THE PRACTICE AND CHALLENGES OF DECISION MAKING IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF ILUBABOR ZONE.

BY

GIZAW DENU

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT.

DECEMBER, 2021

JIMMA ETHIOPIA

THE PRACTICE AND CHALLENGES OF DECISION MAKING IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF ILUBABOR ZONE.

BY:

GIZAW DENU

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT**.**

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHVIORAL SCIENCE, JIMMA UNIVERSITY, IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP.

ADVISORS:

DESALEGN BEYENE (PhD, Asst. Professor)

FIREW AMSALE (MA, Asst. Professor)

DECEMBER, 2021

JIMMA ETHIOPIA

DECLARATION

I, the under signed, declare that this thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university, and that all sources of materials used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name Gizaw Denu

Sign._____

Date_____

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

Main advisor:

Name Desalegn Beyene (PhD, Asst. Professor)

Sign. _____

Date _____

Co-advisor:

Name Firew Amsale (MA, Asst. Professor)

Sign. _____

Date _____

Place: Jimma University

College of Education and Behavioral Science

 Department of Educational Planning and Management

Date of submission _____

AKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

LIST OF TABLES

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ESDP: Educational Sector Development Program

MoE: Ministry of Education

PDM: Participatory Decision Making

PTSA: Parent Teacher Students Association

SPSS: Statistical Package for Social Science

UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was to assess the practices and challenges of decision making in secondary schools of Ilu Aba Bor Zone. To conduct this study, a descriptive survey design was employed. A total of 93 respondents, that is; 67 teachers, 20 school leaders (Principals, vice principals and supervisors), and 6 PTSAs, chairperson were included in to the study. Teachers were selected by lottery method of simple random sampling technique while principals, supervisors and PTSA chairperson were selected by purposive sampling technique. The data were gathered through questionnaires, semi structured interviews and document review. Data gathered through questionnaire were analyzed by using percentages, mean, standard deviation and an independent sample t-test whereas data obtained through interviews and document review were qualitatively analyzed. The major findings of the study disclosed that there was poor decision making practice in secondary schools of Ilu Aba Bor Zone pertaining to communicate with staff regarding problems that needs decision, effectiveness of participative decisions, setting mission, vision and values of the school, participation in school budget, controlling and supervising plan implementation and participation in prioritizing school expenditure whereas they were more involved in such decision areas as planning school activities, informing students' rights and responsibilities, identifying student disciplinary problems and providing guidance, and participating in solving student problems with parents. Work load of school principals and student disciplinary problems were factors that affected the decision making practice. Besides, the study indicated that school leaders were not effective in encouraging stakeholders. It was also found that school leaders were not making decisions through scientific and systematic analysis. It was, thus, concluded that the participation of stakeholders (teacher parents, and students) in decision making was insufficient. This, consequently, is likely to affect the overall activities of schools in general and teaching learning process, in particular. To improve the practice it is thus recommended that school leaders need to make informed decisions through active involvement of stakeholders. Moreover, school leaders are advised to work in collaboration to reduce fear of risk taking, create strong sense of ownership, boost morale and recognize their effort and motivate stakeholders and in particular encourage parents to show greater interest in their children's education which in one way or another implies to the kind and quality of decisions schools make.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Education is regarded as the center of every civilization. It is an important sector for economic, social and cultural development aimed at satisfying needs, desires and hopes of society. Regarding this, (UNESCO, 2010) emphasized that education broadens people's freedom of choice and action, empowering them to participate in social and political lives of their society, and equipping them with the skill they need to develop their livelihood. Education is a process by which man transmits his experiences, new findings, and values accumulated over the years, in his struggle for survival and development through generation. It enables individuals and society to make all-round participation in the development of the process by acquiring knowledge, ability, skills and attitudes (MOE, 1994) The role and responsibilities of school leaders are defined by the policy makers in line with a country's political, socioeconomic, culture and educational contexts, school principals act as mediator between policy makers and teachers, parents and students and are therefore, at the hub of the education process, (UNESCO, 2016)

Decision making is one of the most important activities in which school administrators engage daily. The success of a school is critically linked to effective decisions. Because School is a place where knowledge, skills, and good ethics are transmitting to students for purpose of producing educated, accountable, responsible, competent, committed cooperative and productive citizens. In order to achieve this purpose, there must be coordination, cooperation, delegation of authority and responsibility, transparency, good communication and motivation among principals, vice-principals, teachers and other staff members through decentralized decisions-making process. Decisions are made at all levels of school organization. The administrative officials makes decisions concerning a school district's goals and strategies. Then principals make tactical decisions concerning those goals and strategies to accomplish them in relation to their own buildings. Department heads and team leaders then make curricular and operational decisions to carry out the day-to-day activities of a department or unit. And, finally, classroom teachers make decisions in their classrooms. Participative decision making increases the motivation level of teachers and thus affect individual and organizational out-comes (Smoech, 2010).

School leaders need to have deep and expert knowledge of decision making. That is because school leaders can be a powerful force for school change when they are flexible enough to allow teachers to take part in rational problem solving and responsible, widely shared decision making. In similar manner, Leithwood and Steinbach (1993) state that principals need to develop a positive school climate; ensure opportunity for teacher's collaboration and joint planning through a greater involvement in decision-making.

According to (Yukl, 2006), using a group to make a decision has many potential advantages over decision made by on individual or leader. In the past principals throughout the world have been the main decision makers at school level. The increasing emergence of participatory decisions making may be even more crucial today, when schools struggle to reinvent themselves to respond to a growing demand for flexibility, concern for quality, and the requirement of high degree of commitment by stakeholders to their work (Marrshal, 2006).

In Ethiopia, different researches have been conducted that focus on investigating the existence of participatory decision making of teachers in secondary schools. The study by Workneh (2012) examined the extent to which the involvement of different stakeholders in school impact upon critical decision making at school level. He examined that the Ethiopian education policy suggested the head teachers to lead the activities of various stakeholders involved in school decision-making should be empowered. The finding also confirmed that the attempt to strengthen participative decision making and administration had made good progress.

If people participate in making a decision; they tend to be more committed to the decisions and more motivated to put the decision in to action so that what are wanted will be achieved. On the other hand, in many secondary schools principals do not participate stakeholders and use their ideas and views as a source of information in solving decision-making at school level. Moreover, principals are observed to use their knowledge, skills and experience to direct the whole activities. Therefore, this study try to investigate the principals in Ilu Aba Bor Zone how they apply the decision making practice for the given problems by using the rule, regulation and directives.

1.2. Statement of the problem

Education, as a very important factor to human development, is of a high priority in the overall development endeavor of the government. Schools as educational and social institution that involve people are expected to participative decision making practice by far more than other organization. But encompasses various decision making process concerning different issues and educational problem Bimber (1994),stated that raised key decision in education is governance system include general operation and administration decisions; curricular and instructional, personnel, budget decision, in addition to this Bell (1996) noted that principal needs to involve the staff continuously and increasingly in collective decision making as a key aspect of their job, where by consulting collective decision making and delegation authority and reasonability were stressed.

Involvement of subordinates in decision making in organizations has attracted major advocacy in the current day management. At the same time, involvement in decision making is viewed as a major component of democracy. In line with this idea, the decentralization of school management should make decision making more democratic and lead to improved efficiency and effectiveness. The expansion of good governance and democracy to schools require the involvement of stakeholders such as policy makers, teachers, students, parents and community members (Naidoo & Jordan, 2005).

In addition to this, nowadays, it is very common to seek knowledge as inputs for decision making. In line with this, different scholars, such as Armstrong (1984), David (1989) and Bachelor (cited in Mualuko, 2009) has agreed that, the involvement of the key stakeholders (teachers, students and parents) in decision making helps to improve the quality and acceptance of the decision, and enhance the effectiveness of the organization to achieve its goals. This provides a better chance for the leaders to communicate easily and for delegation of responsibility.

