very low level of performance, 1.50-2.49 -low level of Performance, 2.50-3.49– moderate level of performance, 3.50-4.49 – high level of performance and ≥ 4.50 – very high level of performance.

With regard to item 1 of Table 2, teachers were asked to reflect their agreement on the extent to which school leaders made self-assessment with stakeholders before planning School improvement program. Accordingly, the majority 25 (71.2%) of teachers revealed that the extent of self-assessment made with stakeholders was at low level and the rest 5 (17.3%) and 4(11.5%) of teachers agreed that school leaders made self-assessment with stakeholders at high and moderate level respectively. The interview with external supervisors and PTAs also showed that there is low participation of stakeholders. By Supporting this idea one school external supervisor informed that: “school principals were trying to invite parents and the community to schools, but most of them were not willing to come to the school”. The reason why parents and community, not willing to come to school is not only because of the principal makes less effort. Principal in collaboration with external supervisor are mostly trying to invite parents and the community to school specifically by writing legal letters for each individual, but the majority do not respond to the call except few of them. The result of document analysis also indicated that there were no specified documents showing self-assessment of stakeholders done before panning SIP in most primary school of the sample schools. Regarding this idea, literature revealed that school plan must be democratically oriented and should involve everyone concerned: teachers, students, parents, and community and effective plans are those that require participation of all stakeholders (Coombs as cited in Tigistu, 2012). Therefore, the result indicated that primary school leaders of Setoeddo was not undergoing self -assessment with stakeholders as expected and this might lead the schools to difficulties in identifying their strength and weakness and they may also be unable to identify priorities of their school.

As depicted in item 2 of Table 2 above, the majority 26 (75%) of the teachers were agreed that school leaders identify priority at low level and the rest 5 (16%) and 3 (9%) of teachers supported that school leaders identify priority at high and moderate level respectively. Supporting this idea, Hopkins et al., (in Harris 2005) explained that competing priorities are some of the factors that prevent school improvement from occurring. Therefore, the result indicated that the emphasis that school leaders of primary school of SetoEddo gave to prioritize

activities before planning was not satisfactory and this might affect the preparation of real and applicable SIP plan of the school

As revealed in Table 2, item 3 above, the majority 24 (69.2%) of teachers agreed that school leaders“ work with the school improvement committee during planning at low level and the rest 5 (16.7%) and 5 (14.1%) of teachers agreed that school leaders“ work with the school improvement committee at high and moderate level respectively. The result of interviews from 1 principal, 2 vice principals and 1 external supervisor of sample schools revealed that participation of school improvement committee in planning SIP was almost none. Regarding this idea, literature revealed that the school improvement committee is responsible and should be participating in self-assessment, planning, implementing and monitoring of SIP (MoE 2010). Therefore, from the result, it is possible to conclude that school leaders were not efficiently working with the school improvement committee in planning SIP. But, the plan which is prepared by only school leaders may confront a lot of challenges when put into practice.

As depicted in Table 2 item 4 above, the majority 27 (75%) of teachers revealed that school leaders were active in acquiring support from different stakeholders at low level and the rest 4 (14.1%) and 3 (10.9%) of teachers revealed that school leaders“ activity in acquiring support from different stakeholders were at high and moderate level respectively. The weighted mean (2.32) also showed low performance level.

As indicated in Table 2 item 5 above, the majority 19 (55.1%) of teachers agreed that school leaders were able to give clear orientation at a moderate level and the rest 11 (29.5%) and 4 (15.4%) of teachers believed that school leaders were able to give clear orientation at low and at high level respectively. Regarding this idea, literature revealed that parents and communities should always informed about what is happening in the school and they cannot provide the necessary support for learning without a good understanding of what the school actually does (MoE, 2006).Therefore, it is possible to conclude that school leaders of primary school of Seto Eddo was giving clear orientation at average level, but this might not be enough because unless stakeholders clearly oriented and aware of what is going in school, they might not fully involve in different activities going in the school particularly in a school improvement program

As shown in Table 2 item 6 above, the majority 16 (46.1%) of teachers agreed that school leaders were performing well in arranging adequate resources needed for school improvement at a moderate level and the rest 11 (32.7%) and 7 (21.2%) of teachers agreed that in regard of arranging adequate resources, school leaders did at low and high level respectively. The result from open ended question and interview also indicated that there was a few increment in financial resources in the primary school. Supporting this idea one school principal informed that: “Currently, there is an increment of the school budget than the previous few years because of the increment of school grant per each student. One school external supervisor also explained that: “even though problems are still remaining with block grant budgets of the school, currently there is a slight increase in financial resource due to an increment in school grant better than the previous few years”. Regarding resource, literature revealed that school improvement planning can only lead to genuine and profound change if schools have at least a minimum level of resources to work with and without such resources, the school improvement program could become de-motivating (MoE, 2010).

According to the data in Table 2 item 7 above, the majority 15 (44.2%) of teachers believed that school leaders were capable in setting directions towards achieving the expected educational goals at moderate level. Whereas 11 (29.5%) and 8(26.3%) of teachers believed that school leaders’ performance in this aspect was at low and high level respectively. Supporting this idea, Sergiovanni (cited in Temesgen, 2011) explained that a school system is one of the public institutions having its own specific goals and objectives to be achieved. Such tasks are given to school leaders and nowadays, the success of a school to accomplish its goals depends largely on the ability of the leaders.

As showed in Table 2 item 8 above, the majority 24 (71.8%) of teachers revealed that school leaders were capable of providing clear vision at low level while the rest 4 (10.3%) and 6 (17.9%) of teachers believed that school leaders provide clear vision at high and moderate level respectively. Supporting this idea, Cheng (2005) explained that an effective leader is highly expected to have ability to create and communicate his/ her organizational vision and the success of any organization depends on having a clear vision which is accepted by the staff and other stakeholders. Chance (cited in Tigistu, 2012) also described vision as being the force of the

dream towards which effective administrators strive in the development and shaping of their schools.

As shown in table 2 item 9 above, the majority 25 (71.2%) of teachers agreed that school leaders encourage stakeholders to prepare a collaborative plan at low level and the rest 5(17.3%) and 4(11.5%) of teachers revealed that school leaders encourage stakeholders to prepare a collaborative plan at high and moderate level respectively. Regarding this idea, literature revealed that school plan must be democratically oriented and should involve everyone concerned: teachers, students, parents, and community.

Therefore, effective plans are those that require participation of all stakeholders (Talesraet.al, 2002). Schools need the participation of all stakeholders in the school plan (strategic and annual plan), but most of the time school plan is prepared by school principals. Therefore, the school mission and vision is not visible to all stakeholders (MOE, 2007). Therefore, from the result, it is possible to conclude that primary school leaders of Seto Eddo School was not sufficiently encouraging stakeholders in preparing a collaborative plan and this may be challenging to realize school improvement program in the schools.

