Princpal’s Effectiveness in Leading Change in Jimma Zone Primary Schools

By

Jafer Nura

Jimma University

College of Education and Behavioral Science

Department of Educational Planning and Management

November, 2021

Jimma, Ethiopia

Jimma University

College of Education and Behavioral Science

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Primary School Principal Effectiveness in Leading Change in Jimma Zone

By

Jafer Nura

A Thesis is Submitted to College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, Department of Educational planning and Management in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in School Leadership

Main Advisor: Frew Amsale (Ass.prof)

Co-Advisor: Desalegn Beyene (Ph.D)

November, 2021

Jimma, Ethiopia

Approval

This is to certify that thesis prepared by Jafer Nura entitled'' Primary School Principal Effectiveness in Leading Change in Jimma Zone'' that submitted partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in School Leadership complies with the regulation of the university and meets the Accepted standards with respect to original and quality.

Approved by Examining Board

Advisor	**Signature**	**Date**
_____	_____	_____
Co-advisor		
_____	_____	_____
Internal Examiner	**Signature**	**Date**
_____		_____
_____		
External Examiner	**Signature**	**Date**
_____	_____	_____

Declaration

I the undersigned students, declared that the thesis on the title “Primary School Principal Effectiveness in Leading Change in Jimma Zone is my original work and that all resource materials that have been used for thethesis and referred to or quoted hav been dully acknowledged.

Student Name: Jafer Nura

Signature _____

Date _____

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as the university advisor

Main Advisor name: Frew Amsale (Assistant professor)

Signature_____

Date _____

Co-Advisor Name: Desalign Beyene (Ph.D)

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to express my heart-felt thanks to my advisors; Firew Amsale (Ass.pro) And Dr.Desalegn Beyene for their unreserved, critical and constructive comments gave me that contributed to the overall accomplishment of this thesis. Certainly, had it not been for his sustainable encouragement, this thesis would not have been a success.

Next I would like to express my thanks to Jimma Zone all sampled primary school leaders and teachers for their willingness to give necessary information through questionnaires, interviews and Focus group dictation to make the study successful.

Table of Contents

List of Table

Abbreviations and Acronyms

EdAd: Educational Administration

ESDP: Educational Sector Development Program

GEQAP: General Education Quality Assurance Package

IL: Instructional Leadership

MoE: Ministry of Education

REB: Regional Education Bureau

SD: Standard Deviation

SIP- School Improvement Program

SPSS: Statically Package for Social Science

TDP: Teachers Development Program

WEO: Woreda Education Office

ZEO: Zone Education Office

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to assess the Practices, and Challenges of developing collaboration for school improvement in Government primary schools in jimma zone. The study employed a descriptive survey design. The study was carried out in three worda, in Nine primary schools by using simple random sampling technique. Questionnaire was distributed for 70 teachers using systematic sampling techniques. Interview was conducted for 4 cluster supervisors and Focus group discussion for 6 teacher and 3vace principal and principals were selected using purposive sampling. primary sources were used. To gather the necessary data three types of data collection instruments namely questionnaire consisting of both closed and open ended items, structured interview were used. Descriptive approach such as stander deviation and mean score were utilized to analyze the data. The qualitative data obtained through interview was analyzed. The finding revealed that the extent in developing collaboration for school improvement are not effective due to insufficient participation of parents in their children education, low motivation of students to learn and to do their homework, teachers are not motivated to motivate students, irrelevant curriculum, and low level of parents income hinder leading schools improvement. The conclusion indicated stakeholders are not performing their duty to lead the Schools improvements as expected responsibility. Finally, based on the finding the recommendations were made in the areas of school leaders should motivated by in service training to take responsibility, school leaders should change strategic plan to action, the government and school leaders should prepare in-service training to motivate teachers, Government should take responsibility to hire graduates, and stakeholders should work to enhance students disciplinary issues enhance Leading Schools improvement: Practices, and Challenges Government primary schools in jimma zone.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with background of the study, statement of the problem, research question, objectives of the study, significance of the study, delimitations of the study, definitions key terms and organization of the study.

1.1Background of the Study

The skills individuals need for success in the 21st century are vastly different from those needed in the past. Our education system must evolve in order to prepare students for the changing world in which they will live and work. School reform begins with a desire by some and at least a willingness of others to be led. The administrators and staff in the most successful schools embrace change as exciting and challenging rather than intimidating and threatening. These educators seem to understand that schools today need to be updated in order to keep pace with a changing society and economy. As way of peoples living pattern changes schools way of preparing students for the future life should be related, (Daggett, and Jones, 2014).

In this 21st century, schools and education systems continue to be challenged by the rate and intensity of change, largely driven by technology and its impact on the learning environment (Tonkin, 2016). To meet the increasing expectation by students, families, communities and government and to overcome the challenges as well as to bring the intended outcome schools should introduce a new way of leading schools. Ethiopia education system was never designed to deliver the results which are now needed to equip students for their future, or even today. The reason leading school change is to ensure the achievement of organization goal with less cost.

The purpose of leadership and management development is to ensure the development of the most appropriate style of leadership and achieving a universal level of best practice… A range of more inclusive models of leadership are now emerging which argue for quieter, less dramatic leadership at all levels within the organization (Exeter University 2005:4and5).

Change is not about simply adopting best practices, but rather about creating a culture that recognizes strengths and weaknesses, encourages innovation and initiative, and adapts best Practices and ideas from others. The nature of change is that it must be unique to local needs,

Forgong through consensus, and built upon the unique strengths of each school. There is no one single solution to improving our schools. A combination of strategies is necessary to achieve a new vision of learning. The goal is not to make every school the same, but to enable each school to construct its own solutions (Daggett, and Jones, 2014:2). The role of school principals is central in the success or failure of the school system at school level, and it plays an important role in school improvement programs in the areas of managing resources, support staff and teachers for improving student achievement (Mpoksa&Ndaruhutse, 2008). Implementing School Improvement Program (SIP), which is of way to leading school for improvement is as indicated in school improvement guide line shows that it will enable to improve the teaching process by systematically increasing the competency, efficiency and motivation of teachers and developing strong harmony by exchanging experiences and the pragmatic practical training.

Leading school improvement also increases students for education and improving the necessary resources for education and to create suitable condition for learning. Furthermore, it increases the participation of parents and community and their feeling of responsibility by increasing their awareness regarding education and it provides quality of education by providing the necessary resources through the coordination of the community, non-governmental organizations, humanitarian agencies and religious organizations (MoE, 2006).

1.2 Statements of the problems

In the year 2007 the MoE introduced the General Education Quality Assurance Package to the education system of our country. The package consists of different programs. The school improvement program is one of the components in the package. The program has got four domains. Namely: parent-community and school relations, Teaching and Learning, school Leadership and Administration and Crating Conducive Teaching and Learning Environment. Now a day the SIP is being implemented in all schools of the country. There are however always expected challenges, whenever new programs such as SIP are being introduced and implemented. These challenges may stem from different sources. First of all, the fact that new insights fail to get put in to practice because they conflict with deeply held internal images of how the world works, images that limit us familiar ways of thinking and acting can be the major one. Resisting change can be considered as the nature of human being which appears that, no one is free from. Neither noted scientists nor students playing on school play grounds (Senge in Carlson, 1996).

Secondly, in poor countries there are financial, social, and technical constraints that put forward undesired influence towards the implementation of new programs. In Ethiopia too the presence of such constrains is inevitable, hence affect the implementation of SIP.

Documents of the FDRE Ministry of Information revealed that Ethiopia is suffering from problem of implementation capacity in all sectors, public or private. The education sector as a part of the larger government machinery is also expected to face such problems. These problems might impede the implementation of projects and programs in the sector. The Jimma zone administration as part of governmental structure cannot be free from such implementation capacity problems. Hence, the implementation of SIP in the schools of the jimma zone faces several challenges. The researchers own experience too reveals that, there were several problems that have been affected the implementation of SIP in the zone. Despite those factors discussed above, there were no enough studies conducted on the area of SIP because of the novelty of the case. Even though these studies are considered to give insights on the practice and challenges of implementing SIP, the solutions recommended by the studies may not be feasible for all localities, because solutions for the same problems lies in different cultural, political, social and economic forces. In this regard Sodhi, described as follows:

The national systems of education are just like national experimental laboratories dealing with similar problems. The solution of these problems lies in different nations in cultural condition, current political and social aims, and economic forces. ...So for the solution of these problems it becomes necessary to understand these traditions, forces and objectives that work behind the education scene (1983:9).

The above explanation of Sodhi justifies the importance of studying the same problems, even within a given nation differently. In lights of the above discussion it becomes more important to assess how the school improvement program is actually being implemented and to identify factors that impede school improvement activities in primary schools in Jimma city cultural, political, social and economic contexts. On the basis of this, the study was designed to answer the following basic questions:

In this regard, from the researcher experience point of view and report of educational meeting and workshop conducted at Woreda and regional level shows that in many primary schools, the problem of leading school improvement is highly exhibited. From these primary schools, primary schools of jimma Zone are prominently visible and could be mentioned as an example. However, to the knowledge of the researcher, there was no research conducted on the practices and challenges of leading school for improvement in primary school of jimma Zone. This study, was designed to assess practices and challenges of leading school for improvement in primary school of jimma Zone. To guide the study, the following research questions were formulated and would be addressed on the study.

1. To what extent are primary school principals effective in developing collaboration for School improvement?
2. To what extent do primary school principal's professionally prepared to develop collaboration for school improvement?
3. What are the factors that affected school improvement practices in primary schools of jimma zone?

1.3 Objectives of the study

1.3.1 General Objective

The general objective of this study was to assess practices and challenges of leading school improvement in primary Schools of jimma Zone

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

- To examine the extent of staff collaboration in Schools improvement
- To assess professional preparation of school principal to develop collaboration for school improvement program in selected primary school of jimma zone?
- To point out those factors that affected school improvement practices in primary schools of jimma zone?

1.4 Significance of the Study

In the educational world at present time there is a rent less change at both school and system level (Telford, 199). Hence, if schools to remain as competent as possible in such dynamic world, they need to improve the quality of their outcomes. In the educational systems where school improvement program was being implemented it was useful to study how the program was being implemented.

And identifying those major factors that affected the implementation of the program. On the basis of this, the researcher believes that the study will have the following importance.

1. It may provide with information for educational officials and primary school principals on how SIP activities are being implemented in the primary schools.

2. In might enable educational officials and school principals to identify the weaknesses and strengths observed in implementing SIP and in turn to take corrective measures.

3. It might provide educational official and principals an insight on the solutions for prevailing problems.

4. It might serve OEB as a basis in its attempt of getting best out of the implementation of SIP.

5. It might also serve as a basis for other researchers in conducting scientific inquiry on the area under investigation.

1.5 Delimitation of the Study

This study would be delimited to assessing the practices and challenges of leading school improvement in primary Schools of jimma Zone. It gives due emphasis on assessing the extent of school leaders does strive to enhance leading school for improvement in primary schools of jimma zone, it investigates that the major activities of school improvement program are implemented in primary schools, and explore the major factors that affect practices of leading school for improvement in primary schools of jimma zone. In connection to this, there were 21Woredas in jimma zone. The issue of geographical features and more resemblance of school shave been taken in to consideration and three woredas were incorporated in the sample study by using cluster sampling techniques. The selected woredas are Gera Woreda, Satema Woreda, and Gumay Woreda. In the same fashion, simple random sampling techniques were employed in woredas to select the sample primary schools.The selected schools are, Tobba primary school, Yachi primary school, Hawisa primary school, Yukuro primary school,Gera primary school, Gicho primary school, satema primary school, kecha primary school and gatira primary school were sampled schools.

1.6 Definitions of key terms

For the purpose of this study, the following terms are defined in an attempt to assist the reader in understanding key concepts:

Educational office –the woreda education office and responsible for leading and managing overall educational activities in the woreda (MoE;2002).

Jimma – A historical city found in the West Oromiya, 346km far from the capital of Ethiopia, Addis Ababa-Finfinnee. The city has its own council which is organized with the direct election of city dwellers(Jimma:2009)

Primary school – Schools found in the city whose grade ranging from grade 1 to 8 and run by the government (MoE: 2002).

Principals – people who are responsible for leading primary school through planning, directing, organizing, evaluating and etc(MoE: 2002).

Program – A SIP that is being implemented.

SIP – A program which was launched by MoE in the education system of Ethiopia and being implemented in primary school having four different domains(MoE;2007).

Teachers – Qualified personnel who are engaged in the facilitation of students' learning in primary schools(MoE;2002).

School leaders: - Refers to instructional leaders namely: supervisors, principals, department heads, unit leaders and senior teachers that take part in the leadership of teaching learning and management (Sergiovanni, 2001)

1.7 Organization of the Study

This study was 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, delimitation of the study and definition of key terms. The second chapter was presented a review of relevant literatures. Chapter three was presented research design and methodology including the sources of data, the study population, sample size and sampling technique, instrument of data collection, validity and reliability of the instrument, data collection procedures, methods of data analysis and ethical consideration. The fourth chapter deals with presentation, analysis and interpretation of the gathered data. The fifth chapter was dealt with summary, conclusions and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURES

2.1 Overview of change

The literature in the areas of the concept and meaning of change, characteristics and types of change, change in education, change in school, principal role in leading change and reform and effectiveness in leading change and reform in school form the basis of this literature review. The section on leading school change focuses on the role of leaders and specific behaviors needed to facilitate successful school improvement. The last Part presents Challenges of school reform

Many educators defined change in different ways (Spiro, 2009) defined change as doing things Other than usual ways and situations. “Change means something different from the current state, a departure from the status quo. Change involves going from one situation to another a period Of transition. It is a continuous process. Therefore, change can best be considered as series of Destinations that lead to further destinations. In this way, a leader can benchmark goals and Indicators of success at various intervals and make course corrections as needed“”. Yukl, (2010) Explained leading change as the main role of the leader, base of leadership, and the primary task of the leader in a given organization. He also emphasized that adaptation of the resistant also important role of the leader. Leading change is one of the most important and difficult leadership Responsibilities. For some theorists, it is the essence of leadership and everything else is secondary. Effective leadership is needed to revitalize an organization and facilitate adaptation to a changing environment.