In principle education provision can be improved through better management practice, transparency in the use of resource and accountability to all stakeholders (community, parents, students, and teachers). In addition to this school principal behavior and leadership style are one of the factors that impede stakeholder participation in school decision making. Ethiopia education and training policy gives authority for principals to participate other stakeholders in decision making (MoE, 1994)

The main intention of this study was to investigate the practice and challenges/problems/ of decision making quality through the full participation of stakeholders based on the rule; regulations and directives in participatory manner achieving their goals. Different studies have been conducted on some related topics. Desalegn (2014) the practice of teachers involvement in decision making in government secondary school of Jimma Town Oromia regional state and found that teachers involvement in school decision making to be minimal in the sample school. Fuji (2016) conducted a study on the practice of principals enhancing participation decision making in secondary school of west Arsi zone Oromia regional state. Reta (2017) conducted a study on decision making practices in government secondary school of Horro Guduru Wollega Zone Oromia regional state. As evident literature and real practical situation the practice of decision making involving stakeholder in school are insufficient. In addition to this, according to Ilu Aba Bor Zone education office 2020 annual report, the involvement of stakeholder parents, teachers and students in decision-making at school level to improve the quality of education and students achievement was low. Therefor there are the gap between the theoretical concept and actual practice of decision making. There is also a research gap because in Ilu Aba Bor Zone of Oromia regional state the researcher did not come across a study conducted practice and challenges of decision making in secondary school.

From this point of views, the study was more emphasis on weather principals perform their decision making effectively or not. In addition the study was identified some major problems such as; the stakeholders' participation in school decision making was not satisfactory, decision is not implemented and evaluated timely, the relation between the school and the stakeholders was not sufficient, the school principal lack of skill, vision , training and encountered implementing the rule, regulation and directives. Therefore, from this point of view that the researcher initiated to conduct the study, practice and challenges of decision making quality in selected secondary school of Ilubabor Zone, based on the following research questions.

1.3.Research Questions

1. What is the current practice of decision-making in the secondary schools of Ilu Aba Bor Zone?
2. To what extent do the stakeholders take part in the decision-making in secondary schools of Ilu Aba Bor Zone?

3. What are the areas where stakeholders more participate in decision making of secondary schools of Ilu Aba Bor Zone?

4. What are the major challenges of the practice of decision-making quality in secondary schools of Ilu Aba Bor Zone?

1.4 Objective of the study

1.4.1 General objectives

The general objective of this study was to investigate the current practice and challenges of decision-making in secondary school of Ilu Aba Bor Zone

1.4.2 Specific Objectives

1. To assess the current practice of decisions making in secondary schools of Ilu Aba Bor Zone.

2. To identify the extent of stakeholders involvement in decision making in secondary schools of Ilu Aba Bor zone.

3. To explore decision areas where stakeholders participate in secondary school of Ilu Aba Bor Zone.

4. To identify the challenges decision making quality in secondary schools of Ilu Aba Bor zone

5. To find out the mechanisms in which the school leaders' decision-making practice can be improved in Ilu Aba Bor Zone secondary schools

1.5 Significances of the Study

Schools are complex organizations with a diversified group of people which encountered by various problems that requires an appropriate decision. Because of this, decision can be made in education system at different levels, on various problems, that face the organization in its day - to-day activities. The process of decision making requires a deep investigation and intensive follow up. To this end, the need to know what to do with decision making; how to make it systematic; how to use the appropriate style; in order to ensure the quality and acceptance of decisions are crucial aspects in any organization. Therefore, this study is believed to make the following contribution:

1. It may help to create awareness about perception of school community towards principal decision-making practices in secondary schools.

2. Contribute to the practical knowledge of the duties and responsibilities of school leaders associated with decision making process.

3. Contribute for school leaders, teachers, students and parents to identify the major factors that influence decision making and to serve as reference for future studies on the area.

4. It is also hoped that the study would contribute to the improvement of quality education by initiating responsible parties in school decision making.

5. The research results would help to fill the knowledge gap about the approach, build consensus and raise awareness of stakeholders for better implementation.

1.6 Delimitation of the study

The study was conducted in Oromia region Ilu Aba Bor Zone on practice and challenges of decision making in secondary schools. The scope of the study was delimited to 8 selected secondary schools of Ilu Aba Bor Zone. It was more essential if the study was conducted in all secondary schools of Ilu Aba Bor zone; however, such study requires much resource, time and human power. Because of this 8 secondary schools were selected to which the researcher easily access to the information. Conceptually, the coverage of the study was delimited to assess the current practice and challenges of administrative decision- making regarding to school planning, school curriculum, school rules and policies, school budget and income generation and student disciplinary problem in selected secondary schools of Ilu Aba Bor Zone. Here, how the schools was practiced decision–making, the factors hindered the effectiveness, implementation of rule and regulation to implement effectively will assessed. Principals, Vice principals, teachers, supervisors and PTSAs will selected as participates in the sample study.

1.7 Definition of key terms

Decision making:- it is a process of making conscious, choice between two or more competing alternatives. This choice can be made by an individual or group. It was used in this study in the same way as it was defined in (Abraham, 2017)

School principal:- Refers to the head and deputy of the schools who take front responsibilities of the school activities.

Secondary School: Ranges from grade 9 through 12 with two cycles, first cycle 9-10 level and second cycle 11-12 level, (MOE, 1994:14).

Stakeholders: The stakeholders of an organization are individuals who have an interest in running of an organization or the outcomes of a specific decision. In the

context of schools, stakeholders can be students, teachers, parents, administrators, other members of the community.

1.8 Organization of the study

The study was organized in five chapters. The first chapter deals with introduction which included background of the study, statement of the problem , objective of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, and definition of terms. The second chapter deals with the review of related literature. The third chapter deals with research design and methodology used. The fourth chapter contains presentation, analysis, and interpretation of the results. The fifth chapter deals with the summary of major findings, conclusion and recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 The Concept of Decision-Making

Different authors define decision making differently. While some authors (e.g. Newstrom and Pierce, 1990) focus on the process involved in decision making, other (e.g. Hoy and Miskel, 1991) emphasize the problem solved during a decision making. On the other hand, some other writers (e.g. Irwin, 1996) focused on the actors involved in decision making.

Okumbe (1998) define decision-making as the process of specifying the nature of particular problem and selecting among available alternatives in order to solve the problem. This definition of decision-making indicates that a problem precedes any decision and that there must be a number of alternative courses of action from which an optimum course will be selected Knezevich, (1969) also define decision and decision making as follows:

A decision can be defined as a conscious choice of action from among a well-defined set of often competing alternatives. Decision-making is a sequential process culminating in a single decision or series of decisions (choices) which stimulate moves or actions. The sequences of activities called decision-making result in the selection of course of action from alternative course intended bring about the future state affairs envisage.

Decisions are a composite of values, facts, and assumptions. Each or all of these may be subject to change from time. Decision-making, therefore, is not a onetime activity but rather a continuing enterprise (Okumbe, 1998). Every successful organization must make decision that enable the organization to achieve its goal and which meet the critical needs of members of the organization (Morphet et al, 1982). Moreover, Alkin, (1992) state that "decisions are made daily in school about the conduct of work, the distribution of resources, and short term goals". Decisions involve policies (the definition of objectives), resources (people, money, materials, and authority), and means of execution (integration and synthesis). Insofar as the value content of this type of decision is concerned, the school principal should identify two major values; policy decision that seek purposive action; executing decision that seek coordination's of action (Wilson, 1996).

Thus, decision-making is very important and significant in school and in any organization at large to conduct work, distribute resources, plan short-term and long-term of bring about the future state of affairs as an intention, and activities of the school. Moreover, a school leaders'

main job is to lead the school through effective decision. Decision making, and quite often they have to decide on what is to be done, who to do it, and when and where is to be done.