As depicted in Table 2 item 10 above, the majority 25 (71.7%) of teachers agreed that school leaders get technical support from higher administrative bodies such as word education office at low level and the rest 6 (18.6%) and 3 (9.6%) of teachers agreed that school leaders get technical support at high and moderate level respectively. Therefore, one could conclude that primary school of Seto Eddo was not sufficiently supported technically by higher administrative bodies such as woreda education office and this might de-motivate school leaders. In general, as the finding revealed, in Seto Eddo primary was not effective in making adequate preparation for SIP implementation and the weighted mean (2.46) showed low performance level

4.3. Teaching and Learning Domain

Primary school teachers were asked to measure the extent to which school leaders realize teaching-earning process as it is one of the school improvement program domains. Each of the items was assessed using a five point rating-scale. The result was summarized in the following table.

Table 3: Teachers responses towards the extent of teaching and learning process

No	Items	Very Low		Low		Mode rate		High		Very High		Total		mean
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
2.1	To what extent school leaders encourage teachers to use continuous assessment to enhance students' performance?	8	23	5	13.5	16	48.7	2	5.8	3	9	34	100	2.52
2.2	The extent to which school leaders mutually define the principles which lay down strong foundations for quality teaching	6	16.7	5	15.4	17	49.3	4	12.2	2	6.4	34	100	2.76
2.3	To what extent school leaders motivate teachers for best performances?	6	16.7	18	50	3	10.2	3	10.9	4	12.2	34	100	2.3
2.4	To what extent school leaders coordinate the staff to share their experience?	16	45.5	3	10.3	6	16.7	6	17.9	3	9.6	34	100	2.4
2.5	To what extent school leaders make significant effort to enhance professional development of teachers?	5	14.7	6	18.6	15	41.7	4	12.8	4	12.2	34	100	2.89
2.6	The extent to which school leaders use feedback from stakeholders to motivate students for their best academic performance	6	18.6	17	51.3	6	17.3	2	5.1	3	7.7	34	100	2.43
2.7	To what extent school leaders facilitate provision of instructional materials for teachers?	5	14.1	6	18.6	15	38.5	5	15.4	3	7.7	34	100	2.95
2.8	The extent to which school leaders implement a strategy through which teachers can acquire appropriate teaching methods	4	12.2	23	67.3	4	11.5	1	3.2	2	5.1	34	100	2.28
2.9	The extent to which school leaders encourage internal supervision to enhance the teaching learning process	3	7.7	6	18.5	4	12.8	14	44.2	7	23.7	34	100	3.65
2.10	To what extent school leaders ensure that teachers teach according to their lesson plan?	4	12	3	10.3	3	9.6	17	46.1	7	21.8	100	100	3.51
Overall mean														2.77

Scale: ≤ 1.49 - very low level of performance, 1.50-2.49 -low level of Performance, 2.50-3.49– moderate level of performance, 3.50-4.49 – high level of performance and ≥ 4.50 – very high level of performance. With regard to item 1.1 of Table 3 above, the majority 16(48.7%) of teachers agreed that school leaders encourage teachers to use continuous assessment at a moderate level and therest 13(36.5%) and 5 (14.7%) of teachers agreed that school leaders encourage teachers to use continuous assessment at low and high level respectively. But, the result from document analysis revealed that the majority of sampled schools were using the oldest (teachers centered) assessment method than continuous assessment method and this may affect the pupils’ achievement.

As can be observed from item 1.2 of the same Table 3, the majority 17 (49.3%) of teachers agreed that school leaders mutually define principles at a moderate level and the rest 11 (32.1%) and 6 (18.6%) of teachers agreed that school leaders’ performance in this aspect was at low and high level respectively.

With regard to item 1.3 of the same table above, the majority 24 (66.7%) of teachers revealed that school leaders motivate teachers for the best performances at low and 3 (10.2%) of teachers agreed that school leaders motivate teachers for the best performances at a moderate level the rest 7 (23.1%) of teachers agreed that school leaders motivate teachers for the best performances at high level. Supporting this idea, Sergiovanni (cited in Temesgen, 2011) explained that effective school leaders provide motivation and encouragement that lead to success and they manage effectively in a changing educational environment. Therefore, as the result revealed, primary school leaders of Jimma Town were not sufficiently motivating teachers and this may affect the teaching learning process which has a direct relation to school improvement of the school

As can be witnessed from item 1.4 of the same Table above, the majority 19 (55.8%) of teachers agreed that school leaders coordinate the staff to share their experience at low level and the rest 9 (27.6%) and 6 (16.6%) of teachers agreed that school leaders coordinate the staff to share their experience at high and moderate level respectively. The mean value 2.44 also showed low performance level. Therefore, from the result one can conclude that primary school leaders of Jimma Town were not sufficiently coordinating the staff to share their experience and this might

in turn affect the professional development of teachers and may also affect the relationship within teachers of the same school and teachers of the neighboring schools.

In item 1.5 of the same Table above , the majority 15 (41.7%) of teachers revealed that school leaders made significant effort to enhance professional development of teachers at amoderate level and the rest 11 (33.3 %) and 8(25%) of teachers agreed that school leaders made significant effort to enhance professional development of teachers at low and high level respectively. But, the result of interview revealed that there were some resistances from primary school teachers” side. Regarding this issue, principal of one primary school informed that: “CPD (Continuous professional development) has a great contribution in enhancing the teacher’s profession, but most primary school teachers are still resistant to follow and practice the program”. Vice principal of one school also explained that: “Some teachers consider CPD as it is less valuable and simply imposed on them to make them overload and busy”. Regarding professional development, Hopkins *et al.*, (in Harris, 2002) explained that an essential component of successful school improvement interventions is the quality of professional development and learning.

As indicated in item 1.6 of the same table 3, 23(69.9%) of teachers revealed that school leaders used feedback from stakeholders to motivate students for their best academic performance at low level and the rest 6 (17.3%) and 5 (12.8%) of teachers revealed that school leaders used feedback from stakeholders to motivate students for their best academic performance at moderate and high level respectively. But regarding this idea, MOE (2006) revealed that the school should communicate regularly with the community, and should receive both positive and negative feedback at regular intervals.

As illustrated in item 1.7 of the same Table above, the majority 15 (38.5%), of teachers revealed that school leaders facilitate provision of instructional materials for teachers at a moderate level and the rest 11 (32.7%) and 8 (23.1%) of teachers revealed that school leaders facilitate provision of instructional materials at low and high level respectively. Therefore, as one could understand from the result, school leaders of primary school of Jimma Town of SetoEddo did at an average in providing instructional materials for teachers. Thus, as the finding of the study

revealed, school leaders' accomplishment seems to be fair, but it might not be enough, since success in the implementation of SIP or teaching and learning process might not be reached.