(Mecca, 2004), also defined change as performing activities in different state from present to next. A change is a shift in some condition or situation from its present state to a new and different state. A change can range from minor shifts in procedures or technology to a Revolutionary shift in roles within a society. It is often used to refer both to a shift that occurs in the organization’s external environment, as well as the changes that occur inside of the Organization in response to shifts in its external environment.

Educators have long been aware of the challenges, but have not been successful in overcoming them. In order to respond to current educational challenges school leaders must understand how to lead change in schools. By improving the learning capacity of school’s leaders can deal with change dynamics. Schools will need to become places where groups and individuals continuously engage in new learning processes.

Without combined efforts of both principal and district leadership practices focused on successful implementation of change, school-based reform is not likely to be widespread or lasting (DuFour&Eaker, 2002; Feist, 2003; Schwandt& Marquardt, 2000).

2.2 Understanding Change

Waters and Cameron (2007) argued that effective change leadership requires a fundamental understanding of the change process, which is dynamic and complex. The literature included in this section forms a framework offered by recognized authors of leading change in business and educational contexts, grounded in theories of human behavior from change psychology, learning theory, and anthropology.

2.3 What Is Change?

Change is a construct that is frequently described with a set of assumptions that are rooted in cultural, social, ideological, and personal histories (Sayles, 2002). Change has been defined as an event that occurs when something passes from one state or phase to another, or when something is altered or made different. Change has been described as a process through which people move as they gradually come to understand and become skilled and competent in the use of new ways (Hall &Hord, 2006). When change occurs something ends and something new or different begins. This usually involves moving from the familiar to the unknown, letting go of the old and embracing the new. Most people have a strong psychological response to this process. One of the strongest responses can be a feeling of loss, along with the struggle to accept and become familiar with a new direction. Even when change is positive it is not uncommon for a person to feel an ending or loss associated with it (Sayles, 2002). Conner (2006) argued that the human need for control has a powerful influence on how people perceive and react to change. Change is considered major when it is perceived to be so by those affected. Major change is the result of significant disruption in established expectations. This occurs when people believe they have lost control over some important aspect of their lives or environment. People have a sense of control over their lives when their expectations are matched with their perceptions of reality. Whether the outcomes and events are positive or negative, people tend to feel more in control when they have predicted the outcome and are not surprised by it. Conner further contended that the human need for control can be met by planning for or at least anticipating the future. People then have specific expectations that are established based on what can be planned or anticipated.

There are two possible outcomes when life changes: (a) perceived reality matches expectations, a sense of control is achieved, and there is equilibrium or (b) perceived reality does not match expectations, a feeling of control is lost, and people must adjust to the changes they were unprepared to face (Conner, 2006; Kelly & Hoops, 2004).

The idea that human beings naturally resist change is deeply embedded in thinking about change. The language (e.g., "resistance to change"), assumptions, and mental models about change all seem to imply that something in human nature leads people to resist change. However, it is easy to find examples of human beings, from childhood through old age, actively seeking out change of all sorts. When people have not sought change themselves, but rather are having changes imposed on them, they are more likely to be resistant due to the need to feel in control of their lives (Bridges, 2003). According to Zell (2003) deeply felt experiences associated with change such as shock, anger, helplessness, and depression have been ignored by theorists of organizational change and are mistakenly labeled resistance to change.

The difficulty of overcoming resistance to change may be the reason why efforts to bring about change in professional bureaucracies such as universities, hospitals, and school systems are usually described as slow, messy, and often unsuccessful (Zell). The constant changes of life, whether planned or unplanned, are difficult for most people because of loss and uncertainty associated with ending the old and beginning the new. Planned purposeful change involves a commitment to renew and learn. Unplanned change is often unaccompanied by a desire or commitment to change and can mimic the grief process (Kubler-Ross & Kessler, 2005).

2.4 Why Change?

There are many reasons people change. The first is fundamentally connected to our very being. We change physically, we age, we accumulate experiences, and we participate in a variety of roles throughout our lives. We also are influenced by the changes around us. Society changes, as do families, cultures, even expectations of gender. As these changes occur we are forced to learn to adapt and evolve to respond to the new context. Some change is sudden and unexpected. These changes are often the hardest to assimilate especially when they involve a loss—of a loved one, a job, or even our freedom (O'Connor &Fiol, 2006). Other change is planned in our attempts to improve our lives and ourselves. The changes we

seek are often based on inspiration: we seek improvement with our health, relationships, appearance, community, and profession; or desperation: we want to stop a negative behavior such as smoking, overeating, drinking, being abusive, or worrying, and replace it with a new behavior (Prochaska& Norcross, 2001, 2002).

According to Knowles (2005), there are at least six factors that tend to motivate adults to learn and change: (a) to meet a need for associations and friendships, (b) to fulfill the expectations or recommendations of someone with authority, (c) to prepare for service to the community and improve one's ability to participate in community work, (d) for personal advancement to achieve higher status in a job, secure professional advancement, and to stay ahead of the competition, (e) to relieve boredom, provide a break in the routine of home or work, and (f) to learn for the sake of learning, seek knowledge for its own sake and satisfy an inquiring mind.

2.5 What are the Stages of Change?

The process of change typically unfolds in a manner that can be recognized and predicted. The process has been described by many and generally has three main stages in common: status quo, transition/chaos, and new status quo. Variations on the process are determined by the type of change and the individual's involvement or reaction to the change. The literature primarily deals with change that is unexpected and unavoidable and that causes a significant loss to an individual. These changes are often unpleasant such as the death of a loved one, or the loss of a marriage or a job. There is much to learn about the ways humans react and adjust to this type of change. An overview of the stages of change follows. Status quo describes the period of time before the possibility of a change event is introduced to the individual. This time is marked by stability and lives are familiar, predictable and secure (Habar, 2002).

The individual is not aware of a need to change or that anything may be wrong. In the transition/chaos stage there are several phases that most people experience. According to Sayles (2002), when change occurs the status quo is forever disrupted by the introduction of a foreign element. This foreign element can be positive (promotion) or negative (demotion). It can also be an idea that one has chosen or been advised to consider in an effort to improve the current situation (e.g., the need to learn a new skill).

When the foreign element is something shocking and unexpected people often react by thinking “this can’t be happening to me.” During this stage people instinctively react with denial and disbelief.

Kubler-Ross and Kessler (2005) observed denial as the first stage in the process by which people deal with grief and tragedy, particularly when diagnosed with terminal illness. Longaker (1998) noted similar stages through work with families facing the loss of a loved one. People tend to feel numb and confused during this stage. DiClemente and Prochaska worked with people struggling to overcome alcoholism and contended that in the precontemplation stage people are often unable to acknowledge that a problem exists. This is also described as being in “denial” (DiClemente, 2006). Bridges (2003) connected processes in this stage to work-related transitions. After a professional career and location change he found himself more upset and confused than he had anticipated he would have been and began to question if he had made a bad decision and should go back to his previous situation. He argued that a common error in managing change at work is underestimating the affect it has on individual people.

Denial at work is often characterized by a complete lack of response, concern or reaction to an announced change. Business continues as usual until resistance and bargaining behaviors begin to emerge. Sayles (2002) explained that as people move through the numbness of denial they begin to resist the change and begin to experience self-doubt, anger, depression, anxiety, frustration, fear, or uncertainty. More often than not at the heart of resistance to change is a very powerful emotion: fear of being inadequate to the new demands, of failing and suffering humiliation, of being seen as inept or weak, or, if in a position of authority, of having that power and status diminished. Resistance is also characterized by anger: “Why me? It’s not fair,” and bargaining “Please just give me one more chance.” Finally, when one becomes convinced that resistance is having no impact on the new element or change (the old way of work is gone forever) a deep awareness and understanding of the situation becomes clear. Depression, sorrow, and sadness often occur in response to reality (Bridges, 2003; Kubler-Ross & Kessler, 2005). During the chaos stage, people have a strong sense of urgency and a plethora of strong emotions. They have a wide variety of ideas, rational and irrational, of what can be done to address the foreign element.

Behaviors, feelings, and performance vary and are constantly changing. The stress found in chaos is necessary to motivate people to make sense of what is going on and figure out how to respond to the change. Chaos can be a creative time, but often the urgency and stress overpower the sense of creativity (Sayles, 2002). Habar (2002) described transformation as the time when a transforming idea emerges out of the chaos. This idea helps to make sense of the foreign object, or at least manage it. This is the idea that gives a new understanding of what to do and to begin to see a way out of the chaos. Next, in the integration stage one begins to try the new idea or behavior. Progress is rapid as people learn what works and what does not and become more skilled and hopeful.

Performance improves, often to levels higher than before the foreign element was introduced. This stage can be one of the most challenging because it involves learning new behaviors that will replace old behaviors (Bridges, 2003). Finally, after moving through the transition or chaos stage a new status quo begins to be defined. In this stage equilibrium is being reestablished, new skills become second nature and learning transforms into assumptions and expectations. Ultimately the new status quo becomes *the* status quo (Habar, 2002). This stage has also been described as the "new normal."

2.6 What is educational change?

Educational change aims at school improvement in one way or another. School improvement is closely linked to the professional development of principals and teachers (Postholm, 2012; Timperley, 2008; Timperley, Wilson, Barrar& Fung, 2007). The ultimate goal for school improvement is the improvement of student learning, learning conditions and/or learning processes (Hargreaves, Lieberman, Fullan& Hopkins, 1998). In the literature, the term 'student achievement' is commonly used, but in this article, 'improvement of the education of students' is preferred, since it better captures the more complex and broader picture of educational instruction than do 'learning' or 'student achievement', as also pointed out by Biesta (2010). The term 'student achievement' is, at least in a Nordic context, often associated with competence aims in the various subject curricula, or how students perform on tests.

2.7 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.

2.7.1. Managerial Leadership

Leithwoodet 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 priorities the efficient implementation of external imperatives, notably those prescribed by higher levels within the bureaucratic hierarchy.

2.7.2. 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 (Leithwoodet et al., cited in Bus. 2007). Leithwood 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).

2.7.3. 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 stuff 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.

2.7.4. 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).

Additionally, Bass (1998) argued that transactional leaders are motivated by what is easily identifiable and measurable. Transactional leaders are more reactive than proactive; less creative, novel, and innovative; more reforming and conservative; and more inhibited in their research for solutions.

Yukl (1999) also identified that transactional leadership includes a diverse collection of mostly ineffective leader behavior that lack any clear common denominator.

2.7.5. 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.

2.7.6. 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 (Leithwoodet al., cited in Bush, 2007).

2. 8 Collaboration

According to Lockhart-Wood (2000) the collaborative process can have four stages which includes: the first stage is the planning or design phase, in which the collaboration is established and the goals and reasons are defined for collaboration and conform on, and then the collaborative effort is designed, this is stage is also known as forming stage. The second stage is referred as the information or data-gathering phase, which is typically an important phase in collaboration, which also known to be the storming phase where the members of the team develops rapport among each other, roles are assigned, leadership is defined and commitments are negotiated.

The third stage is defined as the analytical or processing stage where the data and information are analyzed and then processed for defining the collaboration. This stage is named as the norming stage. The last stage is named as the implementation and execution stage where the collaboration moves to motion the outcomes of all the previous stages. This stage is known as performing stage.

2.8.1 Social System

Surgenor, Blike, and Corwin (2003) stated that these are the parts of source of distinction between powers that can be existed between each expert within the team and all of these factors persuade on how collaborative practice develops. The equality between each team member is one of the significant characteristics of the mutual practice. When there is a distinction of power based in gender stereotypes and the differences among the status of the team members, these are the important barriers to the collaboration among team members. Wang et al. (2009) carried out a study on a medical team, considered the power differences as one of the significant factors, where due the unevenness between the power of nurses and doctors, and found that nurses considered power inconsistency as one of the factor preventing their collaboration with physician. This situation can take place for any team as well.

2.8.2 Cultural System

There can be an impact of cultural values on the development of collaboration among team members. (Erchul, 1992) stated that some cultures may have harbor strong cultural values that run counter to the spirit of collaboration.

2.8.3 Professional System

According to the Horsburgh, Lamdin, and Williamson (2001), there is a significant effect of a professional system on the collaboration of team members because it encourages the perspective that is in direct opposition to the logic for collaboration.

2.8.4 Educational system

Ezzamel and Willmott (1998) stated that there is an equal important need for educational system that generates knowledge to the learners to recognize the values and responsibilities of their respective profession. For which some of the authors suggested the inter-professional programs such as (Jackson, Chuang, Harden, Jiang, & Joseph, 2006).

This program will be helpful to all of the learners to promote awareness, sharing and the integration of their knowledge and practices.

2.8.5 Organizational Determinants

The collaboration among team members requires a favorable organizational arrangement. These determinants define the environment in which the team works such as the structure of the team and its philosophy; the resources assigned to the team, leadership, as the communication and communication mechanisms. Dunin-Keplicz and Verbrugge (2011) stated that the collaborative practice is highly influenced by the organizational structure. Some of the authors suggested that the professional teams to be successful must shift from traditional organization structure to the horizontal one. According to Churchman (1971), the traditional structures in the organization do not support the emergence of key conditions for collaboration, for instance shared decision making and direct communication. Flat and decentralized structure more facilitates the importance of teamwork and encourages the shared decision making, thus foster the collaborative practice.