2.2 Importance of Decision making

It is believed to say that decision settles and dismisses the process; however, the ending point of one process can be viewed as the starting point of another. Everybody decides about his affairs as which type of school should be selected, what to choose as profession, what sort of job is to take. Everyone wishes to make good decisions and a good decision is a major concern of ethics because without being aware of goodness, one cannot conceive a good decision. Many philosophers agreed that good is a relative term and generally it implies what a particular person wants, chooses and wishes to achieve. Draft, (2003) Goodness of a decision would be measured by the extent to which its results satisfy the decision maker's objectives. It also solves the problem that why decision must be taken. It is obvious that the decision-maker wants to achieve some purposes, or there is some state of affairs, which wishes to achieve. The decision maker will choose an action which he believes will help him most to obtain his objectives. This is also a hard fact that we do not always achieve our objectives despite our best efforts. The reason is obvious that certain factors that affect the achievement of objectives are either out of control of decision maker or the course of action has been wrongly chosen. These factors which relate to why what, when and how are the problems of decision making which must be dealt with. Finally any administrator is assessed or evaluated in terms of his success in making good decision. As a matter of fact decisions do not occur as discrete and isolated activities. Creating effective decisions depends on determining good alternatives and select best course of action. According to Vroom–Yetton and Jaggon (cited in Invacivich et al, 2005), "effective leadership select the appropriate decisions set and permit the optimal participation for followers" (p.402). This indicates that, even though, decision making is an important managerial process, many decisions should be made by member of the groups.

2.3 Basic Assumptions of Decision making

Assumption 1. Administrative decision making is a dynamic process that solves some organizational problems and creates others. Specific decisions that foster the achievement of the organization's purposes frequently interfere with other conditions that are also important. Thus at best, decision making by thoughtful and skillful executives and their staffs should lead to more rational decisions, but it typically will not result in final decisions.

Assumption 2. Complete rationality in decision making is impossible; therefore, administrators seek to satisfice because they have neither the ability nor the cognitive capacity to maximize the decision-making process. Effective administration requires rational decision making. Administrative decisions, however, are often extremely complex, and rationality is limited for a number of reasons: All the alternatives cannot be considered because there are too many options that do not come to mind. All the probable consequences for each alternative cannot be anticipated because future events are exceedingly difficult to predict and evaluate. Finally, rationality is limited not only by the administrators' information-processing capacities, but also by their unconscious skills, habits, and reflexes as well as their values and conceptions of purpose that may deviate from the organization's vials (Simon, 1991).

Assumption 3. Decision making is a general pattern of action found in the rational administration of all major tasks and functional areas in organizations.

In deciding, those with the responsibility generally go through a general pattern of action that includes the following: Recognize and define the problem or issue, Analyze the difficulties in the situation, Establish criteria for a satisfactory solution, Develop a strategy for action, Initiate a plan of action, Evaluate the outcomes.

Although the process is conceptualized as a sequential pattern because each step serves as a logical basis for the next, the process is also cyclical. Thus, decision making may be entered into at any stage. Moreover, the steps are taken again and again in the process of administering organizations.

Assumption 4. Values are an integral part of decision making.

Decisions are not value free. Values and moral choice are critical in systematic and deliberate decision making. When administrators pursue actions that they believe will attain a valued outcome, they are making judgments of value between competing goods or the lesser of evils. But action requires more than good intention.

The practice of administrative decision making is a continuing exercise in both rationality and valuation; it is both a rational and ethical activity. To separate the activities is foolhardy and impossible. Values and rationality are symbiotic not antithetical. Decision making is about moral choice, and thoughtful moral choice depends on informed explanation and inference (Hoy and Tarter, 1995).

2.4. Decisions Made at School Level

This sub–section attempts to discuss what international literature tells us about education management at school level and how it contributes to improving critical decision-making. Today, greater decentralization of educational decision-making is becoming the common aspiration of many developing countries (De Grauwe et al, 2011).Some researchers argue that participation of communities and students in the day-to-day activities of the schools (for example, in supervision, monitoring and evaluation) is part of the decentralization of school management (J Naidoo, 2005).In some Asian countries, like Malaysia ,school management has improved because it involves students and communities in school decision-making (Luck, 2011).The same is true in South Africa where the participation of communities and students in decision-making has played a role in the improved and expanded school based management (J Naidoo, 2005).

In the successful school, leaders; create a strong sense of vision and mission, build a strong culture of collaboration and creative problem solving situations, plan to facilitate work, set appropriate curriculum implementation mechanism, and possess an instructional leadership that take responsibility for students achievement, develop and communicate plans for effective teaching, and nurture cooperative relationship among all staff members: monitor students learning progress and close work with parents, and community members. In addition, the government of Ethiopia has also recently focused on improving school-based management through the devolution of education is decision making to school levels. To achieve this objective, it has promoted the role of various education stakeholders in decision making specifically; it has tried to strengthen the relationship between the WEOs and the schools through monitoring and capacity building schemes; the recent education programs such as ESDP IV, GEQIP and SIP give more power to head teachers and administrators to coordinate the roles of communities, parents and local administration in decision-making. The policy emphasizes importance of the participation of communities, parents and teachers (through PTA) for the improvement of critical decision- making at school level. The participation of students in education management is also a way of promoting participatory decision making at school level.

2.5. The Rational model Decision Making Steps

Administrative decision-making is assumed rational. By this, we mean that school administrators make decisions under certainty. They know their alternative; they know their

outcomes; they know their decision criteria; and they have the ability to make the optimum choice and then implement it (Towler, 2010). A rational decision making model describes a series of the steps that decision makers should consider if their goal is maximize the quality of their outcomes and systematically selecting among possible choices that is based on reason and facts and in such case we want not only to identify as many of these alternatives as possible but to choose the one that best fits with our goals, objectives, desires, values. According to the rational model, the decision making process can be broken down into six steps (Schoenfeld, 2011). Those are: identifying the problems or opportunity, develop alternatives, evaluating alternatives, choosing an alternatives, implementing the decision and evaluating decision effectiveness.

2.5.1. Identify the problem or opportunity

School exists to achieve certain goals, such as educating students. Within the School, each department or sub unit has goals, such as increasing test scores, reducing dropouts, and developing new approaches to teaching. Establishing these goals becomes the bases for identifying problem areas, deciding on courses of action, and evaluating the decision outcomes. Decision is said to be effective if it helps a school administrator to achieve a specific objective or set of goals for the school or school district (Berhanu, 2011). Failure to achieve a desired goal becomes a problem, and the school administrator is ultimately responsible for solving it .The process of identifying problems requires surveillance of the internal and external environment for issues that merit attention (Verschaffel, 2011).

2.5.2. Develop alternatives

When considering how to solve a problem, people generally increases the chance of making a sound of decision. How the manager does come up with a variety of possible action. Developing Alternative actions is creative process. That does not mean, however, that anything mysterious or magical is involved. One way of getting new ideas is to pick the brain of the other people. Ideas gathered from people of different backgrounds often help the manager develop different viewpoints. After developing a number of alternatives, the best must be selected. To do this, alternative must be evaluated based on result expected. It is recommended to list objectives- desired results under two headings: must and wants. The best alternative is the one that meets the must objective and all or most of the want objectives. Selection of the best alternative requires careful analysis. Managers need to be through and

make certain that there are no unexpected, undesirable outcomes from the selected alternatives (Ayalew, 2014).

2.5.3. Evaluating alternatives

The third step in the decision-making process is evaluating each of the alternatives generated in step 2.In evaluating an alternative, school administrators must ask the following three questions(1) is the alternative feasible (2) Is it a satisfactory alternative (3) What impact will it have on people (Grant,2011), the first question whether the alternative is feasible simply means: can it be done for example, if one alternative requires a generally off of school faculty but the school district has collective bargaining agreement that prohibits such layoffs, that alternative is not feasible. Similarly, if a school district has limited capital, alternative that require large capital outlays are not feasible, unless funds can be borrowed to meet the capital outlay requirements. The second question concerns the extent to which the alternative is satisfactory that is the extent to which it addresses the problem. For instance, suppose a principal wants to expand the curriculum by 25%.One alternative is to implement a trimester schedule. On closer examination, however, the principal may discover that the plan would expand the curriculum by only 15% and that such a modest expansion may negatively affect the quality of the program. The principal may decide to implement the trimester plan any way and search for other ways to achieve the remaining 10% expansion in the curriculum and find ways to maintain the quality of the program. Alternatively, he may decide to drop the alternative from consideration entirely .The third question addresses the impact of alternative on school personnel. The alternative that is chosen must be acceptable to those who with the Consequences of the decision. Failure to meet this condition is the single most likely reason for failure of the decision-making Process to solve problems (Hastie, 2010).For this reasons, questions of acceptability of proposed alternatives should be of great concerns to principal.