With regard to item 1.8 of the same Table above, the majority 27 (80.1%) of teachers agreed that school leaders implement a strategy through which teachers can acquire appropriate teaching methods at low level and the rest 4(11.5%) and 3 (8.3%) of teachers agreed that school leaders implement the strategy through which teachers can acquire appropriate teaching methods at moderate and high level respectively. Supporting this idea, literature revealed that teachers need to have an adequate academic and professional knowledge and also they are required to apply appropriate teaching methods that help in teaching large and diversified classroom (MoE, 2007).

As shown in item 1.9 of the same Table above, 21 (67.9%) of teachers revealed that school leaders encourage internal supervision to enhance the teaching learning process at a high level. Whereas the rest 9 (19.2%) and 4(12.8%) of teachers agreed that school leaders encourage internal supervision at low and moderate level respectively. Regarding this idea, literature revealed that, teachers and administrators must actively engage in the process of supervision. In addition, supervision as a task assigned to all individuals who possess supervisory position to stimulate and coordinate staff development and growth as well as to influence mainly teachers for the betterment of instructional performance (Glatthorn, 1990). Therefore, as the finding of the study revealed, primary school leaders of Jimma Town fairly did in encouraging internal supervision.

As can be observed from item 1.10 of the same Table, 24 (67.9%) of teachers revealed that school leaders ensure that teachers teach according to their lesson plan at a high level and the rest 7 (22.5%) and 3 (9.6%) of teachers revealed that the school leaders ensure that teachers teach according to their lesson plan at low and moderate level respectively. In this regard, literature revealed that in successful schools, teachers are well organized and lessons are planned in advance, are well structured and have clear objectives which are communicated to the students (Sammons et al., in Harris, 2005). Therefore, as one could conclude from the result, in this primary school leaders of Jimma Town were performed above average in enabling teachers to teach according to their plan.

4.4. Safe and Healthy School Environment Domain

Primary school teachers were asked to measure the extent to which school leaders realize safe and healthy school environment as it is one of the school improvement program domains. Each of the items was assessed using a five point rating-scale were dispatched. The result was summarized in the following table.

Table 4: Teachers responses on safe and healthy school environment affairs

No	Items	Very Low		Low		Mode rate		High		Very High		Total		mean
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
3.1	The extent to which school leaders work to create a favorable working environment	7	20.5	5	16	15	42.9	4	10.3	4	10.3	34	100	2.78
3.2	The extent to which school leaders enable parents to play role in improving and maintaining school	8	23.7	16	46.2	4	11.5	4	10.3	2	8.3	34	100	1.17
3.3	The extent to which school leaders work to ensure security of the school for the students' learning	5	13.5	3	9.6	4	10.9	15	44.2	7	21.8	34	100	3.55
3.4	The extent to which school leaders give attention to students' safety	3	9.6	4	10.9	4	12.8	17	47.4	6	19.2	34	100	3.55
3.5	To what extent school leaders work to empower students?	4	12.2	6	17.3	14	38.5	5	18.6	5	13.4	34	100	3.02
Overall mean													2.81	

Scale: ≤1.49- very low level of performance, 1.50-2.49 -low level of Performance, 2.50-3.49– moderate level of Performance, 3.50-4.49 – high level of performance, ≥4.50– very high level of performance.

As depicted in item 2.1 of Table 4 above, 15 (42.9%) of teachers agreed that school leaders “work to create a favorable working environment at a moderate level and the rest 12(36.5%) and 8 (20.6% of teachers agreed that school leaders work to create a favorable workingenvironment at low and high level respectively. Regarding this idea literature revealed that effective schools share a set of characteristics that add up to an environment that raises student achievement. By setting goals to improve a schoolenvironment, principals, teachers, school councils, parents, and other community members can make their schools more effective places in which to learn (EIC, 2000).

As depicted in item 2.2 of the same Table above, 24 (69.9%) of teachers revealed that school leaders enabled parents to play role in improving and maintaining school at low level while the rest 6 (18.6%) and14 (11.5%) of teachers agreed that school leaders enable parents to play role in improving and maintaining school at high and moderate level respectively. As directorof the schooland vice directors of 2 sample school explained the support from parents in finance, materials and labor were very low. In relation to this idea, MoE (2006) explained that school cannot succeed without the support of the parents and community. It is therefore essential for the school leader to develop good relations with parents. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that school leaders of primary school of Jimma Town of SetoEddo School couldn't enabled parents to play role in improving and maintaining school as sufficient as required.

As shown in item 2.3 of the same Table above, the majority 22 (66%) of teachers revealed that school leaders work to ensure security of the school for the students learning at a high level and the rest 8 (23.1%) and 4 (10.9%) of teachers revealed that school leaders work to ensure security of the school for the students learning at low and moderate level respectively. Therefore, one could conclude that school leaders of primary school of Seto Eddo performed well in ensuring security of schools for students' learning.

As can be observed from item 2.4 of the same Table above, the majority 23(66.6%) of teachers agreed that school leaders give attention to students' safety at high level. Whereas 7 (20.5%) and 4(12.8%) of teachers revealed that school leaders give attention to students’ safety at low and moderate level respectively. In relation to this idea literature revealed that, effective schools share the following characteristics. These are: a clear and focused vision; a safe and orderly

environment; a climate of high expectations for student success; a focus on high levels of student achievement that emphasizes activities related to learning (EIC, 2000).

As indicated in item 2.5 of the same Table above, the majority 14 (38.5%) of teachers responded that school leaders work to empower students at moderate level. Whereas 10 (32%) and 10(29.5% (of teachers revealed that school leaders work to empower students at high and low level respectively. Regarding empowerment, Ubben and Hughes (1997) stated that empowerment is giving teachers and even students a share an important organizational decisions and giving them opportunities to shape organizational goals. Therefore, as the result revealed school leaders of primary school of Seto Eddo were performed at an average level in empowering students.

4.5. The School Leadership and Management Domain

Primary school teachers were asked to measure the extent to which school leaders realize safe and healthy school environment as it is one of the school improvement program domains. Each of the items was assessed using a five point rating-scale and the result was summarized in the following table.

Table 5: Teachers responses on school leadership and management tasks

No	Items	Very Low		Low		Mode rate		High		Very High		Total		me an
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
4.1	The extents to which School leaders are capable of managing the school within the changing environment?	3	9	9	26.3	16	45.5	2	8.3	4	10.9	34	100	2.70
4.2	3.2 The extent to which school leaders make the best use of the available budgets to provide resources	5	14.7	20	55.8	6	16.7	2	8.3	1	4.5	34	100	2.42
4.3	3.3 The extent to which school leaders are able to confront challenges that they face in their day to day activities.	7	17.5	7	19.2	16	48.1	2	9	2	6.4	34	100	2.53
4.4	3.4 The extent to which school leaders are able to support others to develop collaborative work practice	7	19.9	16	44.9	5	14.7	2	9.6	4	10.9	34	100	2.37
4.5	3.5 To what extent school leaders share responsibility among staff members	7	18.6	14	39.7	8	24.4	3	10.3	2	7	34	100	2.48
Overall mean														2.55

Scale: ≤1.49- very low level of performance, 1.50-2.49 -low level of performance, 2.50-3.49– moderate level of Performance, 3.50-4.49 – high level of performance, ≥4.50– very high level of performance.