2.8.6 Organization's Philosophy

The literature reviewed elaborated that the philosophy of the organization has an impact on the degree of collaboration. The philosophy of the organization must support the collaborative practices among the members of team. For example, an organization's philosophy that values contribution, fairness, freedom of expression and interdependence is needed to collaborate for members within a team. The atmosphere of openness, risk taking, integrity and trust fosters collaborative attitudes within the members of the team. (Dunin-Keplicz&Verbrugge, 2011); Risser et al. (1999)

2.8.7 Administrative Support

The collaboration among professionals requires an administrative support (Le Pine, Hanson, Borman, &Motowidlo, 2000). There is need of a leader who has knowledge of how to convey the new vision of collaborative practice in the development of the collaboration among team members. The leaders are required to foster the collaborative practice, those who motivate professionals to take up the practice (Makary et al., 2006). The leaders are required who are able to create an organizational arrangement that encourages the collaboration (Risser et al., 1999). McCulloch et al. (2009) highlighted the essentials of the leadership in collaboration development in teams.

2.9 What Skills and Knowledge Do Leaders Need to Facilitate Change?

Successful implementation of change in organizations requires a wide range of leadership behaviors. Some of the behaviors involve political and administrative aspects, and others involve motivating, supporting, and guiding people. Even the people who initially endorse a change will need support and assistance to sustain their enthusiasm and optimism as the inevitable difficulties and setbacks occur. Major change is always stressful and painful for people, especially when it involves a prolonged transition period of adjustment, disruption, and dislocation.

The following guidelines describe current thinking about the best way to implement a major change in an organization are; Create a sense of urgency about the need for change, communicate a clear vision of the benefits to be gained, identify people whose support is essential and any likely resistance, build a broad coalition to support the change, Fill key positions with competent change agents, Use task forces to guide the implementation of changes,

Make dramatic, symbolic changes that affect the work, prepare people for change by explaining how it will affect them, help people deal with the stress and difficulties of major change, provide opportunities for early successes to build confidence, Monitor the progress of change and make any necessary adjustments, Keep people informed about the progress of change, Demonstrate continued optimism and commitment to the change (Yukl, 2010).

2.10 Effective Leadership Theories for Today's Principals

Early forms of effective principal leadership focused on the principal's ability to manage school processes and procedures related to instruction and supervision. However, when considering the recent movements in education and changes in society it is understandable why principals must retool and acquire new knowledge and skills. Considering recent research there appears to be general agreement between researchers and practitioners that there are several leadership styles a principal could use to effectively lead today's educational organizations. However, the most effective leadership style would require less command and control, more learning and leading, less dictating, and more orchestrating (Dufour&Eaker, 1998).

In fact, more recently effective principals have been viewed as transformational leaders that focus on establishing a vision and utilizing leadership skills such as innovation, influence and consideration for the individual in the school improvement process (Walters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2004). Connelly and Goldman state, "initially transformational leadership was viewed as a personal quality or ability to inspire employees to look beyond self-interest and focus on organizational goals" (as cited in Lashway 1995). However, as leadership theories have continued to be researched another form of transformational leadership has evolved termed "Facilitative Leadership". Facilitative leadership is defined as "the behaviors that enhance the collective ability of a school leaders to adapt, solve problems, and improve performance" (Connely& Goldman, 1994).

In this style, the facilitator's role is to foster the involvement of employees at all levels. In other words, a leader should create a school culture that promotes collaboration, involvement, and empowerment of teachers and the school community. In contrast, any form of leadership that focuses on manipulating teachers and school culture to reach a personal vision or agenda will only create a climate and culture that detracts from the district's vision. Stolp (1994) contends, "Healthy and sound school cultures correlate strongly with increased student achievement, motivation, and with teacher productivity and satisfaction" Although much of the current research indicates that the most effective form of leadership reflects transformational or facilitative approaches, most would caution any educational leader who attempted to focus solely on one leadership style.

Thomas Sergiovanni (1994) suggests that organizations, like people, exist at different developmental levels. A school that has traditionally operated with strong top-down decision-making may not be ready to jump into a facilitative environment. In this type of environment, a leader may choose to wear two types of hats- leader and administrator (Starratt 1995). As leaders, principals should not only foster the vision that expresses the school's values but also develop the structure and policies that provide support for the vision. Lashway (1996) adds, "In short running a school does not seem to require all-or nothing strategic choices. Effective leadership is multidimensional". Based on this research, it appears an effective principal's leadership style should incorporate facilitative or transformational models. However, the ability to choose or blend appropriate leadership theories and strategies seems to be an essential part of effective principal leadership.

Leadership Constructs Effective principals must not only consider appropriate leadership theories and styles to shape their intentions and actions, they must also possess essential knowledge and skills in the context of education reform in order to be effective in a school setting. For example, effective principals must have an extensive knowledge base in the area of school improvement and the skills to effectively implement the initiatives. Based on various models of effective leadership and without disregard to other aspects of good leadership, an effective instructional leadership model would include the following competencies: establishing a shared vision, communicating the vision, creating a collaborative culture and empowering others.

2.11 Challenges to School Improvement Program

Challenges to the school improvement may vary in accordance with the variations with the unique features of schools as well as with the external environment in which schools are operating. One simple example, the size of the school is associated with innovative behavior for that smaller schools apparently lack the resources to engage in significant change (Hussen and Postethwore,1994).

However, there are common challenges that most school improvement programs face. These are lack of schedules in schools that permit teachers to meet and work together for sustained periods of time; the demanding nature of teachers' work as an increasing number of students arrive at school less well-socialized, less prepared to deal with materials, and more frequently from family settings that are not supportive; the aging and often demoralization of teachers due to declining resources, increasing levels of bureaucratization and the rapid and frequent demands for change that come from central authorities. In addition, an organizational structure with in which teachers' work is less autonomous and more integrated with that of other teachers' affects the development of commitment to change. Moreover, the continues transfer of teachers, principals and educational administrators at the local level puts pressure on the program to continuously train new staff who may not serve in schools for long (Plan Sudan, 2006).

2.12 Summary of the Chapter

From the above discussion on theoretical and empirical literature one can identify the following important key lessons regarding Practice, and Challenges of Change to lead the Ethiopia education system. The concept of change, the involvement of stakeholders in schools change, the qualities of leaders, and the way organization can learn change; the steps of change, areas of change, phases of change, inputs for schools change, and challenges of change are primary schools in developing countries are less explored in the literature. For instance, in Ethiopia their little investigation is conducted to examine leading primary schools for school improvement, therefore, the Practice, and Challenges of Government Primary Schools jimma zone was investigated to fill the gap.

CHAPTER THREE: THE RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

In the empirical investigation, the study followed a mixed-methods approach. The basic Assumption is that the uses of both quantitative and qualitative methods, in combination, provide a better understanding of the research problem and question than either method by itself. It is a good design to use if you seek to build on the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative data. A quantitative approach is structured in nature, and the data are interpreted in statistical form, using questionnaires. In quantitative research, the investigator identifies a research problem based on trends in the field or on the need to explain why something occurs (Creswell, 2012:13). This implies that both quantitative and qualitative approaches of gathering and analyzing data Were used.

A rationale for combination of qualitative and quantitative research methods was that both approaches provide for cross-validation or triangulation of combining three sources of data to study the same phenomena in order to gain a more complete understanding of that phenomenon (interdependence of research methods) and they also provide for the achievement of complementary results by using the strengths of one method to enhance the other (Weitzman &Lohfeld, 2009).The method also combines and reinforces the strengths of each approaches and providing strong bases for conclusions and discussions based on findings (Creswell, 2003).

3.2 The Research Methodology.

The descriptive survey method is used in this research as mentioned by (Seyoum and Ayalew 1989) cited by Adugna, (2014) descriptive survey method becomes useful when the purpose of the research is to picture the current situations. It also allows collection of the data using tools and documentary analysis, describes and interprets what it is. It is concerned with conditions or relationship that exists, opinions that are held, processes that are going on, effects that are evident, or trend that are developing. Basically survey method helps to obtain firsthand information from small samples representing large size population and also enables researcher to have access to multiple methods of collecting information). Survey design 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 events (Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, 2007) ".

Thus to achieve this purpose descriptive survey design was used. The major purpose of this study was to assess the practices and challenges of Leading School Change focused on Government Primary Schools of jimma zone.

3.3. Sources of Data

In this study, primary data sources will be employed to obtain reliable information about primary school principal effectiveness in leading change in Jimma Zone. Primary sources of data included the key informants for information such as supervisors, principals and vice principals and teachers who have direct and indirect involvement in leadership roles at least at school level.

3.4. Population, Sample size and Sampling Techniques

3.4.1. Population

The geographical setting of this research was jimma zone primary Schools. It is unmanageable to include all the population (teachers vice principals, principals and supervisor) in the study. Therefore, it was necessary to determine and identify number of respondents that would serve as representative sample to generalize the findings of the study. To make valid inferences about the population, we must select the sample to that it is representative of the total population. Singh (2007) on his side agreed that, "the concept of sampling has been introduced with a view to making the research findings economical and accurate."

3.4.2. Sample size and Sampling

There are twenty-one in jimma zone. Three woreda were taken by geographical cluster sampling because the researcher believed that the schools are closer to him and suitable to get detailed information. The three sub-cities were Gumay, Gera, and Gatira. Regarding cluster sampling, (Kothari, 2004), "If the total area of interest happens to be a big one, a convenient way in which a sample can be taken is to divide the area into a number of smaller non-overlapping areas and then to randomly select a number of these smaller areas (usually called clusters), with the ultimate sample consisting of all (or samples of) units in these small areas or clusters"„. There are eighty-nine Government Primary Schools in three woreda.

The researcher selected three schools from each woreda using systematic random sampling method. Nine schools selected together. According to (Cohen, Manion, and Morrison 2007), systematic random involves selecting subjects from a population list in a systematic rather Than a random fashion. One can decide how frequently to make systematic sampling by a simple Statistic – the total number of the wider population being represented divided by the sample size required.

The teachers and department head those who were found in the nine Schools were selected by random sampling(lottery) method. According to, Lawrence, and Morrison, (2007) „„the method involves selecting at random from a list of the populations (a sampling frame) the required number of subjects for the sample. This can be done by drawing names teachers out of a container until the required number is reached"". By the systematic random method from Gumay woreda–Tobba primary school with 45 (20%) teachers,1(100%)principal,1(100%) Vice principal,4(50%)departmenthead,1(100) unitleader and yachi 32(21%)teachers, 1(100%)principal,1(100%) Vice principal,4(50%)department head,1(100) unit leader and Hawisa primary school with 30 (23%) teachers,1(100%)principal,1(100%) Vice principal,4(50%)department head,1(100) unit leader and 2(100%)Cluster supervisors and Gera woreda–Yukuro primary school with 36 (22%) teachers,1(100%)principal,1(100%) Vice principal,4(50%)department head,1(100) unit leader and Gera 46(21.7%)teachers, 1(100%)principal,1(100%) Vice principal,4(50%)department head,1(100) unit leader and Gicho primary school with 25 (24%) teachers,1(100%)principal,1(100%) Vice principal,4(50%)department head,1(100) unit leader and 3(100%)Cluster supervisors and Gatira woreda–Gatira primary school with 44 (22.7%) teachers,1(100%)principal,1(100%) Vice principal,4(50%)department head,1(100) unit leader and Kecha 27(22.2%)teachers, 1(100%)principal,1(100%) Vice principal,4(50%)department head,1(100) unit leader and Setema primary school with 35(20%) teachers,1(100%)principal,1(100%)

Viceprincipal,4(50%)department head,1(100%) unit leader and 2(100%)Cluster supervisors.

Teacher and department head were selected randomly and others are purposively selected. The total numbers of teachers" in these sample schools were 320 teachers and the selected teachers" the researcher planned to distribute open ended and closed ended questions. From the total population the sample frame is 70(21%) of the population and from each school 21% is taken from total teachers and 52 (69%)of the population 69% is taken from total leaders.

The researcher was prepared interview for cluster supervisors and focused group discussion for one principal, vice principal and two teachers respectively in 3 sample schools. In sampled woreda 4 supervisors were selected for interview.

Table 3. 1. Population and Sample of the Study Area

NO	Type of Respondents	Target Population	Sample size	% of the sample	SamplingTechniques
1	Woreda	21	3	14%	Cluster sampling
2	School	83	9	10%	Simple random sampling
3	Teachers	320	70	22%	Simple random sampling
4	Principals	9	9	100%	Purposive
5	Supervisors	7	7	100%	Purposive
6	Vic principals	9	9	100%	Purposive
7	Department head	36	18	50%	Simple random sampling
8	Unit leader	9	9	100%	Purposive

3.5 Instruments of data collection

For the purpose of this study, data collection instruments would be questionnaires, interviews and Focus group discussion in the samples selected primary schools of Jimma Zone. Consistent with the notion that the methods and instruments chosen depend largely on the extent to which they could serve the purpose of the study, and address the research questions posed (Siedman, 1991), questionnaires, interviews and focus group discussion proved to be appropriate instruments for data collection.

3.5.1 Questionnaire

The purpose of this study, data collection instrument was Likert type of questionnaire in the for samples selected schools. Consistent with the notion that the methods and instruments were choose depend largely on the extent to which they could serve the purpose of the study, and address the research questions posed (Kumar, 2005), questionnaire were proved to be appropriate instrument for data collection in this study. In an attempt to collect data, Likert type of questionnaire were prepared by the researcher and used as a main source of data gathering instrument.

Questionnaire is less expensive, offer greater anonymity of respondents, and appropriate for collecting factual information (Kumar, 2005). These justifications made questionnaire more appropriate for this study. Close-ended questionnaire will be prepared to collect information from two groups of respondents namely teachers and school leaders (department heads, unit leaders, vice principals and principals). The items will be prepared in accordance with the designed objectives and research questions will be answer in the study.

3.5.2 Interviews

It is method in that it involves the gathering of data through direct verbal interaction between individuals. In this sense it differs from the questionnaire where the respondent is required to record in some way his/her responses to set questions (Cohen, L, Manion, L and Morrison, K.2007.351). Due to this, in this study, structured interview was prepared for the 4 cluster super. The interview consists of 8 questions prepared by English medium

3.5.3 Focus Group Discussion

According to Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, (2007: 376), focus group discussion made by a panel respondents led by a moderator. The moderator should be equipped with sufficient skill so that he/she can maintain a high degree of interaction among group members in all sample schools. Focus groups are contrived settings, bringing together specifically chosen sector of the population to discuss a particular given theme or topic, where the interaction with the group leads to data and outcomes‟‟‟‟. The FGDs 12 questions were prepared by structurally for 1 principal, vice principal and 2 teachers.