2.5.4. Choosing an alternative

Once the administrator has evaluated all of the alternatives, he attempts to choose the best alternative. The evaluation phase will have eliminated some of the alternatives, but in most cases two or more will remain. How does a school administrator decide which alternative is the best ;One approach is to select the alternative that is feasible, satisfactory, and acceptable to the work group (Gilboa,2011).Because most situations do not lend themselves to sophisticated mathematical analysis, the school administrator use this available information in combination with judgment and intuition to make the decision (Mendel,2011).The basis of

judgment and should be how close the outcomes or consequences of the alternatives comes to achieving the desired goals of the school. For example, if the original goals was to decrease the dropout rate as much as possible, regardless of costs, the school administrator might choose an alternative that will decrease the dropout rate significantly but that carries a high cost, rather than an alternative that would reduce dropouts only moderately at a minimal cost .However, if the original goal was to reduce dropout rate by a moderate amount and if that goals is more desirable now ,the second alternative might be a better choice. Finally, the school administrator may be able to choose several alternatives simultaneously.

2.5.5. Implementing the decision

After choosing an alternative, the school administrator faces the challenge of implementing the decision. A sound decision can fail if implemented poorly. It is useful, therefore, to consider some suggestions for successful implementation (Ahmed, 2011) School administrators need to make sure that the alternative is clearly understood .This is accomplished by communicating the decision to all involved staff .Effective communication is necessary for effectively implementing decisions, school administrators need to encourage acceptance of the alternative as a necessary course of action. Committees can help a school administrator achieve commitment.

2.5.6. Evaluating decision effectiveness

The final step in the decision making-process is evaluating the effectiveness of the decision. When an implemented decision does not produce the desired results, there is probably a number of causes: incorrect definition of the problem, poor evaluation of alternatives, and/or improper implementation. Among these possible causes, the most common and serious error is an inadequate definition of the problem .When the problem is in correctly defined, the alternative that is selected and implemented will not produce the desired result. Evaluation is important because decision-making is continuous, never-ending process. Decision-making does not end when a school administrator votes yes or no. Evaluation provides school administrators with information that can precipitate a new decision cycle. The decision alternatives and selection of a new alternative. Some experts suggest that many large problems are solved by attempting several alternatives in sequence, each providing a modest improvement (Hicks, 2005)

2.6. Types of decisions

Researchers and experts concerning decision-making have developed way of classifying different type of decision based on the nature and purpose they serve. In this regard ,writers such as Ivancevich et al,(2005) and Okumbe (1990) classified based on nature of the problem as programmed decision that is repetitive and routine activities and non- programmed decisions that is novel, unstructured, and new problem. However, for the most part, these different classification systems are similar, differing mainly in terminology (Vancevich et al,2005).The present researcher also believes that almost all the ideas proposed by the authors are similar except in their scope, width and ways of expressing the different types of decision –making. Therefore, this section mainly focuses on the types of decision –making based on their nature, time and purpose. These are: (1) Individual versus group Decision and (2) Program and Non- program Decisions.

2.6.1. Individual versus Group Decisions

Individual and group decisions are kind of decision based on a number of people involved in decision-making process. Based on the nature of the problem and the situation, some decisions may be made better by group, while others may be handled by individuals. As pointed out by Newsrom and Pierce (1990) the question of decision making by individuals or involving other should not be determined by leader personal preference, but by the nature of the problem and the situation. Bhmuck and Blumberg (1969), on their part underlie that, individuals, and not group, can usually reach more efficient decision for issues that are relatively simple in their elements, which are objectively and easily separable, and where the issue requires a strict sequence of acts that can be performed readily by single person.

Group decision-making is sometime referred to by other terminologies: participative decision-making, collective judgment management or plural management (McEwan, 1997). According to Agrawal (1982) in large and complex organization most of the basic and strategic decisions are made by a group of managers rather than by individuals.

Today important decisions are made by group than individuals. This is because there is great deal of information available in a participative decision-making process. Supporting this idea, Chanda (cited in Legesse, 2008) stated that, "group decision would become particularly appropriate for non-programmed decisions because these decisions are complex and few individuals have all knowledge and skills necessary to make the best decisions". This implies

that groups can make higher quality decision than individuals because different ideas come together from different groups and select the best from the given alternatives.

Thus, in school context, the school principals are not the only person that makes decision and the other people like teachers implement the decision without involving on the issues; and also the others should to accept the decision to agree with the action to be chosen. Supporting this idea, Adane et al. (2002) state that, school principals no longer make decision on their owns. That is because they need information and advice from several sources especially teachers and pupils to act rationally.

Generally, decisions may be taken either by an individual or groups. Even if the group decision-making may have its own limited disadvantage in school organizations making the decisions by group is preferable than one individuals. As argued by McEwan, (1997), group decision can bring more resource to many decisions than a single individual. Different people bring a variety of information, ideas, and viewpoints. Moreover, group decision helps to facilitate the identification of creative and innovative solution to the problems through participating staff members.

2.6.2. Programmed and Non-Programmed Decisions

Okumbe (1998) "program decisions are made on routine problems, whereas, non-programmed decision are in response to problems which are either novel or poorly defined". Knezevich (1969) also agrees on the above idea. He notes that programmed decisions are used in repetitive and routine activities. This means when definite procedures can be worked out, program decisions cover the routine problems of an organization that do not need a new response for each recurrence. In contrast, non-programmed decisions encompass novel, unstructured, and consequential issues for which no cut-and dried method can be developed. From the above point of view, programmed decisions are the easiest for school principals to make a decision. In this case, the nature of the problem is clearly defined and is well understood by them. In addition, while employing programmed decisions what principals often need to do follow either written or unwritten policies, procedures or rules to make solution for the problems in their school. By supporting this idea, Tripathi and Reddy (2002) have concluded that, programmed decisions are the easiest for educational managers to make.

Furthermore, program decisions are not time taking and simpler. Instead of to thinking to bring some solution for a problem on their own what principals are required in programmed

decision is to implement a policy. It can thus be said that programmed decision has limited opportunity when it comes to exercising creativity and independent judgment.

2.7 The General practices of school principals in school decision making

Different authors have written on school principal leadership practices in; different administrative setting and tasks of school organization. Benjaamine and Gard, (1993) noted that a; leader who intends to bring about a; change must development and articulate a vising of what a school like. The school principal is the; manger of the school. In order to manage and; administer the school efficiently, he must provide organizational leadership in the school. In this respect, he is responsible for planning, organizing, coordinating, cooperating, monitoring the staff and the students, and managing school building and facilities (Mussazi, 1982).He noted that the principal is an organizational man who must plan and sustain an organization of the school. He plays an important role in communicating his ideas to those with whom he works, and he must be responsive to the communication of other. He provides a leadership recognizing the impact of the changing world outside. Principals are expect to be instructional and curriculum leaders, assessment experts, disciplinarians, community builders, public relations, and communication experts, budget analysis ,facility manager, especial program m administrators, as well as guardians of various legal contractual, and policy mandate and initiatives (Glisi,2006).

In addition principal are expected to serve the conflicting needs and interest of many stake holders, including students ,parents, teachers, distinct office officials, unions & state and federal agencies. Leadership is more concerned with personal relation more sensitive to the feeling of others and better at handling of conflicts. The principal is able to think strategically, build and communicate a coherent vision in a range of complaining ways, inspire, challenge, motivate and empower others to carry the vision forward; model the values and vision of the board; activity engaged the diverse community throughout reach to build relationship and aliens. As MOE, (2002) the principal has to be knowledgeable and understand the local, national and global trends; ways to build communicate and understand a shared vision strategic planning processes; ways to build communicate within and beyond the school, new technologies, their use and impact; leading change, creativity and innovation.