As depicted in item 3.1 of the Table 5 above, the majority 16 (45.5%) of teachers agreed that school leaders were capable of managing the school within the changing environment at a moderate level and the rest 12 (35.3%) and 6 (19.2%) of teachers agreed that school leaders were capable of managing the school within the changing environment at low and high level respectively. Supporting this idea, literature revealed that effective leaders provide motivation

and encouragement that lead to success and they manage effectively in a changing educational environment (Sergiovanni cited in Temesgen, 2011).

With regard to item 3.2 of the same table above, the majority 25(70.5%) of teachers agreed that school leaders made the best use of the available budgets to provide resources at a low level and the rest 6 (16.7%) and 3 (12.8%) of teachers agreed that school leaders made the best use of the available budgets to provide resources at moderate and high level respectively. But, the result from interview revealed that there was an improvement in using the budget in an appropriate and economical way. Supporting this idea, PTA representative of one sample school informed that Not only principals and vice principals who involve in running school budget, but PTA representatives are responsible and has taken part in controlling and monitoring budget of school especially school grant. But, at the same time primary school has scarce of resource because, parents and community are not supporting the schools financially.

School principals of majority of sample schools also explained that primary school was not getting the block grant budget properly. For instance, one school principal explained that: Even though our school is getting faire budget of school grant, the block grant budget is not properly availed to the school as it is specifically allocated per each pupil and which is clearly indicated in the blue print of MoE (2002). Therefore, this problem hinders our school to fulfill important educational materials and facilities in the school. Regarding this idea, Ignathios (cited in Masuku, 2011) stated that the effectiveness is nothing but it is successful accomplishment of intended organizational objectives by effectively and efficiently using the scarce resources. Masuku also explained that the school is said to be effective if it is doing the right things in a right way and strives to achieve its objectives using its resources optimally, economically, efficiently and sufficiently. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that even though there is low provision of financial resources in the Seto Eddo primary school, there is an improvement in the way primary school leaders of Jimma Town of Seto Eddo use school budget.

As indicated in item 3.3 of the same table above, 16 (48.1%) of teachers revealed that school leaders were able to confront challenges that they face in their day to day activities at a moderate level and the rest 14 (36.5%) and 4 (15.4%) of teachers agreed that school leaders were able to confront challenges that they face in their day to day activities at low and high level respectively.

As can be observed from item 3.4 of the same Table above, the majority 23 (64.8%) of teachers agreed that school leaders were able to support others to develop collaborative work practice at low level and the rest 6 (20.5%) and 5 (14.7%) of teachers revealed that school leaders were able to support others to develop collaborative work practice at high and moderate level respectively. Regarding this idea, Hopkins *et al* (in Harris 2005) explained that successful school leaders encourage co-ordination by creating collaborative environments which encourages involvement, professional development, mutual support and assistance in problem solving. Therefore, from the result, one could conclude that school leaders of the Seto Eddo primary of Jimma Town was performing below the average in supporting collaborative work and this might affect the realization of the school improvement program since it needs collaborative work of school leaders, teachers, parents, students and other stakeholders.

As indicated in item 3.5 of the same Table above, the majority 21 (58.3%) of teachers agreed that school leaders shared responsibility among staff members at low level and the rest 8 (24.4%) and 5 (17.3%) of teachers agreed that school leaders shared responsibility among staff members at moderate and high level respectively. Supporting this idea Katz (in Wossenu, 2006) stated that effective school leaders work to share leadership responsibilities throughout all levels of the educational organization. Therefore, as one could understand from the result, school leaders of Seto Eddo primary school of Jimma Town did below the average in sharing responsibility among the staff and this may affect implementation of the school improvement program, as the successes in school improvement are the cumulative activities of different stakeholders.

4.6. Community Participation domain

Primary school teachers were asked to measure the extent to which school leaders enhance Community Participation as it is one of the school improvement program domains. Each of the items was assessed using a five rating-scale. The result was summarized in the following table.

Table 6: Teachers response regarding community participation

No	Items	Very Low		Low		Mode rate		High		Very High		Total		me an
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
5.1	The extent to which school leaders work to make the community active participant in problem solving of academic activities	7	19.9	17	48.7	4	13.4	3	9	3	9	34	100	234
5.2	The extent to which school leaders encourage parents-school relationship to strength collaborative work	8	23.1	14	42.3	5	14.1	4	10.9	3	9.6	34	100	2.42
5.3	The extent to which school leaders encourage participation of parents in the management of the school	6	17.9	7	19.9	13	39.1	4	12.8	4	10.3	34	100	2.61
5.4	The extent to which school leaders encourage parents to support the school with important resources	5	16	8	24.4	17	48.1	2	5.1	2	6.4	34	100	2.70
5.5	To what extent school leader opens their door to the community?	6	17.9	18	52.6	4	12.2	4	10.3	2	7	34	100	2.35
Overall mean														2.48

Scale: ≤1.49- very low level of performance, 1.50-2.49 -low level of performance, 2.50-3.49– moderate level of Performance, 3.50-4.49 – high level of performance, ≥4.50– very high level of performance.

As depicted in item 5.1 of the Table 6 above, the majority 24 (68.6%) of teachers agreed that school leaders work to make the community active participant in problem solving of academic activities at low level and the rest 6 (18%) and 4 (13.4%) of teachers agreed that school leaders work to make the community actively participate in problem solving of academic activities at

high and moderate level respectively. Regarding this idea, literature revealed that PTAs and community members should be active in advising on the benefits of education and in encouraging parents to send their children to school so as to increase access and reduce dropout. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that school leaders of primary school of Seto Eddo did below average in enhancing community participation in problem solving of academic activities and this in turn might affect the realization of the school improvement program since educational goals cannot be achieved in the absence of community participation.

With regard to item 5.2 of the same Table above, the majority 22 (65.4% of teachers agreed that school leaders encourage parents- school relationship to strength collaborative work at low level and the rest 7(20.5%) and 5 (14.1%) of teachers agreed that school leaders encourage parents-school relationship to strength collaborative work at high and moderate level respectively. Regarding this idea, literature revealed that those schools that are able to create positive relationships with their wider community can create a supportive climate for learning. Therefore, as revealed from the result, a school leader of primary schools of Seto Eddo School was not effective in enhancing parent- school relationship.