3.6 Validity and Reliability of the Instruments

Checking the validity and reliability of data collecting instruments before providing for the actual study subject is the core to assure the quality of the data. To ensure validity of instruments, the instruments were developed under close guidance of the advisors and also a pilot study was carried out in dake primary School which was not included in the sample of the study. It was administered to selected respondents of six school leaders (one vice principal, one-unit leader and four department heads) and 10 teachers. The pilot test provides an advance opportunity for the investigator to check the questionnaires and to minimize errors due to improper design of instruments, such as problems of wording or sequence (Adams et al., 2007).

The pilot-test was conducted to test the validity and reliability of the content. It was done with objectives of checking whether or not the items included in the instruments could enable the researcher to obtain the relevant information and to identify and eliminate problems in collecting data from the target population. Before conducting the pilot-test, respondents were oriented about the objectives of the pilot-study, how to fill out the items, evaluate and give feedback regarding the relevant items. To this end, draft questionnaires were distributed and filled out by the population selected for the pilot study. After the dispatched questionnaires were returned, necessary modifications on four items and the complete removal and replacement of 3 unclear questions were made.

To check the reliability and validity of the questionnaires, Cronbach's alpha reliability test was calculated after the pilot test was conducted. All items were carefully input in to SPSS version 22 and the average result found from both teachers and leader's respondents were (0.802).

N0	***Variables***	***No of items***	***Cronbach Alpha***
1	To what extent are primary school principals effective in developing collaboration for school improvement?	**23**	0.849
2	To what extent do primary school cluster supervisors professionally prepared to give the required supervision service?	**6**	0.774
3	What are the factor school improvement practices in primary school?	**7**	0.87
	Average Reliability result		0.802

Cronbach's alpha coefficient normally ranges between 0 and 1. George and Mallery (2003) provide the following rules of thumb: "_ > 0.9 – Excellent, _ > 0.8 – Good, _ > 0.7 – Acceptable, _ > 0.6 – Questionable, _ > 0.5 – Poor and _ < 0.5 – Unacceptable". It is noted that an alpha of (0.82) is reasonable good to use the question for the research.

3.7. Data Collection Procedures

Permission to conduct the study was requested and granted to the sample woreda Education offices and the selected schools principals. After gaining permission, the investigator was contacted every principal physically to explain the purpose of the study, what instruments the teachers were expected to complete and request time to distribute the instruments.

In the sample schools the researcher was described the study, invited the teachers to participate, give instructions for completing the questionnaire and assure confidentiality, and identified a teachers were being responsible for collecting and returning the questionnaires. Questionnaires were being returned in a prepared envelope.

3.8. Method of Data Analysis

The data collected from the questionnaire was analyzed and interpreted quantitatively. Depending on the nature of the variables quantitative data analysis method was employed. The quantitative data obtained through a five point Likert scales ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree in questionnaire was organized and tabulated around the sub-topics related to the research questions. Descriptive statistics like frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, and weighed mean was calculated for those items prepared in Likert type of scale was analyzed and interpreted. For more advanced statistical operations, data was inserted into statistical software programmer, SPSS version 22 and inferential statistical such as Independent sample t- test was used. Independent sample t- test was used to make sure whether there is a significant difference between means of the two groups of respondents (school leaders and teachers) in terms of a given items of Principal effectiveness in leading change in primary schools of Jimma Zone. Finally, the qualitative data that was collected through interviews and Focus group discussion (FGD) was analyzed qualitatively and interpreted through description of trends to complementary results of the quantitative data.

3.9. Ethical Consideration

The participants‟ consent to participate in the research should be voluntary, free of any coercion or promises of benefits. Unlikely to result from participation and no group should be Disadvantaged by being excluded from consideration. In doing so, first the researcher went with official letter written from Jimma University Educational Planning and Management Department to the woreda Education office and sample primary schools. Then, the researcher explained the purpose of the study to the woreda Education officers and school principals to get permission to accomplish the work. Finally, to start the study the researcher explained the objective and advantage of the study to the respondent to obtain their voluntarily participation.

The information obtained from the respondent were kept confidential. In doing so, the researcher respected to all school community and attends their work respectfully by sharing all the current stipulation of the school. These were done by showing positive path to the respondents as they filled the questionnaires properly and return back honestly to the researcher. The response of each target/sample/ population was kept as secrete to protect them from any doubt. All these were considered for the effectiveness of the issue under the study.

CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

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

The data was collected from a total of 122 respondents. A total of 124 copies of questionnaires were distributed to 72 teachers and 52schoolleaders (18 department heads, 4supervisors, 12 vice principals,9 principals and 9 unit leaders). The return rate of the questionnaires was 125 (96.8%) specifically, 70 (97.22%) from teachers and 52 (100%) from department heads, supervisors, vice principals and unit leaders. Moreover, four supervisors were interviewed.

Table *:* - **4,1Characteristics of Respondents**

No	Items	Category of items	Respondents			
			Teachers		*school leaders*	
			No	%	No	%
1	Sex	Male	58	82.85	43	89.58
		Female	12	17.15	5	10.4
2	Age	21-30 years	48	68.57	31	64.58
		31-40 years	15	21.43	15	31.25
		41-50 years	7	10	2	4.16
		51-60 years	_			
3	Qualification	Diploma	70	100	30	62.5
		BA/BED/BSC			18	37.5

4	Work experience	5 and below 5 years	10	14.28	2	4.16
		6-10 years	30	42.85	15	31.25
		11-15 year	13	18.57	13	27.08
		16-20 year	10	14.28	16	33.33
		21 and above	7	10	2	4.16
5	Training attended	Did not take at all	55	78.57	30	62.5
		Less than 1week	10	14.28	12	25
		1-2 week	5	7.14	6	12.5
		3-4 week				
		1-3 month				
		Graduated in EDPM(MA)				

4.1. Characteristics of Respondents

The teacher and leader respondents were asked to indicate their background information. The details of the responses were given in table 2 and discussed as follows: In table 2 above, the data of the study revealed that, (82.85%) of teacher respondents and (89.58%) of school leader member respondents were males while the remaining 17.15% of teacher respondents and 10.4 % leader respondents were females respectively. This implies that, the participation of females either in the primary school teaching or involvement in the leadership is too much less than males.

Regarding their age, 68.57% of teacher respondents and 64.5% of school leader respondents were between 21-30 years. Others 21.43% of teacher respondents and 31.2 % school leader respondents fall between the ages of 31-40 years. 19.8% of school teacher respondents of and 15.7% of leader respondents were between the ages of 41-50 years. The remaining 10 % of teacher respondents and 4.16 % of school leader respondents were between 41-51 years.

According to the above diagram the age of the two group of respondent between 21-30 in average this implies that the two group respondent are power fueled to implement school improvement program . Regarding the educational background of teachers and school leaders, Moreover, all 70(100%) and 30(62.5%) respectively were diploma holders. Moreover, 37.5 % of school leader respondents and the 75% of the interviewed cluster supervisor's respondent had a first degree. From this, it is possible to conclude that, cluster supervisors and school leaders in the sample Woredas of Jimmazone were relatively more qualified than the primary school teachers.

Regarding the experience of teachers, the majority (75.72%) have above 5 years of experience. Only 14.28 % are between 1-5 years of experience. Concerning the experience of the school leaders, the majority (95.84%) are above 5 years of experience. Only 4.16 % were between 1-5 years of experience. Among the interviewed four cluster supervisors, only one is between 6-10 years; however, the rest three were between 11-15 years. From this, one can conclude that, school leaders were relatively more experienced than teachers in the sample Woredas of Jimma zone.

Relating training relevant to school leadership, 78.57% of teacher respondents and the 62.5% of school leader respondents including four of interviewed respondent supervisors 3(three)of them did not take at all any training which is relevant to school leadership. This statistical data and interview question responses reveal that school leaders were in opposite to today school leadership qualities in experience, qualification and training related with leadership. The leadership influence could be measured through their qualifications, training and experience they have in leadership activity, their experience to delegate authorities and provision of teachers' freedom to do their duties independently (Hoy and Miskel, 2001).

Table 4.2: Response on Extent that School principal gives attention to engaged staffs for school improvement

No	Item	*Respondents*	*mean*	std	Independent t test		
					t	df	Sig(2tailed)
1	The school develop a clear personal vision of what you want to achieve	teachers	4.02	.741	1.23	116	0.27
		leaders	3.70	.797			
2	The school leader develop a positive attitude for school improvement	teachers	3.67	.811	2.28	116	0.24
		leaders	3.29	.988			
3	The school encourage team members to contribute in school improvement	teachers	2.22	.66	2.17	116	0.31
		leaders	2.0	.357			
4	The school leaders develop effective communication and listening skills	teachers	2.37	.93	1.70	116	.09
		leaders	2.10	.66			
5	Average Mean	teachers	3.07	.63			
		leaders	2.77	.700			

Key: Mean value ≥4.50= very high, 3.50-4.49= high, 2.50-3.49= moderate, 1.50-2.49= low and ≤1.49= very low at p>0.05, tcr= 1.96, df =116

Item 1 of table 4.2 shows the responses of the participants regarding school efforts in developing a clear personal vision of what you want to achieve. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be $\bar{X}$= 3.86 (SD=.76). This shows that the mean score was found out to be high. This implies that the participant of the study highly perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (1.23) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P 0.27 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher(M=4.02:SD:.741) and leaders (M=3.70:SD:.797)

Item 2 of table 4.2 shows the responses of the participants regarding school efforts in developing a positive attitude for school improvement. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be$\bar{X}$(3.48) (SD=.98). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This imply that the participant of the study moderately perceived that.

However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (1.28) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P 0.24 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher(M=3.67:SD:.811) and leaders (M=3.29:SD:.988). In connection to this, the interview response of cluster supervisors confirmed that school attitude for improvement. Was a problem in primary school? School improvement requires a favorable organizational arrangement. Dunin-Keplicz and Verbrugge (2011) stated that the collaborative practice is highly influenced by the organizational structure.

Item 3 of table 4.2 shows the responses of the participants regarding school efforts in encourage team members to contribute in school improvement. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be($\bar{X}$ =2.11,SD=.50). This shows that the mean score was found out to be perceived low that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (2.28) was greater than the table value (1.96) at (P 0.31 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is statistically significant difference between teacher(M=2.22:SD:.66) and leaders (M=2.0:SD:.357). Moreover interview conducted for the supervisors on the same issue verified that: working with team is the main problem of primary school principals in selected woreda of jimma zone. Sustainable improvement needs the collaboration of all stake- holders.

Item 4 of table 4.2 shows the responses of the participants regarding school efforts in develop effective communication and listening skills. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be ($\bar{X}$ =2.23 ,SD=.79). This shows that the mean score was found out to be low. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (1.70) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P .09 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher(=$\bar{X}$2.37:SD:.93) and leaders (=$\bar{X}$2.10:SD:.66).School improvement needs skilled leaders.

Table 4.2.1 on extent that principals develop collaboration for school improvement.

No	Items	Respondents	$mean$	SD	Independent T-test		
3.1.4	Internal condition of the school				*t*	df	Sig(2tailed)
1	The extent to which school leaders motivate teachers for the school improvement process	teachers	2.65	.996	61	116	57
		leaders	2.50	.967			
2	The level to which school leaders give attitudinal awareness before implementing school improvement	teachers	2.61	1.01	-.79	116	.42
		leaders	2.77	1.09			
3	The range to which conduciveness of the school environment to implement program.	teachers	3.35	1.00	-.88	116	.37
		leaders	3.52	.945			
4	Facilitating professional growth of teachers through short term training, workshops and seminars.	teachers	2.60	.971	-.46	116	.64
		leaders	2.68	1.03			
5	The extent to which school principals Coordinating teachers to meet and learn from each other.	teachers	2.60	1.02	1.43	116	.15
		leaders	2.33	.930			
6	The extent to which school SIP committee conducted monitoring and evaluation on the implementation of the program	teachers	2.68	.971	-.55	116	.57
		leaders	2.79	1.07			
7	The degree to which the school leaders helps people deal with the stress and difficulties of major school improvement	teachers	2.68	.986	.64	116	.52
		leaders	2.56	1.07			
8	The level to which the school provides opportunities for early successes to build confidence	teachers	2.70	.968	.28	116	.77
		leaders	2.64	1.04			
9	The extent to which the school leaders develop responsible tem members on SIP program	teachers	2.78	1.01	-.13	116	.89
		leaders	2.81	1.08			
10	The extent to which the school principals bringing teachers together to share experience	teachers	2.67	1.03	-.71	116	.47
		leaders	2.81	1.08			
11	The school's capability to modify its plan based on the information obtained through monitoring and evaluation	teachers	2.55	.99	-.68	116	.49
		leaders	2.48	1.12			
12	The extent to which school leaders provide overall guidance for staff members to make the correct decision in a given situation	teachers	2.64	.96	.79	116	.42
		leaders	2.50	.94			
13	Average Mean	teachers	2.71	.99			
		leaders	2.64	.94			

Mean Value ≥ 4.5 = very high, (3.51-4.51) = high, (2.51-3.5)
moderate,(1.51-2.5) =low and<1.5 =very low

To assess the extent of leading school improvement the internal and the external
Environment is examined. The internal environment of the school contains sixteen variables and the external variables contain four variables.

Item 1 of table 4.2.1 shows the responses of the participants regarding extent to which school leaders motivate teacher for the school improvement process. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be ($\bar{X}$= 2.57 (SD=.98). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This imply that the participant of the study moderate perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (.61) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .53 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher($\bar{X}$=2.65:SD:.99) and leaders ($\bar{X}$=2.50:SD:.96).