2.8 Factors Affecting School Decision Making Process

One of the most congruent findings from studies of effective leadership in school is that authority to lead need not located in the person of the leader, but can be dispersed within the school in between and among people (Mac Beath, 1998, Day, etal, 2000). There is a growing understanding that leadership is embedded in various organizational context within school communities, not centrally vested in a person or office. The effectiveness of school principal in decision making is affected by the number of factors.

2.8.1 Quality of Decision Making

Quality of decision-making is considered as a dependent variant. Decision-making is a broad concept and have direct and indirect effect on all organizational matters. This feature has make it is very interesting subject for experts, But we should clarity how a decision is measured and what is considered as a better decision. Quality of decision means the degree and level of success in teaching a goal and better decision is the decision that in Opinion of the person who decides will lead the system (group of organization) faster and better toward its goal (Sa'adat, 1993). Decision-making is defined as a combination of science, thought, sense and imagination in away the result in complex can be implemented. In other words, decision-making is an action that cannot be shown or defined by and kind of formula or relation, but one of the recognized features of decision making in managements the fact that certainty and trust is present and evident in it. Thus, we can suggest that decision-making is the process of choosing the most ideal or the most logical way for solving a problem or reaching a goal (john and Netsky, 1991).

2.8.2 True and Timely information

The people who make decision often are in lack of required information and statistics for making decisions and because the value and importance of decisions for them is the same as gathered information, it can be easily understood that how much the lack of true and correct information can cause problem in decision making process. The most important problem in this is the lack of central and creditable database that can help people in making decision. Available Information is usually in complete and out of date 28 and you can trust their creditability. Large number of authorities and organizational position in most governmental organization is another problem in way of delivering information to people. Because this information has to go through many department, groups, and people and it usually causes many changes in it reduce its credibility (Alvani, 2001)

2.8.3 Personal Ideas and knowledge

Sometimes managers make their decision in their minds without paying attention to phases of decision making and conforming and justifying their opinion, they try to find information that confirms their decision and will ignore other facts and truths that are in contradiction with their opinion. Extensive focus on personal experience and ignoring other people's opinions is another aspect of personal influence on decision-making. However, personal experience of people who are going to make decisions can be useful as one of information sources in making decisions; but whenever these experiences are used as the only guide and basis for making decision, it cannot guarantee a successful outcome (Alvani, 2001).

2.8.4 Environmental Factors

Decision-making problems are related to ruling conditions and situations of society and the impact of environments surrounding the system on decision-making process can be very effective. This environment includes effective factors such as cultural, social, economic, regional, technological and political factors, so it can be assumed that the meaning of effective environmental factors is forces and factors that have close relation with organization's activities and operations and have some effects on the decision making process of that organization's managers (Daft, 1998)

2.9 The Way of Administrative Decision Making in School

As (MOE, 2002) stated in the concept paper of principals the first and for most for the personal who is working in administrative line is making effective decision. To make effective decision on should collaborative with necessary bodies from the upper echelons and on other hand with subordinates sometimes with students. Some principals familiar with directive decision making approach by which principals more collecting information. Other exercise consultative decision making to get the idea of their subordinates even other encourages participative decision-making .In this practice the principals share the problem to subordinate and both of them discuss and analyze the issue jointly. This attitude develops mutual trust and generates strong felling and job satisfaction. To make effective decisions, the principals should know not only the alternative but also the type and effective of the decision to be made.

2.10 Decentralization of decision-making authority to schools

Researchers have identified some benefits of decentralization for critical decision-making at school level. First as Dunne et al, (2007) have pointed out education decentralization reduces inequalities mainly when financial responsibility is delegated to local government. Sub-Saharan African countries, from Ethiopia to South Africa, have recently been engaged in administrative decentralization, and efforts have been made to be increase schools level independence through the provision of direct financial support to schools in the form of school grants and by promoting community participation in school governance (Naidoo, 2005) therefore, decentralization facilitates responsiveness to local needs through community participation, transparency and accountability in school management (Dunne et al, 2007).

Second, decentralization leads to change in school management. Many African countries, for example, regarded decentralization as a means for management restricting (Dunne et al, 2007).In many developing countries the school administration is a combination of head teacher, teachers, school administrators, community representatives and local government authorities. The decentralization process has achieved important outcomes as school administration and communities play greater roles in building classrooms, recruiting contract teachers, and raising community contributions (Dunne et al, 2007). Moreover, the school administrations are involved in the setting of staff qualifications, textbook development, monitoring and evaluation, teacher training, partial financial administration, designing school rules, and maintenance of school facilities (Naidoo, 2005).

Third, the decentralization of school management can make decision-making more democratic and lead to improved efficiency and effectiveness.

2.10.1 The Role of School Principals in School Decision-Making

Principals as the school chief educational leader play a major role in shaping the nature of school organization. In supporting this idea, Ministry of education, Government of Ethiopia (2005:16) Commented that; principals as individual leader play a pivotal role in the success of the school. In the successful school, leaders; create a strong sense of vision and mission, build a strong culture of collaboration and creative problem solving situations, plan to facilitate work, set appropriate curriculum implementation mechanism, and possess an instructional leadership that take responsibility for students achievement, develop and communicate plans for effective teaching, and nurture cooperative relationship among all staff members: monitor students learning progress and close work with parents, and

community members. In addition, the government of Ethiopia has also recently focused on improving school-based management through the devolution of education is decision making to school levels. To achieve this objective, it has promoted the role of various education stakeholders in decision making specifically; 1) It has tried to strengthen the relationship between the WEOs and the schools through monitoring and capacity building schemes. 2) The recent education programs such as ESDP IV, GEQIP and SIP give more power to head teachers and administrators to coordinate the roles of communities, parents and local administration in decision- making. 3) The policy emphasizes importance of the participation of communities, parents and teachers (through PTA) for the improvement of critical decision-making at school level. 4) As a key local administration unit working closely with the community, kebele administration is considered as one of the key stakeholders for enhancing school- based management. 5) The participation of students in education management is also a way of promoting participatory decision making at school level.

2.10.2. The role of teachers in school decision-making

Teachers can participate in decision making either as individuals, in committees or in staff meetings as a group. (Chan et al, 1997) has discussed that teacher participation in a decentralized devolution system as follows; the level of participation involves individuals who carryout tasks and make decisions while pursuing the schools goals, the level of participation focuses on the interaction among school members as teams, groups or departments.

The decision-making area at this level of participation involves issues that mainly relate to functioning of groups, for example, subject committee. This committee will be in charge of ordering text books, promotions within the department, supervision of members and other issues, extracurricular activity groups: this committee will be in charge of sports, entertainment and school trips and groups that handle discipline and disciplinary issues. Committees are a way to formally draw together people of relevant expertise from the whole staff complement (Chan et al., 1997).

2.10.3 The Role of Communities and Parents in School Decision-Making

In this sub-section, the paper reviews literature on the role of communities and parents in school- based decision-making. It also provides some discussion of how community participation contributes to the further decentralization of critical decision-making at school level. One of the advantages of involving communities in school decision-making is that it

creates a greater sense of ownership, morale and commitment among the stakeholders. Decisions that are made at local level are arguably more responsive to specific issue related to school contexts (Dunne et al, 2007). An important achievement has been observed in South Africa in the regard, since school-based governance is often integrated with participatory decision-making (Naidoo, 2005). Another advantage is that decentralization empowers communities to mobiles resources (Dunne et al, 2007). In Ghana, for example, decentralization helps to enhance the efficiency of school management and accountability (Dunne et al, 2007).

Third, decentralization motivates parents to show greater interest in their children's education. In some cases, the functioning of local education offices was financed by communities (Dunne et al, 2007). According to De Grauwe et al, (2011), the involvement of parents, teachers, local councilors and education officials in school management can help to promote decision-making at school level, which improves the quality of schooling and students" achievement. However, the implementation of decision-making through the full participations of parents and communities entails challenges.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

In order to assess and clarify, the current practice and challenge of decision making it is necessary to conduct descriptive survey design. This descriptive survey is concerned with condition that exist; practice that prevail; point of view and process that are going on. This design was selected because it is appropriate when the aim of the study is to get an exact description of current status (Seyoum and Ayalew, 1989). Similarly, Best and Kahn, (2003) note that descriptive research design helps to describe and interpret the current conditions. Then in this descriptive survey design both quantitative and qualitative data was required to assess the practice and challenges of decision making in secondary school of Ilu Aba Bor zone.