As depicted in item 5.3 of the same Table above, the majority 13 (39.1%) of teachers agreed that school leaders encourage participation of parents in the management of the school at a moderate level and the rest 13(37.8%) and 8 (23.1%) of teachers agreed that school leaders encourage participation of parents in the management of the school at low and high level respectively. Regarding the interview result, one primary school external supervisor mentioned that: “PTA members are often participating in school management, but the capacity and activities of PTA members to mobilize parents in large to play their role is very less”. Additionally, one primary school principal indicated that: Few of PTA members are coming to school and take part in the meetings and decisions of some important issues of school after repetitive invitation. But, the main responsibility of PTA isnot only coming to school by themselves but to mobilize the parents in large to enable them to support the school. But, still in this aspect their contribution is very less particularly in this primary school.

As indicated in item 5.4 of the same Table above, the majority 17 (48.1%) of teachers agreed that school leaders encourage parents to support the school with important resourcesat a moderate level and the rest 13 (40.4%) and 4 (11.5%) of teachers agreed that school leaders encourage

parents to support the school with important resources at low and high level respectively. But, the result from interview revealed that there was low support of resources from parents. The result from interview also revealed less support of community. For instance, supporting the idea one external supervisor of sample school informed that: “Resources, such as financial and material support from parents are very less particularly in primary school”. Regarding this idea literature revealed that communities and PTAs need to play important roles in all aspects of education from raising resources to managing schools (MOE, 2005). MOE (2006) also revealed that school cannot succeed without the support of the parents and community.

As can be seen from item 5.5 of the same Table above, 24 (70.5%) of teachers agreed that school leaders open their door to the community at low level and the rest 6 (17.3%) and 4 (12.2%) of teachers agreed that school leaders open their door for the community at high and moderate level respectively. Thus, if the school leaders are not ready to welcome the community with full interest and respect the community or stakeholders may not have interest to come to school and work with schools and this might in turn affect the collaboration and positive relationship between school leaders and school communities which is very important in facilitating the realization of school improvement program. Thus, the finding revealed that, school leaders of SetoEddo School performed at a low level in promoting community participation or implementing the domain. The weighted mean was(2.48) also indicated low performance level.

4.7. Challenges Affecting School Leaders in Implementing SIP

Teachers were asked their level of agreement to the statements, which describe challenges encountered school leaders in implementing school improvement programs in primary school of Jimma Town. The result was presented and analyzed as follows:

Table 7: Teachers responses to challenges of school leaders

Scale: ≤1.49- very low level of performance, 1.50-2.49 -low level of performance, 2.50-3.49–

No	Items	Very Low		Low		Mode rate		High		Very High		Total		mean
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
6.1	To what extent the school is availed with adequate financial resources?	4	10.9	12	35.3	13	38.5	3	8.3	2	7	34	100	2.43
6.2	Availability of man power in the school	5	15.4	8	22.4	14	42.3	4	11.5	3	8.3	34	100	2.75
6.3	The extent to which school leaders' are capable of creating good communication with the staff	8	22.4	16	46.8	5	14.1	3	9	2	7.7	34	100	2.32
6.4	The extent to which school leaders' are capable of creating good communication with the staff	6	18.6	17	50	6	16	2	6.4	3	9	34	100	2.35
6.5	The level of commitment of the school leaders	6	17.3	18	51.9	5	13.5	3	10.9	2	6.4	34	100	2.37
6.6	The extent to which school leaders involve members of the school community in the articulation of school vision	5	14.7	8	24.4	16	44.2	3	9	2	7.7	34	100	2.70
Overall mean														2.49

moderate level of Performance, 3.50-4.49 – high level of performance, ≥ 4.50 – very high level of performance.

As depicted in item 6.1 of Table 7 above, the majority 16 (46.2%) of teachers agreed that the extent to which primary school availed with adequate financial resource were at a low level. Whereas the rest 13 (38.5%) and 5 (15.3%) of teachers revealed that primary school was availed with adequate financial resource at moderate and high level respectively. Regarding resource, literature revealed that, school improvement planning can only lead to genuine and profound change if schools have at least a minimum level of resources to work with and without such resources, the school improvement program could become de-motivating (MOE, 2010). Therefore, from the finding, one can conclude that in SetoEddo school of Jimma Town was not

getting available financial resources and this may be challenging for school leaders in implementing SIP.

As indicated in item 6.2 of the same Table above, the majority 14 (42.3%) of teachers agreed that numbers of man power in this schools were fair or at a moderate level and the rest 16(37.8%) and 4 (19.8%) of teachers agreed that the availability of manpower in the schoolwas at low and high level respectively. But as director and vice directors of some sample Seto Eddo primary school explained there were shortage of teachers, particularly in natural science and shortage of manpower in non-teaching such as an administrative area.

With regard to item 6.3 of the same Table above, 24 (69.2%) of teachers agreed that school leaders were at low level in creating good communication with the staff and the rest 5 (14.1% and 5 (16.7 %) of teachers revealed that primary school leaders create good communication at moderate and high level respectively. Concerning this idea, literature revealed that, meaningful engagement and dialogue with staff in their day-to-day working lives facilitates effective communication (Duignan, 2006). Therefore, it is possible to conclude from the finding that in SetoEddo primary school, leaders of this school was in challenging as a result of insufficient communication among school leaders and the staff. As depicted in item 6.4 of the same Table above, the majority 23 (68.6) of teachers revealed that commitment of the leaders of this school were at a low level and the rest 6 (16%) and 5 (15.4%) were agreed that commitment level of secondary school leaders were at moderate and high level respectively. Supporting this idea, Day et al., (2010) explained commitment as it is one of the most key attributes of effective school leaders.

As can be seen from item 6.5 of the same Table above, 24 (69.2) of teachers agreed that school leaders involve members of the school community in articulation of school vision at low level and the rest 5 (13.5%) and 5 (17.3%) of teachers revealed that school leaders involve the school community at moderate and high level respectively. Supporting this idea, Duignan (2006) suggested that, the articulation of vision necessarily involves leaders sharing their hopes, desires and expectations with the members of the school community, and establishing the foundations of an organizational culture that supports the aspirations of all stakeholders. Ubben and Hughes (1997) also explained that the success of any organization depends on having a clear vision which is accepted by the staff and other stakeholders.

As depicted in item 5.6 of the same table above, 16 (44.2%) of teachers agreed that, the extent to which school leaders“ deal with poor performances was at a moderate level and the rest 13 (39.1%) and 5 (16.7%) of teachers revealed that primary school leaders deal with poor performances at low and high level respectively. Therefore, as it could be understood

from the finding primary school leaders of Jimma Town were performed satisfactorily in dealing with poor performances, but this may not be sufficient because unless daily performance of the staff is critically followed up and defects encountered in the teaching learning process is solved through peaceful discussion, in the long run the cumulative defect may lead to the failure of school improvement program. Additionally, school leaders should not be reluctant in taking important measures to correct poor performances.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This final part of the thesis deals with the summary of the findings of the study, the conclusions and the recommendations forwarded on the basis of findings.