One of the respondents at the end of the questionnaire referred the principal is consuming their time by student's disciplinary cases and other meeting and he is not contacting us as we need. In another school I heard the teachers said that the principal is blaming us for not doing our task properly however the principal himself is not punctual and role model for us. This implies that principals are not engaged on leading day to day teaching and learning activities.

Item 2 of table 4.2.1 shows the responses of the participants regarding school leaders give attitudinal awareness before implementing school improvement. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be($\bar{X}$=2.69 ,SD=1.05). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This imply that the participant of the study moderate perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (-.79) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .42 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher($\bar{X}$=2.61:SD:1.01) and leaders ($\bar{X}$=2.77:SD:1.09). In connection to this, cluster supervisor replied on their interview that principals are not focuses on implementation of school improvement.

Item 3 of table 4.2.1 shows the responses of the participants regarding conduciveness of the school environment to implement SIP. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be($\bar{X}$= 3.43 ,SD=.97). This shows that the mean score was found out to be high. This imply that the participant of the study high perceived that.
However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (-.88) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .37 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher($\bar{X}$ =3.35:SD:1.00) and leaders ($\bar{X}$ =3.52:SD:.94). In connection to this, cluster supervisors replied on their interview that school have opportunity to implement school improvement This implies that principals are not work at expected from them.

Item 4 of table 4.2.1 shows the responses of the participants regarding the extent to which school Principals Facilitating professional growth of teachers through short term training, workshops and seminars. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be($\bar{X}$=2.61 ,SD=.98). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This imply that the participant of the study moderate perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (-.46) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .64 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher ($\bar{X}$=2.60:SD:.97) and leaders ($\bar{X}$=2.68:SD:1.03). This implies that indicated that, principals were not providing training as expected. Although principals were not effective, MoE (1987 E.C:10) indicated that, principals are responsible to provide training to solve various instructional problems that teachers face.

Item 5 of table 4.2.1 shows the responses of the participants regarding the extent to which school principals Coordinating teachers to meet and learn from each other. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be($\bar{X}$= 2.49 (SD=.96). This shows that the mean score was found out to be low. This implies that the participant of the study low perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants.

Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (1.43) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .15 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher($\bar{X}$ =2.60:SD:1.02) and leaders ($\bar{X}$ =2.33:SD:.93). Respectively confirmed that, school principals were not coordinating teachers to meet and learn from each other, as to the required level. However, Bray (1987:19) noted that, through experience sharing among teachers in a class, the more experienced teachers help the less experienced teachers and this contribute for quality of education. Similarly, primary schools cluster organization guideline indicated that, principal are expected to facilitate the experience sharing among schools in a cluster (BGREB 1997 E.C:10).

Item 6 of table 4.2.1 shows the responses of the participants regarding Did the school SIP committee conducted monitoring and evaluation on the implementation of the program. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be($\bar{X}$=2.73 ,SD=.98). This shows that the mean score was found out to be low. This implies that the participant of the study moderate perceived that.

However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (-.55) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .57 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher(M=2.68:SD:.98) and leaders ($\bar{X}$=2.56:SD:1.07). This shows that the SIP committees of the schools were made an effort to assess the strengths and weaknesses observed in the program on effect moderately. This in turn might provide the committee to get a necessary information that helped to revise and modify its plan.

Item 7 of table 4.2.1 shows the responses of the participants regarding degree to which the school leaders help people deal with the stress and difficulties of major school improvement. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be($\bar{X}$= 2.62 (SD=.99). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This imply that the participant of the study moderate perceived that.

However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (.64) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .52 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher($\bar{X}$ =2.68:SD:.98) and leaders ($\bar{X}$ =2.56:SD:1.07). In connection to this, cluster supervisors replied on their interview that school principals only coordinates students result on the end of semesters. This indicated that there is no evaluation on implementation school improvements.

Item 8 of table 4.2.1 shows the responses of the participants regarding level to which the school provides opportunities for early successes to build confidence. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be($\bar{X}$=2.57 ,SD=.98). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This imply that the participant of the study moderate perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (.28) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .77 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher(M=2.70:SD:.96) and leaders (M=2.64:SD:1.04). School development is need day to day encouragement of successes to sustain the observed change

Item 9 of table 4.2.1 shows the responses of the participants regarding extent to which the school develop responsible tem members. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be($\bar{X}$= 2.71 (SD=1.04). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This imply that the participant of the study moderate perceived that.

However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (-.13) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .89 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher($\bar{X}$=2.78:SD:1.01) and leaders ($\bar{X}$=2.81:SD:1.08). Developing team member is the beneficent responsible led team members facilitate the period implementation of improvement.

In connection to this, cluster supervisors replied on their interview that school principals kill their time on miner things. This implies that principals are not engaged on leading day to day teaching and learning activities.

Item 10 of table 4.2.1 shows the responses of the participants regarding The extent to which the school principals bringing teachers together to share experience. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be($\bar{X}$= 2.68 (SD=1.05). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This imply that the participant of the study moderate perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (-.75) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .47 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher($\bar{X}$ =2.67:SD:1.03) and leaders ($\bar{X}$ =2.81:SD:1.08). Schools principals were bringing schools‟ teachers together to share experiences from each other. However, the computed „P‟ value (5.540) is greater than the table value (3.07), which indicates the existence of significant difference among the responses. Regarding the experience sharing of school teachers, the participants of the interview also informed that, the school principals were facilitating the experience sharing of school's teacher. However, they indicated that, in most cases the experience sharing was arranged during class competition. Based on this, it is possible to conclude that, the school principal were facilitating the experience sharing of teachers. MoE (2012:3) indicated that, principals are expected to identify and spread best practice among teachers by facilitating experience sharing among teachers.

Item 11 of table 4.2.1 shows the responses of the participants regarding The school's capability to modify its plan based on the information obtained through monitoring and evaluation. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be($\bar{X}$= 2.5 (SD=1.01). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This imply that the participant of the study moderate perceived that.

However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (-.68) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .94 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher($\bar{X}$=2.55:SD:.99) and leaders ($\bar{X}$=2.48:SD:1.12).

This shows that, the school's capability of revising and modifying plan was found to be low. Since the very purpose of monitoring and evaluation is to made possible and necessary adjustments and modifications on the plan based on the information gained, primary school's leadership seem to had a weakness in this regard.

Item 12 of table 4.2.1 shows the responses of the participants regarding extent to which the school leaders provides over all guidance for staff members to make the correct decision in a given situation. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be($\bar{X}$= 2.57 (SD=.95). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This imply that the participant of the study moderate perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (.79) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .42 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher($\bar{X}$ =2.64:SD:.96) and leaders ($\bar{X}$=2.50:SD:.94). This implies that the school monitors the progress of change and make any necessary adjustments under the study almost do not keep the work of the school under review and account for its improvement.

Table 4.2. 2. Resource Management to Lead Schools Improvement

No	*Items*	*Respondents*		$\bar{X}$	*SD*	Independent T-test		
4.2.6	Resource management to lead schools Improvement							
1	The degree to which capacity of the leaders to manage human, materials, and financial in the school to lead the program	teacher		2.71	1.07	.53	116	.59
		leaders		2.60	1.10			
2	The level to which leaders effort to create awareness on resource management in leading the school improvement	teachers		3.34	.991	.38	116	.70
		leaders		3.27	1.02			
3	The extent to which availability of financial resources to implement the school improvement	teachers	70	3.40	.969	-8.03	116	.42
		leaders	48	3.54	.898			
4	Average Mean	teachers	70	3.5	1.01			
		leaders	48	3.13	1.00			

Mean Value ≥ 4.5 = very high, (3.51-4.51) = high, (2.51-3.5) = moderate, (1.51-2.5) =low and <1.5 =very low

Item 1 of table 4.2.2 shows the responses of the participants regarding capacity of the leaders to manage human, materials, and financial in the school to lead the change. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be ($\bar{X}$=2.65 ,SD=1.08). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This imply that the participant of the study moderate perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (-1.31) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .192 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher ($\bar{X}$ =2.71:SD:1.07) and leaders ($\bar{X}$=2.60:SD:1.10). Furthermore, FGD members conducted to assess the capacity of the leaders to manage human, materials, and financial in the school to lead school improvement. the replied that:

The capacity of principal to manage school resource not that much because the principals have not trying on leadership.

Item 2 of table 4.2.2 shows the responses of the participants regarding leader's effort to create awareness on resource management in school improvement. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be ($\bar{X}$= 3.3 (SD=1.00). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This implies that the participant of the study moderate perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (.38) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .70 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher (M=3.34:SD:.99) and leaders (M=3.27:SD:1.02).

Item 3 of table 4.2.2 shows the responses of the participants regarding availability of financial resources to implement the school improvement. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be ($\bar{X}$= 3.47, SD=.93). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This imply that the participant of the study moderate perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (-8.03) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .42 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher ($\bar{X}$=3.40:SD:.96) and leaders ($\bar{X}$=3.54:SD:.89). In connection to this, cluster supervisors replied on their interview that the school have resource to implement school improvement. This indicate that the school have resource but they are a problem to use resource for implementation of school improvement.

resource for implementation of school improvement. improvement. This indicate that the school have resource but they are a problem to use resource for implementation of school improvement.

4.3 External condition of the schools to lead change.

*Table **4.2. 3**.***External condition of the schools to lead school improvement.**

No	Items	Respondents	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	Grant Mean		
1	The degree to which convenient of the political environment to motivate the school improvement	teachers	70	3.21	1.07	-.60	116	.54
		leaders	48	3.33	1.01			
2	The level to which the availability of infrastructure in the school area	teachers	70	3.25	1.04	-.28	116	.77
		leaders	48	3.31	1.05			
3	The extent to which economic support of the government to lead the school for change	teachers	70	3.40	.99	.02	116	.98
		leaders	48	3.35	.99			
4	The level to which active involvement of the community during implementation of the change	teachers	70	2.57	1.07	.32	116	.74
		leaders	48	2.47	1.03			
5	Average Mean	teachers	70	3.10	1.03			
		leaders		3.11	1.02			

Mean Value ≥ 4.5 = very high, (3.51-4.51) = high, (2.51-3.5) = moderate, (1.51-2.5) =low an<1.5 =very low

Item 1 of table 4.2.3 shows the responses of the participants regarding The degree to which convenient of the political environment to motivate the school for improvement. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be($\bar{X}$=3.27 ,SD=-.60). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This imply that the participant of the study moderate perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (-8.03) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .54 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher ($\bar{X}$ =3.21:SD:1.07) and leaders ($\bar{X}$=3.33:SD:1.01).Furthermore the information obtained from cluster supervisors revealed that currently the political influence in the school environment is minimized after the reform. One of the principal described as:

The woreda may appoint us for meeting with in one day, we may attend if the agenda is related to school issues, if not we may left it currently the force to attend the meeting and political appointment of school leaders is reducing. This explains that the political environment of the school is encouraging to facilitate school change.

Item 2 of table 4.2.3 shows the responses of the participants regarding The level to which the availability of infrastructure in the school area. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be($\bar{X}$=3.28 ,SD=1.04). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This imply that the participant of the study moderate perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (-.28) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .77 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher ($\bar{X}$=3.25:SD:1.04) and leaders ($\bar{X}$=3.31:SD:1.05).this indicate that the school have infrastructure for implementation of school improvement but the problem is the way to use the materials.

Item 3 of table 4.2.3 shows the responses of the participants regarding The degree to which convenient of the political environment to motivate the school for change. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be($\bar{X}$= 3.37 (SD=.98). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This imply that the participant of the study high perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (.02) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .98 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher ($\bar{X}$=3.40:SD:.99) and leaders ($\bar{X}$=3.35:SD:.99). In connection to this, cluster supervisors replied on their interview that the schools supported by school grant and blue grant.

Item 4 of table 4.2.3 shows the responses of the participants regarding The level to which active involvement of the community during implementation of the change. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be($\bar{X}$=2.52 ,SD=1.05). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This imply that the participant of the study moderate perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (.32) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .74 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher ($\bar{X}$=2.57:SD:1.07) and leaders ($\bar{X}$=2.47:SD:1.03).Generally, the practice of schools improvement is not that much. For instance in school H and Y the supervisors replied that:

The improvement progress is gradual, the school leaders and teachers are busy by solving Disciplinary cases and performing routine works, for example in 2012 E.C the number of Students those who joined secondary school is 90% of them score blow 50 percentile This Indicates that students learning outcome is not satisfactory.

4.4. Professional Preparation of school principal's to lead school improvement

Table 4.3: Respondents View on the Professional Preparation of school principal's

No	*Items*	*Respondents*	*Mean*	Sd	Independent T-test		
					t	df	Pv
1	School principals are well experienced.	Teacher	2.14	.83	-1.31	116	.19
		Leader	2.35	.88			
2	Cluster supervisors have taken induction training.	Teacher	2.48	.88	-6.73	116	6.7
		Leader	2.41	.88.			
3	Cluster supervisors are qualified enough to give the required service.	Teacher	3.42	.86	2.26	116	6.7
		Leader	3.22	.49			
4	In service training has been arranged for school principals.	Teacher	2.75	1,12	-.35	116	.72
		Leader	2.64	.84			
5	School principals lack support instruments like manuals and guides.	Teacher	2.59	.76	2.5	116	1.79
		Leader	2.83	.68			
6	Experience sharing sessions has been arranged for cluster supervisors.	Teacher	2.8	2.43	2.24	117	9.7
		Leader	2.4	.99			

Mean Value ≥ 4.5 = strongly agree, (3.51-4.51) = agree, (2.51-3.5) = moderate, (1.51-2.5) =disagree and <1.5 =strongly disagree

Item 1 of table 4.2.1. shows the responses of the participants regarding School principals are well experienced.. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be($\bar{X}$= 2.24 ,SD=.85). This shows that the mean score was found out to be low. This imply that the participant of the study low perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (-1.31) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .19 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher ($\bar{X}$=2.14:SD:.83) and leaders ($\bar{X}$=2.35:SD:.88). These indicated that, school principal was not well experienced. Similarly, as can be seen in the background information of the respondents, school principals were

relatively the same experienced with teachers. In relation to this, it is indicated that, in education academic qualification and experience are given more emphasis and many countries use a successful performance as teachers and head teacher (De Grauwe, 2001a:70). Carron and De Grauwe (1997:31) indicated that, teachers appreciate the classroom experience of principals. As De Grauwe (2001a:70) indicated, only few principals occupy the position with the same grade as principals and when principals are less experienced than school teachers, teachers do not consider principals as their principals. However, Certo (2006:13) indicated that, neither promotion through experience nor hiring a qualified principal is a guarantee to know how to lead.