3.2 Research Method

In this study, the research methods used are both quantitative and qualitative methods with more focus on quantitative one. Because focusing on using more quantitative method is that assessing the current practices and challenges of decision making demands the collection of quantitative data, which can be put to rigorous quantitative data in a formal, structured and rigid manner. Furthermore, the qualitative information was used to provide greater clarity and understanding of the information obtained from the quantitative survey response and the qualitative data was also incorporated in the study to validate and triangulate the quantitative data (Creswell, 2002). Therefore, these methods were selected with the assumption that they were helpful to obtain precise information concerning the practices of decision making in detailed from the respondents.

3.3 Source of Data

The data were gathered from both primary and secondary sources to accomplish the study, to get reliable and valid information.

3.3.1 Primary Source of Data

The source of primary data were teachers, principals, vice principals supervisors and PTSA through questionnaire and interview. The respondents were selected because their day to day activities are related to the objective of the study.

3.3.2 Secondary Source of Data

The secondary source of data were various school document meeting minutes of staff, guidelines related to committee works and any written report on the decision making in year 2020.

3.4 Population, Sample size and Sampling Techniques

3.4.1. Population

Ilu Aba Bor Zone is one of the 21 administrative Zones in the Oromia Region. The total number of secondary schools in the Zone is 47.The number of teachers is 1316 in secondary school, the number of PTSAs chair-person 47, the number of principals 47, vice principals 51 and supervisor 17 according to statistical report of Ilu Aba Bor zone education office in 2012 E.C.

3.4.2. Sample Size and Sampling techniques

Ilu Aba Bor zone was selected as study site purposely, because the researcher has been working there and is familiar with the area. The woredas of Ilu Aba Bor Zone were more or less homogenous in infrastructure, facility, availability of human resource and others. There are thirteen woredas and one town administration in Ilu Aba Bor Zone. Those woredas and town administration categorized in to four cluster by using multistage cluster sampling. Those are Metu cluster, Alge Sachi Cluster, Yayo cluster and Bure cluster. The woredas under Metu cluster were: Metu town, Metu woreda, Becho woreda, Yayo cluster included Yayo woreda, Hurumu woreda, and Doreni woreda whereas Alge Sachi Cluster consists of Alge Sachi Woreda, Darimu Woreda, Bilo Nopha woreda Bure cluster comprised Bure woreda, Halu woreda, Ale woreda, Didu and Nono Sale Woreda. The researcher selected 2(two) woredas from each cluster Alge-Sachi, Bilo-Nopha, Bure, Halu, Mettu, Becho, Yayo, and Hurumu woredas. From each selected wereda one secondary school was selected by using lottery system of simple random sampling technique. The selected schools were Burusa, Becho, Bure, Halu, Alge, Nopha, Yayo Haida, Hurumu secondary schools. Out of 277 teachers in these schools, 83 (30%) in the sample secondary schools were selected by lottery system of simple random sampling technique. 8 principals, 8 vice principals, and 8 secondary school supervisor, were selected by purposive sampling technique. From each eight secondary schools, 8 PTSAs chairpersons were selected by purposive sampling

technique. Because they were considered to have relevant information about the practice of decision making in secondary school.

Table3. 1: Summary of population, sample size and sampling techniques of the sample schools.

No	Participant	Secondary School	Total No of Population	Sample size	Percent (%)	Sampling technique
1	Teachers	Alge	38	11	30%	Lottery method of Simple Random Sampling
		Nopha	35	11	30%	
		Uka	33	10	30%	
		Bure	38	11	30%	
		Burusa	34	10	30%	
		Becho	27	8	30%	
		Yayo Ayida	30	9	30%	
		Hurumu	42	13	30%	
2	Principals, Vice principals and Supervisors		24	24	100%	Purposive Sampling
3	PTSA chair persons		8	8	100%	Purposive Sampling
	Total		309	115		

To determine the sample size of teachers for each secondary school, the following stratified formula of William (1977) will utilize.

$P_S = \frac{n}{N}$ X No of teachers in each school

Where P_S = Sample size of the school

n= total teacher sample size

N= total population of sampled school

Based on the above stratified formula sample size of teachers in each secondary school was computed.

Alge secondary school (teacher population= 38)

$P_S = \frac{83}{277} \times 38 = 11.3 \approx 11$

Nopha secondary school (teacher population= 35)

$P_S = \dfrac{83}{277} \times 35 = 10.48 \approx 10$

Uka secondary school (teacher population= 33)

$P_S = \dfrac{83}{277} \times 33 = 9.88 \approx 10$

Bure secondary school (teacher population= 38)

$P_S = \dfrac{83}{277} \times 38 = 11.33 \approx 11$

Burusa secondary school (teacher population= 34)

$P_S = \dfrac{83}{277} \times 34 = 10.18 \approx 10$

Becho secondary school (teacher population= 27)

$P_S = \dfrac{83}{277} \times 27 = 8.09 \approx 8$

Yayo Ayida secondary school (teacher population= 30)

$P_S = \dfrac{83}{277} \times 30 = 8.98 \approx 9$

Hurumu secondary school (teacher population= 42)

$P_S = \dfrac{83}{277} \times 42 = 12.58 \approx 13$

Total sample size number is 11+ 10+10+11+10+8+9+13=83

3.5 Instrument of Data Collection

The data gathering tools employed in the study were questionnaires, interview, and document review.

3.5.1. Questionnaires

Questionnaires a written forms that ask exact questions of all individuals in the sample group, and which respondents can answer at their own convenience (Gall et al., 2007).The questionnaire is the most widely used type of instrument in education. The main purpose of to use questionnaires was for obtaining information, opinions, and attitudes from large number of objective with in short period of time. It is convenient to conduct survey design and to acquire necessary information from the target population.

The data provided by questionnaires can be more easily analyzed and interpreted than the data obtained from verbal responses. Questionnaires provide greater uniformity across measurement situations than do interviews. Each person responds to exactly the same questions because standard instructions are given to the respondents. Questionnaire design is relatively easy (Haines, 2007).

Therefore, questionnaires are believed to be better to get large amount of data from large number of respondents in a relatively shorter time with minimum cost. Both open and closed ended questions were developed as main instrument of data collection from the respondents.

Hence, questionnaires was developed by the researcher based on review of the literature, the guidelines and policy issues particular to Oromia regional state and also prepared in English language, because all of the sample respondents teachers, school principals and supervisors can have the necessary skills to read and understand the concepts that were incorporated. The questionnaires have two parts. The first part of the questionnaire describes the respondents' background information, categories include; sex, level of education, area of specialization and service year. The second and the largest part were incorporated with the whole possible administrative school decision making variables of both closed and open ended questions. The questionnaire has five rating scale and the level of the scale is from strongly agree to strongly dis agree.

The closed type of questions are in the form of Likert-scale model by which the researcher has the chance to get a greater uniformity of responses of the respondents that are helpful to make it easy to be processed. In addition to this, few open ended type of questions were used in order to give opportunity to the respondents to express their feelings, perceptions, problems and practice related to decision making in the schools.

3.5.2 Interview

An interview is the verbal questions asked by the interviewer and verbal responses provided by the interviewee (Gall et al., 2007). Interviews are necessary tool to understand deep feeling, perception values or the around them. Therefore, interview was used in this study to collect information from PTA on the practices and challenges of decision making.

The researcher used semi-structured interview and it contained similar idea with the contents of the questionnaires in order to gather qualitative data from the respondents. Thus, an interview guide (a written list of questions) will be prepared by the researcher and conducted in a face to face interaction. Afan Oromo language was used during interview and later translated to English by the researcher to avoid miss understanding between the informants and the researcher. Notebook was used to take down the information provided by the informants. The responses of the respondents were organized properly and analyzed in their appropriate area.