5.1. Summary

The main objective of this study was to assess the school leaders' effectiveness in implementing School improvement program. To achieve this aim, the following research questions were raised:

1. To investigate to what extent school leaders make adequate preparations for the implementation of SIP in Seto Eddo primary school of Jimma Town?
2. To what extent the four SIP domains are effectively implemented by school leaders in the Seto Eddo primary school of Jimma Town?
3. What are the major challenges affecting the effectiveness of school leaders in the implementation of SIP in Seto Eddo primary school of Jimma Town?

To achieve this objective, the sampling technique used was stratified sampling technique. The study was conducted in 1 primary school of Jimma Town selected by purposive sampling techniques. 26 sample teachers and 4 PTA were selected using sampling random of lottery method techniques. In addition, the interview was conducted with 1 principal 2 vice principals, 1 external supervisor primary school to enrich data obtained through questionnaires. External supervisor and principals were selected by census sampling technique. Data were obtained from the sample respondents through questionnaire and interview. In doing this, the necessary information was gathered mainly through questionnaires filled by teachers. However, 4 teachers have not returned the questionnaires and this reduced the rate of return of teachers (the respondents) to 22. The data obtained were analyzed using various statistical tools: frequency, percentages, and mean. According to the result of data analysis, the following major findings were identified.

Regarding preparation stage of SIP, the result revealed that efforts made by primary school leaders of Seto Eddo of Jimma Town in preparation stage of SIP were insufficient and below the average. For instance the result revealed low levels of self-assessment with stakeholder 25 (71.2%), low in priority identification 26 (75%), low level of school committee participation in planning 108 (69.2%), low level of supports from stakeholders 26 (75%), low level of performance in giving clear vision 23 (68.6%) were some of the activities insufficiently performed by primary school leaders. The weighted mean was 2.46, also shows low performance level. Regarding the second basic question, school improvement program encompasses four domains and depending on the results of the finding the four domains are summarized as follows:

The teaching and learning domain mainly focuses on the roles and responsibilities of teachers. First of all, teachers are expected to plan and make adequate preparation and present learning activities. To this end, teachers need to have an adequate academic and professional knowledge. Besides, they are required to apply appropriate teaching methods that help in teaching large and diversified classroom. But, for teachers to be committed and responsible for their job, school leaders are responsible to promote teachers activity in the school by motivating teachers and exercising their leadership role in an appropriate manner. As the result indicated, school leaders performed at an average level in implementing (realizing) teaching and learning domain. The weighted mean was 2.77 also indicated an average performance level.

Even if, the finding indicated average performance level, there are some activities performed below average or at low level. These are: efforts made in motivating teachers 23 (66.7%), coordinating the staff to share experience 17 (55.8) enhancing teachers training 23 (66.7), using feedbacks from stakeholders 24(69.9). Regarding safe and healthy school environment domain, 10 items were developed and teachers revealed their agreement. Accordingly, concerning the activities specified under this domain, school leaders' performance was at an average level. The weighted mean was 2.44 also indicated average performance level. Despite this fact, there were some activities under this domain which school leaders performed below average. Accountability and responsibility of every activity going in the school primarily lie on the shoulder of the school leadership. Therefore, school leaders are responsible in encouraging, motivating, supporting, coordinating teachers, students and other stakeholders, so that they can play role in assessing,

planning, implementing and monitoring school improvement program. Regarding this domain, teachers were asked to respond their opinion on 3 items. The result revealed that efforts made by school leaders to play leadership role were low or unsatisfactory. Moreover, the weighted mean was 2.55 this indicates low performance level. Specifically, primary school leaders of Seto Eddo primary were performing below average in developing collaborative work practices 23 (64.6%), sharing responsibility 21 (58%), capacity building 20(60%) and participatory decision making 103 (66%).

Regarding usage of resources, the result from interview revealed that there was an improvement in using the budget in an appropriate and economical way. As PTA and external supervisor representatives of some sampled school explained, not only principals and vice principals who involved in running school budget, but PTA representatives were responsible and had taking part in controlling and monitoring budget of school specially school grant. But, concerning the availability of resources, they explained that this primary school had a scarcity of resources as the result of insufficient financial support from parents and the community.

Parents and community members, play a vital role in the success of school improvement. Accordingly, various activities are identified to be carried out in promoting the participation of these key stakeholders. The participation of parents is justified since they have children in schools. Hence, they need to make discussions with school leaders on issues pertaining students' discipline, dropouts and participation. Therefore, school leaders are expected to encourage parents to follow up the learning of their children and to make regular visits of schools. Regarding community participation domain, teachers were asked to respond to 5 items concerning efforts made by school leaders in promoting community participation. Hence, the overall result revealed that primary school leaders of Seto Eddo of Jimma Town was unsatisfactory and performed below average in promoting community participation and the weighted mean with (2.48) also confirm low performance level. The result specifically revealed that there was low parent participation in solving academic problem 24 (68.6%), low collaborative work 22 (65.4%), low participation of parents in school management 13 (39.1%), low support from parents 16 (48.1%).

Moreover, the findings of this study showed that the major challenges that affect school leaders' effectiveness in implementing SIP include inadequate financial resource 16 (46.2%), inadequate man power in the school 14 (42.3%), insufficient and lack of transparency of communication among school leaders and the staff 24 (69.2) low level of commitment of school leaders 107 (68.6) and inability of school leaders to fully involve stakeholders in the articulation of school vision 21 (62.8). Additionally, absence of clear understanding of some school leaders on procedures of SIP plan preparation, lack of guidelines and frameworks, lack of parents and community supports were also some challenges that were revealed by the finding. In this regard, the weighted mean = (2.49) indicated low performance level.

5.2. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings the following conclusions were drawn. As the finding of this study revealed, the majority of the activities in the preparation phase of the school improvement program were not effectively implemented by Seto Eddo primary school leaders. Particularly, as the finding of the study revealed, primary school leaders were preparing non - collaborative SIP plan which is prepared without the participation of stakeholders and a SIP plan which is prepared without undergoing adequate assessment with stakeholders may face great challenges during its implementation. Therefore, from the finding, it is possible to conclude that a school leader of Seto Eddo primary school was not effective in making adequate preparation before planning SIP. Regarding teaching and learning domain, the finding of the study demonstrated that school leaders of Seto Eddo primary school have fairly performed in implementing teaching learning domain. However, there are some activities related to teaching and learning domains of SIP that were not effectively implemented by primary school leaders. Such level of performance might not be enough as the teaching and learning activity is basic and core in the SIP.