Item 2 of table 4.2.1 shows the responses of the participants regarding Experience sharing sessions has been arranged for cluster supervisors. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be($\bar{X}$= 2.24 (SD=.85). This shows that the mean score was found out to be low. This imply that the participant of the study perceived at low. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (3.07) was greater than table value (1.96) at (P= 9.781 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is statistically significant difference between teacher ($\bar{X}$ =2.48:SD:.88) and leaders ($\bar{X}$ =2.41:SD:.88). This shows the difference among the responses is significant. However, during interview the cluster supervisors informed that, even though they repeatedly asked the WEO to arrange experience sharing, there is no any experience sharing. However, facilitating the experience sharing at Woreda, zonal and regional level was written in the primary schools cluster organization document (BGREB, 1997 E.C:7). Most of the participants who were interviewed during the study indicated that, induction trainings did not exist; in-service trainings were inadequate and not related to the profession of principals; school principals were less experienced than most of the teachers and school principals; and support instruments were inadequate. However, they indicated that, the academic qualification was not the problem as school principals had first degree.

Item 3 of table 4.2.1shows the responses of the participants regarding school principals are qualified enough to give the required service. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be ($\bar{X}$= 3.35 (SD=.48). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate.

This imply that the participant of the study moderate perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (-.35) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= 6.7 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is statistically significant difference between teacher ($\bar{X}$=3.34:SD:.47) and leaders ($\bar{X}$ =3.37:SD:.48). Regarding the induction training, the informants during interview indicated that, principals were recruited teachers in formal way and "just told to go" to primary schools to do their job without any induction training. From this one can conclude that, school principal had not taken any induction training. In relation to this, many authors in the field indicated the importance of training: Carron and De Grauwe (1997: 15) and UNESCO (2007:15) indicated that, induction training help principal prepare themselves for their role. Giordano (2008:142) pointed the importance of matching the employee with the demands of the job and to give training when necessary for all principals and staff. Similarly, Bray (1987:135) indicated the importance of training both newly appointed and experienced individuals. Likewise, BGREB (2003 E.C:15) noted that, principals should have technical, conceptual and human skills. And to get these skills principals should get adequate training.

Item 4 of table 4.2.1 shows the responses of the participants regarding Cluster supervisors are qualified enough to give the required service. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be ($\bar{X}$= 2.7 (SD=.48). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This imply that the participant of the study moderate perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (-.35) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .72 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher ($\bar{X}$=3.34:SD:.47) and leaders ($\bar{X}$=3.37:SD:.48). this indicated that, in-service training was not arranged for school principals. However, it is indicated that, in-service training is important for principals. It helps supervisors keep abreast of new curriculum, teaching methodologies and school management (UNESCO, 2007:17). Carron and De Grauwe (1997:33) noted that, advisors, principals and inspectors need training, however do not receive it. Similarly, Giordano (2008:111) noted the lack of adequate training of school coordinators as a problem.

Item 5 of table 4.2.1shows the responses of the participants regarding school principals lack support instruments like manuals and guides. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be ($\bar{X}$= 2.45 (SD=.48). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This imply that the participant of the study moderate perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (-.35) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= 1.72 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher ($\bar{X}$=2.6:SD:.1.15) and leaders ($\bar{X}$=2.21:SD:.79). indicated that, manuals and guidelines are inadequate for supervisors and when available, not more than circulars and administrative forms. As a result supervisors lack important information. Carron and De Grauwe (1997:3) and (UNESCO, 2007:19) this indicated that, support instruments such as manuals and guide lines are important for principals. They prepare themselves for class visits using these instruments. In addition, these instruments support the actions of principals on the activity.

Item 6 of table 4.2.1shows the responses of the participants regarding Experience sharing sessions has been arranged for cluster supervisors. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be ($\bar{X}$= 2.6 (SD=.53). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This imply that the participant of the study moderate perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (-.35) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= 9.72 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher ($\bar{X}$=2.8:SD:2.43) and leaders ($\bar{X}$=2.4:SD:.99). This indicated that, an experience sharing sessions were not arranged for school principals. The computed „F" value (9.781) by far exceeded the table value (3.07). This shows the difference among the responses is significant. However, during interview the cluster supervisors informed that, even though they repeatedly asked the WEO to arrange experience sharing, there is no any experience sharing. However, facilitating the experience sharing at Woreda, zonal and regional level was written in the primary schools cluster organization document (BGREB, 1997 E.C:7).

Most of the participants who were interviewed during the study indicated that, induction trainings did not exist; in-service trainings were inadequate and not related to the profession of principals; cluster supervisors were less experienced than most of the teachers and school principals; and support instruments were inadequate. However, they indicated that, the academic qualification was not the problem as school principals had first degree. From the information available, it seems that professional preparation and support instruments were inadequate for school principals to give the required service.

4.4. Factors that May Affect staff collaboration for school improvement

The respondents were asked to rate some of the possible factors that may hinder Implementation of school improvement that were presented by the student researcher and their response was analyzed in the following table as follows.

Table 4.4: Rating of possible Factors that may affect staff collaboration for effective school improvement

No	Items	Respondent	mean	SD	T-test for equality of means		
					t	df	Pvalue
1	Lack of qualified principals	teachers	3.45	.49	.04	16	.96
		leaders	3.39	.31			
2	Lack of trained teachers' for special need education	teachers	3.39	.88	1.32	16	.18
		leaders	3.25	1.04			
3	Limited support from woreda education office	teachers	3.85	.54	.38	16	.69
		leaders	3,81	.70			
4	Lack of school facilities	teachers	3.52	1.04	.28	16	.77
		leaders	3.51	1.23			
5	Lack of availability of Educational Resource (financial and material).	teachers	3.74	.52	-.45	16	.64
		leaders	3.79	.61			
6	Lack of necessary awareness, attitude and practical involvement in SIP implementation community	teachers	2.62	.83	.46	16	.46
		leaders	2.52	.71			
7	Lack of rewards for those who deserved it	teachers	3.11	.73	.46	16	.64
		leaders	3.06	.31			
8	Average Mean	teachers	3.26	.71			
		leaders	3.20	89			

Item 1 of table 4.7 shows the responses of the participants regarding Lack of qualified principals. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be($\bar{X}$=3.42 ,SD=.40). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This imply that the participant of the study low perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (0.41) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .96 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher ($\bar{X}$=3.45:SD:.49) and leaders ($\bar{X}$=3.39:SD:.31). None of the respondent principal was graduated in educational leadership or related field and all of them was subject specialist. Due to this reason, they lack the ability to design vision and coordinate the school community so as to lead to the attainment of the goals. MoE, 2007 also confirms that most of the school principal who is in the leading position did not get adequate educational training leadership. Even those who are trained also are not effective in leading the schools. Due to this reason, they lack the ability to design vision and coordinate the school community so as to lead to the attainment of the goals.

Item 2 of table 4.7 shows the responses of the participants regarding Lack of trained teachers for special need education. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be($\bar{X}$= 3.32 (SD=.99). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This imply that the participant of the study low perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (1.32) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .18 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher ($\bar{X}$=3.39:SD:.88) and leaders ($\bar{X}$=3.25:SD:1.04).this indicated that lack of trained teachers for special need education is the main factors of primary schools.

Item 3 of table 4.7 shows the responses of the participants regarding Limited support from woreda education office. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be ($\bar{X}$= 3.83,SD=.62). This showed that lack of regular supervisory support from the concerned education official highly affect the effectiveness of school leadership. This imply that the participant of the study low perceived that.

However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (.38) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .69 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher ($\bar{X}$=3.85:SD:.54) and leaders ($\bar{X}$=3.81:SD:.70). This shows that, the major challenges that affect the implementation of SIP in the primary schools were Limited support from woreda education office.

Item 4 of table 4.7 shows the responses of the participants regarding Lack of school facilities. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be ($\bar{X}$= 3.51,SD=.99). This shows that the mean score was found out to be high. This imply that the participant of the study high perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (.28) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .77 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher ($\bar{X}$ =2.68:SD:1.04) and leaders ($\bar{X}$=2.62:SD:1.23).this indicate that lack of school facility highly affect the implementation of school improvement program(SIP) in primary schools.

Item 5 of table 4.7 shows the responses of the participants regarding Lack of availability of Educational Resource (financial and material). Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be($\bar{X}$= 3.76,SD=.54). This implies that the participant of the study low perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (-.45) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .64 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher ($\bar{X}$ =3.74:SD:.52) and leaders ($\bar{X}$ =3.79:SD:.61). This shows that the mean score was found out on availability of educational resources highly affect implementation of school improvement. On the other hand all the interviewed supervisory raised lack of educational resource and lack of training concerning leadership as one factor for the ineffectiveness of their leadership on school improvement.

They have stressed this as a very serious factor which affects their leadership effectiveness since education needs a lot of resources both for teachers as well as for students to run the teaching learning process.

Item 6 of table 4.7 shows the responses of the participants regarding Lack of necessary awareness, attitude and practical involvement in SIP implementation community. Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be($\bar{X}$= 2.57,SD=.77). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This implies that the participant of the study moderate perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (.72) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .76 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher ($\bar{X}$ =2.62:SD:.83) and leaders ($\bar{X}$=2.52:SD:.71). This indicated that Lack of necessary awareness, attitude and practical involvement in SIP implementation community moderately affect the implementation of SIP .

Item 7 of table 4.7 shows the responses of the participants regarding Lack of rewards for those who deserved it . Accordingly, the mean score of the participants was calculated and found out to be M=3.53, SD=.56). This shows that the mean score was found out to be moderate. This implies that the participant of the study moderate perceived that. However, t-test analysis was carried out to see if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of participants. Accordingly, the calculated t-test result (.46) was less than the table value (1.96) at (P= .64 >0.05) level of significance with 116 degrees of freedom. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between teacher ($\bar{X}$=3.53:SD:.73) and leaders ($\bar{X}$=3.54:SD:.31). In this regard Lack of rewards for those who deserved it was found to be high factors that affected the implementation of the program.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMANDATION

Introduction

A summary of the study, research questions, methods and findings are presented in this chapter. It starts with a brief overview of the study. Conclusions are drawn from the review of the literature. Implication and recommendations for further studies are included. Change is not about simply adopting best practices, but rather about creating a culture that recognizes strengths and weaknesses, encourages innovation and initiative, and adapts best practices and ideas from others. The nature of change is that it must be unique to local needs, forged through consensus, and built upon the unique strengths of each school. There is no one single solution to improving our schools. A combination of strategies is necessary to achieve a new vision of learning.

The goal is not to make every school the same, but to enable each school to construct its own solutions (Daggett, and Jones, 2014:2). Hence, school change is a process that involves participation of the school societies these are, teachers, parents, community, students, and others by one person or group of people for the overall school effectiveness and achievement of goals. Successful stakeholders provide capacity for building as shared vision and facilitate the change process, help promote the acceptance of group goals, and set expectations for high performance within the school and implement appropriate strategies for school change. Therefore, the main purpose of this study was to assess the practices and challenges leading schools change in government secondary schools of jimma zone. To address this purpose, the following basic research questions were raised:

1. To what extent are primary school principals effective in developing collaboration for school improvement?

2. To what extent do primary school principal's professionally prepared to develop collaboration for school improvement?

3. What are the Factors that may affect staff collaboration for effective school improvement?

In the empirical investigation, qualitative and quantitative method design was used. Data was collected from a total of 118 respondents constituting 70 teachers, 9 principals, 4 supervisors,9 vice principals ,9-unit leader and 18 department head total 52 leaders. Representatives drawn from 9 sample schools in 3 cluster selected woreda. The Data was collected by a means of questionnaire, interviews and focus group discussion. The data from the quantitative method was analyzed using Descriptive statistics like frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, and weighed mean and the data from the qualitative method was analyzed using narrative method. In this chapter therefore, summary of the major findings along with objectives of the study, conclusions drawn from analysis and interpretation of data and recommendations for enhancement leading schools for change of government primary schools of Jimma zone was made.

5.1.1. To what extent are primary school principals effective in developing collaboration for school improvement?

Under this sub units, there has been four sub parts namely the extent that school for improvement with 4 variables, internal practices staff collaboration with12 variables, resources management 3 variables and external condition of the school 4 variables. The average mean score of the extent of school for improvement is 3.07 teacher and 2.77 for leaders. Generally, the average mean score of the extent of the school leaders team engagement for school improvement is moderately practiced.

For internal conditions of collaboration for school improvement, the response from the respondent 2.70teachers and 2.6for leaders. This indicated that the internal condition of the schools to staff collaboration is moderate. However, the resource management of the schools the average mean score showed that 3.10 teacher and 3.11for leader this indicates resource management better.

The external condition of the school to lead schools change the average mean indicated that 3.10 (moderate). This implies that there is better external environment to create positive teaching learning environment for school improvement.

5.1.2. To what extent do primary school principals professionally prepared to give the required leader service?

The study revealed that, school principals were relatively less experienced than most teachers; lacked both induction and in-service trainings; lacked support instruments and experience sharing.

5.1.3. Challenges collaboration for School Improvement Program

Challenges to the school improvement may vary in accordance with the variations with the unique features of schools as well as with the external environment in which schools are operating. One simple example, the size of the school is associated with innovative behavior for that smaller schools apparently lack the resources to engage in significant change (Hussen and Postethwore,1994).