3.5.3 Document review

Different written documents, minutes of meeting and the decision passed by the stakeholders are analyzed to support data obtained through questionnaires and interviews. Therefore for the triangulation of data, information from related documents was collected to complement the quantitative data obtained through questionnaire concerning the extent and areas of decision making practice in secondary school.

3.6. Pilot testing

Advisors observed the validity questionnaire so, that the item was rearrange and corrected. Once the questionnaires were prepared pilot testing of the instruments was made in Abdi Bori Secondary School in Mettu town of Ilu Aba Bor Zone, to test the questionnaire before it was administered to the final participants of the study. The pilot test was conducted on 20 respondent teachers, one principal and two vice-principals. Pilot-test was done with the objectives to check whether the items contained in the instruments could enable the researcher to gather relevant information. Based on the feedbacks from respondents valuable improvements was made and irrelevant items was rejected. Then the Cronbach Alpha reliability was calculated for the major theme was between 0.723 and 0.886. Based on the result of the pilot study the Cronbach Alpha reliability results 0.723 for perception of stakeholders towards the decision making practice of school leaders, 0.886 for participation of stakeholders in decision making, 0.852 for the areas of stakeholders participation in decision making and 0.759 for factors affecting the school leaders to make quality decision in the school. In general, the pilot test was help the researcher to avoid errors related to ideas and contents. After the necessary correction was made, the final copies were distributed to respondents.

3.7 Procedure of Data Collection

Data those valid this research was collected through questionnaire, interview and document review. The questionnaire was tested and necessary correction was made to avoid ambiguity and confusion before conducting the final data collection. This is follow by the preparation of the final draft of the questionnaire. Then, the questionnaire was administered with the help of principals and unit leaders of the schools after provision of necessary orientation by the researcher. The researcher will be distributed 83 questionnaires to teachers and 24 questionnaires for school principals, vice principals and supervisors respondents and collect them after a week.

The data was gathered though questionnaire is complemented by data gathered through interview from sampled respondents. Afan Oromo language was used during interview and later translated to English by the researcher to avoid miss understanding between the informants and the researcher. Notebook was used to take down the information provided by the respondents. The responses of the respondents organized properly and analyzed in their appropriate area. For the triangulation of data, information from related documents was collected to complement the quantitative data obtained through questionnaire concerning the extent and areas of decision making practice in secondary school.

3.8 Methods of Data Analysis

The data was analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. The analysis of the data was based on the responses collected through questionnaires, interview, and document observation. In accordance with the data that were collected from different sources, the close–ended questionnaire was systematically coded, tabulated and organized for analysis using quantitative method. The organized and coded data was stored in an editable excel spreadsheet and imported to SPSS version 25 and analysed using frequency, percentage mean, standard deviation and independent sample t-test. In addition, the data gathered through open ended question, interview and document observation, was categorized thematically. The items were classified into different tables according to similarities of issues raised in the questionnaire. After the classification, each of the issue analysed and interpreted. Depending on the nature of the basic questions and data gathered, data was analysed using different statistical tools. Accordingly, the respondents report and the nature of the basic questions required the following statistical techniques:

1. Frequency and percentage distribution was used to analyze various characteristics of the sample population such as sex, age, academic qualification, field specialization and experience.

2. Frequency, mean score, and standard deviation were computed for quantitative variables against each item score to identify the extent of stakeholder participation in selected areas of decision–making.

3. Independent sample t-test was employed to see the statistical significance of the responses of the teacher respondent groups and leaders respondent groups. This is because t-test is considered as an appropriate test for judging the significance difference between the mean of the two sample groups (Kothari, 1985).

Besides this, the data obtained through interview, open ended questionnaire and document review was analyzed and interpreted qualitatively by describing or narrating the ideas provided by the respondents based on their themes.

3.8 Ethical Consideration

To make the research process professional, ethical consideration were made. To conduct this research the researcher was take the official letter from Jimma University, College of Education and Behavioral Science, Department of Educational Planning and Management to Ilu Aba Bor Educational Office. The Zone Educational Office was send to the Wereda Educational Office. Again the 'Weredas' send the researcher to High Schools Administrative Office. The researcher informed the respondents about the purpose of the study and asked their permission to answer questions in the questionnaire or interview guide. He also informed the participants that the information they provided only used for the study purpose. Accordingly, the researcher was use the information from his participants only for the study purpose. In addition, the researcher ensured confidentiality by making the participants anonymous. In this way the ethical issue of the participant was protected.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF DATA

This chapter deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of data gathered from sample population. It consists of two parts. The first part is concerned with presenting personal information of the participants and part two deals with the presentation and analysis of the findings of the study. In the study, 83 teachers 24 school leaders (principals, vice principals and supervisors) and 8 Parent Teacher Associations totally 115 sample respondent from eight secondary schools were included. Questionnaires were distributed to all sample teachers, principals, vice principals and supervisors and were 67 teachers and 20 leaders totally 87 respondent filled and return the questionnaires. Based on the data obtained from the total of 87 respondents, the analysis was made. In addition, the questionnaire was sustained by interview conducted with Parent Teachers' Association.

All the data obtained through questionnaires, and interviews based on the basic questions posed in chapter one, interpretation and discussion were carried by taking into account theories discussed and empirical works reviewed in the literature.

4.1. Characteristics of the Respondents

Description of respondent's characteristics gives some basic information about the sample groups that helps to know the overall information of the respondents in relation to school decision making process. The following table presents the general characteristics (sex, age, Years of experience and Level of qualification) of respondents involved in the study.

Table 4.1: Characteristics of respondents by sex, age, Years of experience and Level of qualification

No	Items		Respondents									
			Teachers		Dep. Heads		Principals		Vice principals		Supervisors	
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Sex	Male	40	81.6	16	88.9	7	100.0	8	88.9	4	100.0
		Female	9	18.4	2	11.1	-	-	1	11.1	-	-
		Total	49	100.0	18	100.0	7	100.0	9	100.0	4	100.0
2	Age	<20	1	2.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		21-25	5	10.2	-	-	-	-	2	22.2	-	-
		26-30	11	22.4	7	38.9	1	14.3	-	-	1	25.0
		31-35	7	14.3	3	16.7	3	42.9	3	33.3	1	25.0
		36-40	12	24.5	5	27.8	1	14.3	2	22.2	2	50.0
		41-50	13	26.5	3	16.7	2	28.6	2	22.2	-	-
		Total	49	100.0	18	100.0	7	100.0	9	100.0	4	100.0
3	Years of experience	<5 years	3	6.1	1	5.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		6-10 years	9	18.4	4	22.2	-	-	1	11.1		
		11-15 years	11	22.4	6	33.3	3	42.9	5	55.6	3	75.0
		16-20 years	8	16.3	3	16.7	2	28.6	1	11.1	1	25.0
		>20 years	18	36.7	4	22.2	2	28.6	2	22.2	-	-
		Total	49	100.0	18	100.0	7	100.0	9	100.0	4	100.0
4	Level of qualification	BA/BSc/Bed	35	71.4	14	77.8	1	14.3	1	11.1	-	-
		MA/MSc/Med	13	26.5	4	22.2	6	85.7	8	88.9	4	100.0
		Others	1	2.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Total	49	100.0	18	100.0	7	100.0	9	100.0	4	100.0

Item 1 of Table 2 relates to sex of the respondents. Accordingly, 40(81.6 %) teachers 16(88.9 %) of department heads 7(100%) of the principals, 8(88.9 %) vice principals and 4(100 %)of the supervisors were males. whereas 9(18.4 %) teachers 2(11.1 %) of department head 0(0%) of principals, 1(11.1 %) vice principals and none(0 %) supervisors were females. This implies less proportion of females workers in the secondary schools of Ilu Aba Bor Zone were participating in the study.