Regarding safe and healthy school environment domain, the findings revealed that, the activities under this domain in general were satisfactorily implemented. However, there were some activities which were not sufficiently implemented by school leaders. These are: participation of parents, provision of counseling service to students and collegial relationship among staff. Finding from open ended items of the questionnaire also indicated that there were low participation and low support of parents. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that, even though primary school leaders generally seem to perform satisfactorily in this domain, still there are some basic activities which were not properly accomplished by primary school leaders. Regarding school leadership domain, the finding revealed that primary school leaders have not satisfactorily accomplished most activities in this aspect. This is because, as one can clearly understand from the findings, most activities were done below average or low. Therefore, , it is possible to conclude that primary school leaders were not effective in realizing leadership domain and this in turn may have a negative impact on the implementation of SIP. Community participation domain is the fourth domain in the school improvement program and it deals with stakeholders or community roles in SIP. Regarding this, the finding revealed that most activities under this domain were accomplished at low level or unsatisfactory except few activities.

Therefore, it is possible to conclude that primary school leaders were not effective in promoting community participation in the Seto Eddo primary school in Jimma Town.

Finally, it is possible to conclude from the result that, inadequate financial resource, inadequate man power in the school, insufficient and a communication which lacks transparency among leaders and the staff, low level of commitment of school leaders, inability of school leaders to fully involve the school community in the articulation of school vision were the major challenges that affect the school leader's effectiveness in implementing SIP.

Additionally, as it could be concluded from the interview result, the absence of clear understanding of the procedures of SIP plan preparation, lack of guidelines and frameworks in some schools and lack of parents and community supports were also some challenges in school of SetoEddo primary school in Jimma Town. It is obvious that all this challenges can negatively affect the implementation of SIP and in turn the teaching learning process and students' achievement. Therefore, primary school leaders should strive to eradicate or minimize these challenges by evaluating themselves through feedbacks given to them in the day to day activities. External supervisor, and Woreda Offices and other top management bodies are also responsible and need to have sustainable and near contact with school leaders in order to help and capacitate them.

5.3. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusions the following recommendations are forwarded:

- ❖ The finding of the study revealed that, primary school leaders of Seto Eddo School in Jimma Town did not sufficiently practice self-assessment with stakeholders before panning SIP. But, a SIP plan which is developed without undergoing self- assessment with responsible stakeholders may face a great challenge during implementation. Therefore, it is advisable that primary school leaders need to aware and convince responsible bodies such as SIP committee, parents, teachers, students through continuous discussion and work with them. The external supervisor and Woreda Education Office may visit the school in a sustainable manner and discuss with school leaders, identify problems and give technical support including training where it is necessary.
- ❖ It is also advisable that school leaders in collaboration with woreda Education Office promote stakeholders support through awareness creation and also better to search different mechanisms such as, preparing panel discussions, preparing exhibition and sport festival in the school, conducting education conferences that enable parents and community to develop willingness toward supporting schools.
- ❖ School leaders, external supervisors, teachers and PTAs need to search mechanisms which enable them to generate their own schools ‘income rather than waiting for only external supports.
- ❖ It is advisable that school leaders need to encourage teachers to use the continuous assessment method in their schools. Beside, external supervisors and Woreda, Education experts are also advised to support the schools and make sure of its realization.
- ❖ Motivation is a driving force which may lead the teachers to more success. Therefore, in this primary school leader, external supervisors and PTAs in collaboration with Woreda education office ought to emphasize on teachers motivation and incentives and allocate budgets in their yearly plan for this purpose.
- ❖ It is advisable that school leaders with external supervisors need to promote teachers professional development through CPD program which incorporates training, experience sharing, meetings with other teachers/supervisors, action research and mentoring.

- ❖ As the finding revealed, school leaders didn't sufficiently implement a strategy through which teachers can acquire appropriate teaching methods. Therefore, it is advisable that primary school leaders and external supervisors need to encourage teachers to use active learning methods in the classroom to promote improved learning results.
- ❖ As the result revealed, school leaders were not sufficiently helping students in giving sustainable counseling services. Therefore, it is advisable that school leaders, external supervisors, teachers in collaboration with Woreda education experts need to give sustainable counseling services for the students.
- ❖ At the end, to alleviate the challenges encountered school leaders in implementing SIP, it is advisable that external supervisor and Woreda Education Offices in collaboration with the Zonal Education Office need to give sustainable training to fill the skill gaps of school leaders. They also need to avail primary school with important financial, material and human resources. Beside, Woreda and Zonal Education Office should timely supervise and support the school leaders.
- ❖ Finally, the researcher recommends a more detailed and comprehensive study in the area to strengthen the result of the findings.

REFERENCES

- AbiyZegeye, AlemayehuWorku, Daniel Tefera, MeleseGetu and YilmaSilashi (2009). *Introduction to Research methods. Graduate studies and research office*: Addis Ababa University.
- ACT. (2009). *School Improvement Framework: Better Schools... Better Futures Raising Quality and Achieving Excellence in ACT Public Schools*. Canberra. Retrieved October 3/2015 From:
- Adams, J., Khan, H. T. A., Raeside, R. & White, D. (2007). *Research method for graduate business and social science students*. USA: Sage Publications, Inc
- Ahmed, A. (2006). *A comparative study of managerial effectiveness between governments and Private High schools of Addis Ababa* (Unpublished MA Thesis). Addis Ababa University.
- Assefa, B. (1991). *Female Participation and Performance in Rural Primary School in Ethiopia*. Addis Ababa: UNICEF and SIDA.
- Bass, B. & Avolio, B. (1989). Potential biases in leadership measure: How prototypes leniency and general satisfaction relate to ratings and rankings of transformational and transactional leadership constructs: *Educational and psychological measurement*, 49, 509 –527.
- Bass, B. (1998). *Transformational leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bass, B. & Avolio, B. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Beare, H., Caldwell, B., & Millikan, R. (1989). *Creating an Excellent School*. London: Routledge.
- Bush, T. (2007). Educational Leadership and management: *Theory, Policy and Practice*, 9 (3), pp. 391- 406.
- Harris, A. (2005). *School Improvement: What's in it for School?* London: Tylor &Franci e- Library.
- Harris, A. (2002). *School Improvement: What's in It for Schools?* London: Routledge Flamer Press

- Hopkins, D. (2001). *School Improvement for Real*. London: Rout ledge, Flamer.
- Jemal Haji (2013). *Practice and Challenges of School Improvement Program in Secondary schools of Asosa zone* (Unpublished master's Thesis). Jimma University.
- Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques*. (2nd revised Ed.). New Delhi: New Age International (P) Ltd.
- Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., Harris, A. & Hopkins, D. (2006). *Successful School Leadership: What it is and how it influences pupil learning* (Report Number
- LemessaAbdi (2012). *The Implementation of School Improvement Program in East Welega Zone* (un Published MA thesis). Addis Ababa University.
- Masuku, S. L. (2011). *The Instructional leadership Role of The high school head in Creating a Culture of Teaching and Learning in Zimbabwe* (Published Doctoral Dissertation). University of South Africa.
- McCormick, A., Adams, D. & Gamage, D. (2009). *How does school Leaders Role Influence Student Achievement? A Review of Research Findings and Best Practices*. Vol. 4 (1).
- MOE (1994). *The Education and Training policy*, Addis Ababa.
- MOE (2002). *Education sector Development program (ESDP – II)*. Addis Ababa. MOE (2005). *The Education sector Development program Implementation Manual (ESDP – III)*. Addis Ababa.
- MOE (2006). *Decentralized Management of Education in Ethiopia: A reference Manual*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- MOE (2007). *General Education Quality Assurance package*. Addis Ababa MOE (2008). *General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQUIP)*. Addis Ababa.
- Oakland, E. (1993). *Total Quality management: The Route to Improving Performance*. London: Clays,

St. Ivas Plc.