However, there are common challenges that most school improvement programs face. These are lack of schedules in schools that permit teachers to meet and work together for sustained periods of time; the demanding nature of teachers' work as an increasing number of students arrive at school less well-socialized, less prepared to deal with materials, and more frequently from family settings that are not supportive; the aging and often demoralization of teachers due to declining resources, increasing levels of bureaucratization and the rapid and frequent demands for change that come from central authorities. In addition, an organizational structure with in which teachers' work is less autonomous and more integrated with that of other teachers' affects the development of commitment to change. Moreover, the continues transfer of teachers, principals and educational administrators at the local level puts pressure on the program to continuously train new staff who may not serve in schools for long (Plan Sudan, 2006).

5.2. Conclusions

The main conclusions of this study will be presented in the next sections:

5.2.1. The current practice of leading school for change.

Successful school change is the sum of leaders‟ ability and willingness to lead the school with very strong and clear vision and set of values for their school. In addition to they take part their way of leading their schools having professional skills to overcome the challenges that their schools face. „„,If you want your school to be a good and safe place, you must enhance family and community involvement with the school.

A key strategy in all this is collaboration Adelman, and (Taylor,2007:3)‟‟‟‟. To sum up, the above points are expected from the effective leadership, active participation of parents, government, students and other education sector supporters of the school. However, the research revealed that the leaders are ineffective at implementing change because they are not committed to implement what they planned. Due to this the practice of change is not as expected under this study area.

Therefore, data and ideas were gathered from the review of the literature; the quantitative portion of the study and the qualitative portion of the study were analyzed to develop reasonable conclusions about the finding. As such triangulation of the data from these three sources Produced the following conclusions are made. A single leader is unlikely to have the knowledge needed to develop a vision that will appeal to all the stakeholders whose support is necessary to accomplish major organizational change (Yukl, 2010:313). However, creating awareness and Involvement of all stakeholders is limited. Developing skill capacity of stakeholders through Training, workshop and seminaries has great contribution for influencing the school community. Active involvement of stakeholders in the conducted research schools is low. Most the time only PTAS coordinators participate.

The quality and skill of the school leaders play a vital role in school leading for change. Based on demographic data most of second cycle primary school’s principals and supervisors B.A degree holders. in subject area. However, the skill of the school leaders to lead schools for change is low.

The internal condition of the school is the main interaction site of the change progress. It is the Site of teaching learning is occurring, the leaders and the followers engaged in all school activities Using different schools resources. However, the findings showed that school internal condition to implement mission and shared vision to the quality of education as well as to common educational goal are insufficient. According to Hanson (1985:135) cited by Shibeshi, (2014:56), the school system is very often at the mercy of these external organizations…the school administrator is not in control of the external system that play major roles in the conduct of Affairs in his or her organization. The result showed that the schools external environment is better moderately to lead the schools for change.

The main target of the school's change is to enhance learning outcome of students in knowledge, Skill and attitude. According to (MOE) ESC (2018:25), „„it is puzzling however why learning Outcomes are so low in Ethiopia in spite of the fact that many new initiatives such as book Supply, teacher qualification, education in radio, new curriculum, school improvement packages". The condition of primary school facilities is less than that of secondary schools. Most of Primary schools have latrines; four in five have water and the same share a supply of Electricity The research also showed that the change practice of the primary schools is not fundamental change in student's result, attitude and skill rather than externally availability of resources, developing the quality of teachers and school leaders, change in infrastructure, availability text books and building class room.

The study revealed that, factors affecting the effectiveness of school leaders in their role. Accordingly, lack of training towards the school leadership was one of the major factors. While lack of regular supervisory support from the concerned education officials, lack of financial and material support, are the major challenges that influenced school leadership effectiveness.

5.3. Recommendations

1. As indicated by the finding the collaboration of stakeholders is not satisfactory to practice

According to the literature the collaboration of stakeholders very Essential to implement school improvement. The active participation of stakeholders in school Leadership creates conducive atmosphere and development. Therefore, principals, supervisors and Woreda educational officers should take their responsibilities in organizing parents, students and teachers to practice the school improvement.

2. The finding described that the motivation of teachers to motivate their students to practice better teaching- learning is insufficient. As noted by the many writers to affect student Outcomes they must exercise some form of positive influence on the work of other colleagues, Especially teachers. So, the government and the school leaders together should give Continuous trainings and awareness creating mechanism for teachers on the area how to inspire their student for better performance.

3. The study indicated that, principals lack training, experience sharing and support instruments like manuals and guidelines. To enable principals to play an expected role, BGREB,ZED,WEB and NGOs are advised the following:

- To provide on -the job professional training for school principals.
- To arrange experience sharing within and out of the region.
- To provide manuals and guides for school principals

4. The woreda education office should create and maintain a properly scheduled and organized formal monitoring and evaluation. In order to provide adequate support and guidance to the primary schools, activities should be evaluated through checklists that were provided to schools beforehand so as to show. Schools the major areas in which they must focus. If any lack of expert in the woreda education, the monitoring and evaluation can be done by classifying schools and assigning a group of experts to formally follow up schools.

5. The school leadership should create a strong awareness creation program so as to get the involvement of key stakeholders in all activities of SIP. Seminars, workshops and various discussions should be used in this regard.

6. The city education office in collaboration with primary school leadership needs to design a strategy to ensure sustainable participation of the community members. This can be done through creating awareness creation programs such as seminars, workshops and etc. Simultaneously, the leadership capability of principals should be promoted in a way that they can be capable of mobilizing the community for the realization of goals of SIP.

7 As the resources are very much crucial for the realization of goals of SIP, the woreda education office in collaboration with school leadership need to avail a reasonable number of administrative primary schools. Moreover, so as to address the shortage of budget, the school leadership and the woreda education office should create an income generation mechanism rather than relying absolutely on budgets allocated from the government. This can be done through creating strong school and community relationship.

8. in the sampled schools most of the principals were wasting their time by solving disciplinary related issues not only principals the teachers also. Currently students discipline is one the basic challenge for schools. Therefore, parents, teachers, school leaders and government should work together to enhance the discipline of the primary school Students.

Finally to address the problems, it can be suggested that further studies need to be conducted in this area with regard to the practice and challenges of leading school improvement.

REFERENCES

Adugna, A,(2014). The practice and challenges of school leadership in secondary schools of Iluababor Zone, MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University.

Ajzen, I. (2012). Perceived behavioral control, self-efficacy, locus of control, and the

Aswathappa, K., & Reddy, G.S. (2009).*Organisational Behaviour*(Vol. 20). Mumbai: Himala ya

Ayalew, S. (2009). *Overview of educational resear in Ethiopia studies*. Journal of Ethiopia st udies,141-147.

Barens, F. D. (2004). *Inquiry and Action:Making School Improvement Part of Daily Practice.* Brown university Annenberg Institution.

Bass, B.M. (2008). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Biesta, G. (2010). Good Education in an Age of Measurement. Ethics, Politics, Democracy.L ondon: Paradigm Publishers

Bridges, W. (2003). Managing *transitions: Making the most of change.* Cambridge, MA: CA: Corwin Press (Bush, 1995; Fullan, 2001; Maxwell, 1998).

Bush, T. (2007). Educational Leadership and management: Theory, Policy and Practice, 9 (3),

Bossert, S. T. et al. (1982). "The Instructional Management Role of the Principal." Educational Administration Ouarterly. vol.18, No.3, pp.34-65

Certo, S.C. (2006). Supervision: concepts and skill building (5thed), McGraw Hill /Irwin, Uni ted Sates.

Churchman, C. W. (1971).The Design of Inquiring Systems Basic Concepts of Systems and Organization.

Corbally E. John, et. al. (1961).*Educational Administration*: The Secondary School. Boston:Allyn Bacon, Inc.

Cohen, L, Manion, L and Morrison, K.(2007:107,509 511).Research Methods in Education Sixth edition, USA , First published 2007 by Routledge.

Connely, D., & Goldman, P., (1994). Facilitative leadership: How principals lead without do minating. *Oregon School of Study Council Bulletin, 37(9).*(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED379728).

Conner, D. (2006).Managing at the speed of change. New York: Random House. Creswell,

J.W. (Ed.). (2012). Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating *Contemporary Family Therapy, 24*, 93–109.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design, quantitative and mixed approaches* (2ndEd): Londo n, Sage Publication Inc.

Creswell, J, W, (2012). Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantit ative and Qualitative Research (4th ed). University of Nebraska–Lincoln *Research Report 2*and5

Daggett, B, Ed.D (2014). Addressing Current and Future Challenges in Education, *Learning, education conference*, Irish, Croke park conference centre, Dublin,14-15.

Daggett, B, Ed.D (2014). Addressing Current and Future Challenges in Education, *INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION, 22nd Annual Model Schools Conference.*

De Grauwe, A. (2001a). School supervision in four African countries: Volume I: Challenges and Reforms. Paris: UNESCO/International Institute for Educational Planning.

DiClemente, C. (2006). *Addiction and change*. New York: Guilford Press.Document Reproduction Service No.ED 381 851).

Dinham, S., & Scott, C. (2000).*Moving Into the Third, Outer Domain of Teacher Satisfaction*. Jo urnal of Educational Administration, 38(4), 379-396

Dufour, R., &Eaker, R. (1998).*Professional learning communities at work.*Bloomington, IN: National Education Service.

DuFour, R., &Eaker, R. (2002).*Getting started: Reculturing schools to become*

Duignan, P. (2006). *Educational Leadership:Key Challenges and Ethical Tensions.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dunin-Keplicz, B., &Verbrugge, R. (2011).*Teamwork in multi-agent systems: A formal approach* (Vol. 21): John Wiley & Sons.

ED370198).*education and human resource development.* Burlington, MA: Elsevier. Educational Management.(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. *Executive, 32,*788 Family Therapy, 24, 23–34.

Erchul, W. P. (1992). On dominance, cooperation, teamwork, and collaboration in school based consultation. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 3*(4), 363366.

Finn, J. D. (2001). *Small classes in American schools: Research, practice, and politics*. Phi Delta Kappan, 83(7), 551-560.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change.*San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Giordano, E.A.(2008).School clusters and teacher resource center.Paris: UNESCO/Internatio nal Institute for Educational Planning.

Ghoshal, S., & Bartlett, C.A. (1996). Rebuilding behavioral context: A blueprint for Corporate *grief through the five stages of loss.* New York: Simon & Schuster

Gorton, A, (1983). *School Administration and Supervision: Leadership Challenges and Opportunities (2nded).*): DubugueLowa, WC brown publisher Co.

Habar, R. (2002). Virginia Satir: An integrated humanistic approach. *Contemporary*

Hall, G. E., &Hord, S. M. (2002). Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and Handbook of Educational Change. Netherlands: Springer Netherlands

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (1999).*Next generation methods for the study of leadership and school improvement.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hargreaves, A., Lieberman, A., Fullan, M., & Hopkins, D. (Eds.). (1998). International Harvard Mental Health Letter.

Jørgensen, H. H., Owen, L., and Neus, A. (2008).*Making Change Work*. IBM Corporation. https://www.ibm.com/downloads/cas/2EXR3WMA.

Harris, A., Day, C., Hopkins, D., Hadfield, M., Hargreaves, A., & Chapman, C. (2002). Effective leadership for school improvement. New York: Routledge.

Harris, A. (2004a) 'Distributed leadership and schoolimprovement: leading or misleading?' *Educational managementand administration,* 32(1), 11-24.

Horsburgh, M., Lamdin, R., & Williamson, E. (2001).Multiprofessional learning: the attitudes of medical, nursing and pharmacy students to shared learning. *Medical education, 35*(9), 876-883.

Jemal Haji (2013). *Practice and Challenges of School Improvement Program in Secondary schools*

*of Asosa zone (*Unpublished master"s Thesis). Jimma University.

Jackson, S. E., Chuang, C.-H., Harden, E. E., Jiang, Y., & Joseph, J. (2006). Toward developing human resource management systems for knowledge-intensive teamwork. *Research in personnel and human resources management, 25*(6), 27-70.

Kanter, R.M., Stein, B.A., &Jick, T.D. (1992), *The Challenge of Organisational Change.* NewKelly, H., & Hoops, L. (2004).*Managing change with personal resilience.*Atlanta, GA:

Kinsler, K., & Gamble, M. (2004).*Reforming schools.*London: Continuum International.

Knowles, M. S. (2005). *The adult learner, 6th edition: The definitive classic in adult*

Kotter, J.P. (1995). Leading change: Why transformational efforts fail. *Harvard Business Review,*

Kotter,P.(1996). Leading change: An action plan from the world‟s for most expert on Busine ss leadership. *Harvard business school press*. Bosten, Massachusetts (17).

Kothari, C.R.(2004). Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques.2nd Ed. New Age International publishers. New Delhi., India.

Kubler-Ross, E., & Kessler, D. (2005).*On grief and grieving: Finding the meaning of* Kumar, (2005). *Research Methodology London*: SAGE Publications.

Kumar, R, (2005). *Research Methodology London*: SAGE Publications.

Lashway L (1996). The Strategies of a Leader *ERIC Digest, 150.*Eugene OR: ERIC

Lashway, L. (1995). Facilitative Leadership.*ERIC Digest, 96.* Eugene, OR: ERIC *Leadership, 64*, 58–62.

Lawler, E. E., Mohrman, S. A. & Ledford. G. E. (1992). *Employee Involvement and TotalQuality Management*: Practices and Results In Fortune 1000 Companies. San Francisco, CA Jossey-Bass.leaders. *Conference of the South Carolina Technical Education Association and the 2003National Science Foundation's Principal Investigators Annual Conference, SouthCarolina, (2).*

Lawrence, L.M, and Morrison, K. (2007).Research Methods in Education. 6th ed, simultaneou sly published in the USA and Canada,12

Lee, V. (2000).*School Size and the Organization of Secondary Schools.*In M.T. Hallinan (Ed.), Handbook of the Sociology of Education (Pp. 327-344). New York:Klewer /Ple

Leithwood, K., &Riehl, C. (2003b). *What do we already know about successful school leadership ? (Report).*New Brunswick, NJ: AERA Division ATask Force on Developing Research in Educational Leadership.

Leithwood, K., &Riehl, C. (2003b). *What do we already know about successful school leadership ? (Report).*New Brunswick, NJ: AERA Division ATask Force on Developing Research in Educational Leadership.

Lewin, K. (1951). *Force Field Analysis.*In D. Francis, & M. Woodcock (1982).*Fifty Activities For Self-Development*.Aldershot: GOWE London: John Wiley & Sons. Lockhart-Wood, K. (2000). Collaboration between nurses and doctors in clinical practice.*British Journal of Nursing, 9*(5), 276-280.

Longaker, C. (1998). *Facing death and finding hope.* London: Arrow. Lunenburg, C; and Orstein, A. (1991).*Educational Administration*: Concepts and Practices. Los Angeles: Wadsworth Inc.

McCoy, A. R., & Reynolds, A. J. (1999).*Grade retention and school performance*: An extend ed investigation. Journal of School Psychology, 37(3), 273-298.

Mecca, Thomas.V.(2004). *Basic concepts of organizational change for administrative*

McCulloch, P., Mishra, A., Handa, A., Dale, T., Hirst, G., & Catchpole, K. (2009).

MoE, (1994), *Federal Democratic Republic Government of Ethiopia,*

MoE (2006).*Decentralized Management of Education in Ethiopia:* A reference manual. Addi Ababa, Ethiopia.

MoE (2007).*Review of Ethiopian Education and Training Policy and Its Implementation.* Addis

Ababa: USARD MOE, ESDP V (2015) *Education Sector Development Programme* Published by: Federal Ministry of Education, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, Agust,2015

MoE, (ESC). (2018). *Ethiopian Education Development*: Road map. *An integrated Executive Summary; Draft for Discussion*. 23 and 24.

Mpokosa, Chikondi, SusyNdaruhutse.Managing teachers: *The centrality of teacher manage ment to quality education.Lessons from Developing Countries,London and Reading:*CfBT and VSO;2008.Nadler, D.A. (1997). *Champions of Change: How CEOs and their Companies are Mastering the*Nebraska Press.

O'Connor, E., &Fiol, M. (2006).Handling emotional reactions to change.*Physician of Applie d Behavioral Science, 39,* 73–96.

Pendlebury, J., Grouard, B., &Meston, F. (1998).*The Ten Keys to Successful ChangeManag ement.*

Postholm, M. B. (2012). Teachers' professional development: a theoretical review. *Education al Research, 54*(4), 405 429. doi:10.1080/00131881.2012.734725 potholes (2nd ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

Prochaska, J., & Norcross, J. (2001).Stages of change. Psychotherapy, *38*, 443–448.

Prochaska, J., & Norcross, J. (2002).*Using the stages of change.* Cambridge, MA: *profession al learning communities*. Bloomington IN: National Educational Publishing House.qu antitative and qualitative research (4th ed) Lincoln and London: University of renewal .*Sloan Management Review, 37*(2), 23 36. Retrieved August 24, 2008, from http///idea .ed.gov/explore/view/p/

Risser, D. T., Rice, M. M., Salisbury, M. L., Simon, R., Jay, G. D., Berns, S. D., & Consort ium, M. R. (1999).The potential for improved teamwork to reduce medical errors in the emergency department.

Robbins, S., & Coulter, M. (2005). Management with one key course compass (8th ed.) Misha waka, IN: Prentice Hall.

Sammons, P. (2007) *School effectiveness research and equity: making connections.* Reading: CfBT Education Trust.

Spiro, Ed.D. (2009). *Leading Change Hand Book*: Concepts and Tools (1and7).

Sayles, C. (2002). Transformational change based on the model of Virginia Satir

Sergiovanni,T.(1994). *Building community in schools.*SanFrancisco:Jossey-Bass. Service *Skills of Radical Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sergionanni, J.T. (2001). *Leadership: What is in for School*? London: rout ledge Falmer.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1995).*The Principal Ship: A Reflective Practices Perspectiv*e. Londan:Ally An d Bacon.

Starratt R (1995). *Leaders with vision.The quest fo school renewal.*Thousand Oaks

Stolp, S. (1994).*Leadership for school culture.*Eugene, OR ERICClearinghous on

Suarez-Orozco, M. M., &Sattin, C. (2007).Wanted: Global citizens.*Educational* theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*, 665–68

Sayles, C. (2002). Transformational change based on the model of Virginia SatirSurgenor,S.D. ,

Blike, G. T., & Corwin, H. L. (2003). Teamwork and collaboration in critical care: lessons from the cockpit. Critical care medicine, 31(3), 992-993.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1995).*The Principal Ship: A Reflective Practices Perspectiv*e. Londan:Ally An d Bacon.

Siedman .I. E. (1991).*Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and social sciences.* New York: Teachers college press.

TemesgenMelaku. (1998). *A study of principals instructional leadership effectiveness and Factor sin senior Secondary Schools of Amhara Region*, AAU Unpublished

Timperley, H. (2008). Teacher professional learning and development.InEducationalPractices Series.Belley, France: Imprimerie Nouvelle Gonnet.

Timperley, H., Wilson, A., Barrar, H., & Fung, I. (2007). Teacher Professional LearningandD evelopment: Best Evidence Synthesis Iteration. Wellington: Ministry of Education

Tonkin, A. (2016). *Leading Schools for Innovation and Success*: Five case studies of Australi an Principals, *Creating innovative school cultures* (p, s2).

*Tomas, T, (2015). The Influence of Leadership style on Teachers" Job Satisfaction in Private Primary Schools of Addis Ababa City Administration. MA Thesis, Addis Ababa Unive rsity, Ethiopia*U.S.Department of Education. (2008a).

Alignment with the No Child Left Behind Act. Waters, T. J., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2004) Leadership that sparks learning.*Educational Leadership, 61(7),* 48.

Waters, T., & Cameron, G. (2007).*Balanced leadership framework: Connecting vision with action.* Aurora, CO: McREL. Wang, L., MacCann, C., Zhuang, X., Liu, O. L., & Roberts, R. D. (2009). Assessing teamwork and collaboration in high school students Amultimethod Approach.

Yuk, G. (2010). *Leadership in Organizations* 7th ed. University at Albany, State University of New York, 319, 303Zell, D. (2003). Organizational change as a process of death, dying and rebirth.*Journal*

APPENDIX-A: QUESTIONER TO BE FILLED BY PRIMARY SCHOOL LEADERS AND TEACHERS

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

QUESTIONER TO BE FILLED BY PRIMARY SCHOOL LEADERS AND TEACHERS

This questionnaire is designed to gather information to gather information about the impact of primary school principal effectiveness in leading change in selected primary school of Jimma zone

The study focus on government primary schools in jimma zone The purpose of the study is purely academic that will have no any negative effect on you as an individual or on your school. the success of this study depends on your genuine view, frank opinion and timely responses to all parts of the questionnaire which will be kept confidential. Failure to complete the items highly affects the study. Therefore, I kindly request you to fill this questionnaire as openly and honestly as possible. For any information you can contact me through tel number 0913882762 or e-mail jafernura2011@ gmail. com

N.B:

No need to write your name

Each question has its own instruction

You have to return the questionnaire as possible after completion.

Thank you in advance for your genuine cooperation!

Part I: Personal Information

Direction 1:Write name of your school on the blank space provided and put "√" mark on the box you chose as answer for each question.

1. Zone JimmaWoreda_____ School_____

1.1 Your role in school: Supervisor □ Unit leader □ Dept. head □ Teacher □ Principal □Vice principal □ other □

1.2. Sex: - Male □ Female □

1,3. Age: In years_____

1,4. Level of educational attainment: Certificate □Diploma □ BA/BSC/BED□ MA/MSC□ other_____

Field of specialization: _____

1.5. Work experience: In years_____

1.6 Training attended relevant to School leadership:

Did not take at all □ Less than 1 week□1-2 week □3-4 week□1-3 month□ more than 3 months□

Part II. .What are the Current Practice of principals to form staff collaboration for Effective school improvements ?

Direction 2: The following statements show the Leadership practice in primary schools. Please Indicate your level of agreement with the statement the Current Practice to which each statement characterizes your school by putting mark (√) in one of the boxes against each items1to5.the number indicate:1=Strongly Disagree (SD), 2=Disagree (D), 3= Mode lately (ML), 4=Agree (A), 5=Strongly Agree (SA)

TABLE;2.1To what extent your school gives attention to engaged staffs for school improvement?

No	Item	Responses				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	The school develop a clear personal vision of what you want to achive					
2	The school leader develop a positive attitude for school improvement					
3	The school encourage team members to contribute in school improvement					
4	The school leaders develop effective communication and listening skills					

ABLE-2.3. what are the current practices of staff collaboration for school improvement?

No	Item	Responses				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	The extent to which school leaders motivate teachers for the school improvement process					
2	The level to which school leaders give attitudinal awareness before implementing school improvement					
3	The range to which conduciveness of the school environment to implement program.					
4	Facilitating professional growth of teachers through short term training, workshops and seminars.					
5	The extent to which school principals Coordinating teachers to meet and learn from each other.					
6	The extent to which school SIP committee conducted monitoring and evaluation on the implementation of the program					
7	The degree to which the school leaders helps people deal with the stress and difficulties of major school improvement					
8	The level to which the school provides opportunities for early successes to build confidence					
9	The extent to which the school leaders develop responsible tem members on SIP program					
10	The extent to which the school principals bringing teachers together to share experience					
11	The school's capability to modify its plan based on the information obtained through monitoring and evaluation					
12	The extent to which school leaders provide overall guidance for staff members to make the correct decision in a given situation					

2.3.1 Resource management of the school

No	Item	Responses				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	The degree to which capacity of the leaders to manage human, materials, financial, and technology in the school to lead the change.					
2	The level to which leaders effort to create awareness on resource management in leading the school for change					
3	The extent to which availability of financial resources to implement the school improvement					

2.3.2 External condition of the school

No	Item	Responses				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	The degree to which convenient of the political environment to motivate the school for change					
2	The level to which the availability of infrastructure in the school area.					
3	The extent to which material support of the government to encourage creativity the school for improvement					
4	The level to which active involvement of the community during implementation of school improvement					

2.To what extent do primary school principal's professionally prepared to develop collaboration for school improvement?

The following questions are stated to assess whether the principal's professionally prepared for school Improvement program implemented. Therefore, you are requested to give your response by rating the extent to which your school achieved by putting a (√) make in one of the boxes against each other

1=Strongly Disagree (SD), 2=Disagree (D), 3= Mode lately (ML),4=Agree (A), 5=Strongly Agree (SA)

No	Item	Responses				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	School principals are well experienced.					
2	School principal have taken induction training.					
3	School principal are qualified enough to give the required service.					
4	In service training has been arranged for school principals.					
5	School principals lack support instruments like manuals and guides.					
6	Experience sharing sessions has been arranged for school principals					

3. What are major factor hinder school principal effectiveness in staff collaboration for school improvement in primary school of jimma zone

The following statements show major factors Affecting Principals' Leadership Effectiveness. Please indicate the extent to which each statement characterizes your school by putting mark (√) in one of the boxes against each item. 1=Strongly Disagree (SD), 2=Disagree (D), 3= Mode lately (ML), 4=Agree (A), 5=Strongly Agree (SA)

No	Item	Responses				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Lack of qualified principals					
2	Lack of trained teachers' for special need education					
3	Limited support from woreda education office					
4	Lack of school facilities					
5	Limited support from the					
6	Lack of necessary awareness, attitude and practical involvement in SIP implementation community					
7	Lack of rewards for those who deserved it					

APPENDIX B: Interview Guide

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR CLUSTER SUPERVISORS

The purpose of this interview is to investigate issues related to the primary school principal effectiveness in leading change in jimma zone. The information obtained from the respondents will help improve the primary school principal effectiveness in leading school change. I would like you assure that data obtained will be used for research purpose only.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation!

Part I: General information

1. Woreda_____

2. Sex_____3. Qualification_____4. Current position_____ 5. Experiences as:-

- vice principals _____ School principal_____

- Cluster supervisor _____

Part II: Give your responses for the following questions.

What is the extent of leading school for improvement in primary schools?

How can you mention the commitment of stake holder in school improvement?

.To what extent do primary school principals professionally prepared to give the required leaders service?

What are the extents of school collaboration with external stakeholders to support the practice of improvement?

Does school improvement have a parallel relation with you as a school leader?

If yes, how? And if no why?

What are the major challenges that school leaders face during their leadership activities on school improvement program?

APPENDIX-C: Guides for Focus Group Discussion

Interview

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Dear Respondents:

The purpose of this interview is to collect primary data on the topic, "principal's effectiveness in leading change: Practices, Challenges, and activities inJimma Zone Governmental primary Schools" as partial fulfillment research for the master's program in

School leader ship at Jimma University. In this regard you are

kindly requested to provide reliable information so that the findings of this study meet the

intended outcome.

Thank you very much for your time and support.

Jafer Nuratel number 0913882762 or e-mail jafernura2011@ gmail.com

INTERVIEW GUIDES FOR FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION

Part 1 Back ground of Information

Part I: 1. Woreda _____

2. Qualification _____

3. Age_____

4. Duration of time as supervisor in years_____

Part 2. Interview questions related to the Practices of a Leading Schools improvement.

1. How would you explain about the general practices of collaborating school for improvement?

a) Collaboration

b) Leader Quality

c) Stakeholder involvement

2. What challenges face you in order to collaborate your school for change?

a) What do you think about the possible solutions of the problems in collaborating school for improvement?

3. What are major activity school Improvement program in your school?

Teaching learning element

Community participation

School management

School environment