Talesra, H. (2002). *Managing Educational Challenges; Global view*. Delhi: Tarum Offset press.

Pont, B., Nusche, D. & Moorman, H. (2008). *Improving School Leadership Volume 1: Policy and*

Practice, Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

TemesgenTeshome (2011). *The relationship between Leadership Style and Employee Commitment*

in Private Higher Education Institution of Addis Ababa City (Master's Thesis). Addis Ababa.

TigistuAwelu (2012). *Perception of Leadership in Effectiveness of school Improvement Program: The*

Case Of Selected High Schools In Addis Ababa City Administration (Unpublished MA

Thesis).Addis Ababa University.

Wossenu, Y. (2006). *Educational leadership*.Addis Ababa. Alpha, University College

Yukl, G. (2008). *Leadership in Organizations* (7th Ed.). New York: Lehigh- Poerix.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE AND INTERVIEW

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

This questionnaire is designed to assess the school leaders' effectiveness in the implementation of the school improvement program in Seto Eddo primary school of Jimma Town. This research will be conducted for academic purposes and are no way affecting you personally and your identity remains confidential. Evidently, the success of this study depends on your honest response to all parts of the questionnaire. Therefore, I kindly request you to fill this questionnaire openly.

N.B

- ❖ No need of writing your name
- ❖ Please, reply to questions by putting "X" mark in the space provided and write a brief response/s to open ended questions that require your reflection.
- ❖ School leaders = director and vice director

PART ONE

I. Background Information

1. Name of the school: _____

Sex: Male female

5. Position _____

4. Age: 20-30 31-40 41-50 51 and above

6. Level of Education: Certificate Diploma Holder

1st Degree 2nd Degree

7. Work Experience in year: 1-4 5- 8 9- 12 13-16 above 16

Therefore, to what extent the following issues are being addressed for School Improvement program implementation in your schools .Please, put

“ x ” marks in the space provided for each item under the rating.

(1= Very Low 2=Low 3= Medium 4= High 5= Very High)

No	Items	Rating				
		1	2	3	4	5
I	Teachers responses on the preparation stages of SIP					
1.1	The extent to which school leaders make self-assessment with stakeholders before the planning of School improvement program.					
1.2	The extent to which school leaders identify priority areas before the planning school improvement program.					
1.3	To what extent school leaders“ work with the school improvement committee during the preparation of the school improvement plan?					
1.4	To what extent school leaders get support from different stakeholders?					
1.5	The extent to which school leaders are able to give clear orientation on the regulations of the school.					
1.6	To what extent school leaders are performing well in arranging adequate resources needed for school improvement?					
1.7	To what extent school leaders are capable in setting directions towards achieving the expected educational goals?					

1.8	The extent to which school leaders are capable of providing clear vision in order to have a common understanding.					
1.9	The extent to which school leaders encourage stakeholders to prepare the collaborative plan					
1.10	To what extent school leaders get technical support from higher administrative bodies such as woreda education office?					

II	Four Domains schools					
A	Teaching and Learning Domain	Rating				
2.1	To what extent school leaders encourage teachers to use continuous assessment to enhance students’ performance?					
2.2	The extent to which school leaders mutually define the principles which lay down strong foundations for quality teaching					
2.3	To what extent school leaders motivate teachers for best performances?					
2.4	To what extent school leaders coordinate the staff to share their experience?					
2.5	To what extent school leaders make significant effort to enhance professional development of teachers?					
2.6	The extent to which school leaders use feedback from stakeholders to motivate students for their best academic performance					
2.7	To what extent school leaders facilitate provision of instructional materials for teachers?					
2.8	The extent to which school leaders implement a strategy through which teachers can acquire appropriate teaching methods					
2.9	The extent to which school leaders encourage internal supervision to enhance the teaching learning process					
2.10	To what extent school leaders ensure that teachers teach according to their lesson plan?					

B	Safe and healthy school environment domain					
2.11	The extent to which school leaders work to create a favorable working environment					
2.12	The extent to which school leaders enable parents to play role in improving and maintaining school					
2.13	The extent to which school leaders work to ensure security of the school for the students' learning					
2.14	The extent to which school leaders give attention to students' safety					
2.15	To what extent school leaders work to empower students?					
C	School leadership and management domain					
2.16	The extents to which School leaders are capable of managing the school within the changing environment?					
2.17	The extent to which school leaders make the best use of the available budgets to provide resources					
2.18	The extent to which school leaders are able to confront challenges that they face in their day to day activities.					
2.19	The extent to which school leaders are able to support others to develop collaborative work practice					
2.20	To what extent school leaders share responsibility among staff members					
D	Community participation domain					
2.21	The extent to which school leaders work to make the community active participant in problem solving of academic activities					
2.22	The extent to which school leaders encourage parents- school relationship to strength collaborative work					
2.23	The extent to which school leaders encourage participation of parents in the management of the school					
2.24	The extent to which school leaders encourage parents to support the school with important resources					
4.25	To what extent school leader opens their door to the community?					

2.26	To what extent school leader opens their door to the community?					
II	Challenges of School Leaders in SIP implementation					
3.1	To what extent the school is availed with adequate financial resources?					
3.2	Availability of man power in the school					
3.3	The extent to which school leaders' are capable of creating good communication with the staff					
3.4	The extent to which school leaders' are capable of creating good communication with the staff					
3.5	The level of commitment of the school leaders					
3.6	The extent to which school leaders involve members of the school community in the articulation of school vision					

Interview questions for school Director, vice Directors and Primary school external supervisor

1. What are the major activities performed during the preparation phase of the SIP in your school? - Awareness creation program - Financial and material support - Technical trainings
2. Do all documents and guidelines of SIP available in the school? If not, what efforts have been made by the school to have an access?
3. What resources have been mobilized to implement SIP in your school?
4. What are the major improvements exhibited in your schools?
5. According to your view, what are the major challenges that have been confronting the implementation of SIP in your school?
6. What possible solutions do you suggest to overcome these and other challenges for better results