In terms of age, as could be seen from the response to item 2 of table 2, the respondents were found to vary. Accordingly as to the age of teacher respondents for instance11 (22.4%) were between 26-30 years, 7(14.3%) were between 31-35years, 12(24.5%) were between 36-40 years and 13(26.5%) were above 40 years. Regarding department heads, 7(38.9%) were between 26-30 years, 3(16.7%) were between 31-35years, 5(27.8%) were between 36-40

years and 3(16.7%) were above 40 years. Principals 1(14.3%) between 26-30 years, 3(42.9 %) between 31-35years, 1(14.3 %) between 36-40 years and 2(28.6%) were above 40 years and supervisors 1(25%) were between 26-30 years, 1(25 %) were between 31-35years, and 2(50 %) were between 36-40 years.

Table 2 item 3 concerns the experiences of the respondents. Accordingly from all respondent 9(18.4 %) of teachers were found 6-10 years of experience 11(22.4 %) of them found 11-15years, 8(16.3%) of them16-20, and 18(36.7%) of them were above 21years. Department heads 4(22.2%) were found 6-10 years of experience 6(33.3%) of them have 11-15years experience, 3(16.7%) of them16-20, and 4(22.2%) of them were above 21years. When we see here about the experience of principal's 3(42.9 %) were between 11-15 years, 2(28.6 %) were found 16-20 years and 2(28.6 %) were above 21years, whereas 1(11.1%) of vice principals were 6-10 years 5(55.6%) of them have 11-15 years 1(11.1%) were between 16-20 years and 2(22.2 %) of them above 21 years of experience. Supervisors 3(75%) were found to have 11-15years experience and 1(25%) 0f them were between 16-20years of experience. It can be said that most of the respondents were well experienced and involving those in school decision making is very important and they asset for the school. (Alvani, 2001) Personal experience of people who are going to make decisions can be useful as one of information source in making decision; but whenever these experience are used as the only guide and basis for making decision, it cannot guarantee as successful outcome.

In terms of educational level 35(71.4%) of teacher, 14(77.8%) of department head, 1(14.3%) of principals and 1(11.1%) of vice principals were BA/BEd/BSc holder. Moreover, 13(26.5 %) of teachers, 4(22.2 %) of department head, 6(85.7%) of principals, 8(88.9%) of vice principals and 4(100%) of supervisors are had MA/MEd/MSc. This may clearly show that all of teachers' respondents were qualified at this level. The guidelines of ministry of education (1994) has indicated that secondary school have minimum of first degree. Most of the school principals and supervisors were MA holders. This show that recruitment criteria indicated in the document of the secondary school principals and supervisors are required to have second degree in field of school leadership and educational leadership. In reality most of the school principals and supervisors from academic subject.

4.2. Presentation, Analysis, and Interpretation of the Main Data

4.2.1. Perception of stakeholders towards decision making practice of school leaders.

Table4.2: Perception about the decision making practice

N0	Item	Respondent	No	Mean	S.D	Av. Mean	Av. S.D	t-Value	P-value
1	Staff members believe decisions are implemented properly.	Teachers	67	3.58	.801	3.66	0.790	-1.691	0.100
		Leaders	20	3.90	.718				
2	Staff member's acceptance of decision is based on actual problem.	Teachers	67	3.67	.842	3.69	0.867	-0.327	0.746
		Leaders	20	3.75	.967				
3	Staff members agree that decision regarding every problem should be correctly identified.	Teachers	67	3.40	1.031	3.46	1.009	-1.013	0.318
		Leaders	20	3.65	.933				
4	Principals communicate the staff regarding problems that need decision.	Teachers	67	3.61	1.014	3.72	0.985	-2.266	0.029
		Leaders	20	4.10	.788				
5	Decisions are made timely.	Teachers	67	2.82	1.290	2.99	1.325	-2.183	0.037
		Leaders	20	3.55	1.317				
6	Stakeholders (leaders and teachers) believe that their participation in decision making promotes school improvement.	Teachers	67	4.09	.949	4.18	0.896	-2.299	0.026
		Leaders	20	4.50	.607				
7	There is an effective participation in decision making made at school level	Teachers	67	3.46	.910	3.56	0.898	-2.099	0.043
		Leaders	20	3.90	.788				
8	Principals are able and skilful to read different situations /options/ for decision making	Teachers	67	3.43	1.048	3.53	1.044	-1.634	0.112
		Leaders	20	3.85	.988				

As can be seen from Table 3, with Item 1, respondents were requested to rate their degree of agreement as to whether or not various types of decisions at the school were properly implemented.

The mean scores were M=3.58(S.D=0.801), and M=3.90(SD=0.718) for teachers and leaders respectively. The average mean was M=3.66(SD=0.790) for the two groups. The mean score of teachers was below the average mean 3.66. But, the mean score for school leaders was higher than the average mean. An independent samples t-test was run to determine if there

were differences in the responses of the two groups concerning the first item in the table. P-value was 0.100, which is greater than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was found to be -1.691. This shows that there was no statistically significant difference between the responses of two groups implying that school leaders and teachers agreed that various type of decision are implemented properly.

Item 2, of Table 3, relates to staff members decision acceptance based on actual problems. As could be seen from the table the mean scores rate for teachers and leaders were M=3.67(SD=0.842) and M=3.75(SD=0.967) respectively. The average mean was M=3.69(SD=0.867) for the two groups. An independent samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in the responses of the two groups, P-value which was 0.746, is greater than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was found to be -0.327.This shows that there was no statically significant opinion difference among the two groups of respondents with regard the staff member's belief as to the acceptance of decision is based on actual problem.

With Item 3 of the Table 3 the respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement concerning proper identification of every problem for decision. The mean scores rate was M=3.40(SD=1.031) for teachers and M=3.65(SD=0.933) for school leaders. The average mean was M=3.46(SD=1.009) for the two groups. This show that the mean of the teacher respondents was less than the average mean whereas the mean of the leader is greater than the average mean. An independent samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in the responses of the two groups, P-value which was 0.318, is greater than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was found to be -1.013.The result thus suggests that there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. This implies that both groups have similar attitude that every problem should be correctly identified for the decision to be made.

While responding to Item 4, of Table3, that is their degree of agreement regarding whether or not principals communicate with staff about to the problem that need decision a could be seen from that table the mean scores rate for teachers was M=3.61(SD=1.014) whereas it was M=4.10(SD=0.788) for school leaders. The average mean for the item was M=3.72(SD=0.985). This implies that there was a statically significant difference between mean of the teachers and leaders. Consequently an independent sample t-test was run to compare the two groups' responses. Accordingly, p-value was found to be 0.029 which is less

than the significant level 0.05 and t-value which is -2.266. This implies that there was statistically significant difference between the responses of two groups'. These results indicate that principals' communication with staff regarding problem that need decision was poorly practiced. This implies that, most of the time, school principals did not communicate with stakeholders regarding to decision. Communication is the sharing of information between two or more individuals or groups to reach common understanding. Good communication is essential for increasing efficiency, quality, responsiveness, and innovation (Janse R. and George M. 2009). In Organization ,there should be effective participation of staff members .This can be achieved through creating good coordination and cooperation between managers and staff members by building their moral (Caldwell and Brain,2005).Therefore, to make decision there must be a good communication, cooperation, coordination between school principals, vice principals, teachers supervisors and PTSAs members .If this is so, there is trust and respect among them .Otherwise the reverse will be true supporting this, (Cheng .2008) point out that, unless the staff members feel secure in communicating certain information and feel that what they are communicating will be taken seriously, they are not like to increase their communication.

As can be seen from Table 3 with item 5, the respondents were requested to rate their degree of agreement timely decision making. The mean scores rate shows M=2.82(1.29) for teachers and M=3.55(1.317) for leaders. The average mean for the item was M=2.99(SD=1.325). But, the mean score for school leaders was higher than the average mean. An independent sample t-test was run to compare the response of the two groups. Regarding this, p-value was found to be 0.037, which is less than the significant level 0.05 and t-value which is -2.183. This implies that there was statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups. From this, thus it could be understood that there was no timely decision making in secondary schools under the study.

Concerning Item 6, Table 3, the respondents were requested about participation in decision promotes school improvement as could be seen from the table shows that M=4.09(SD=0.949) for teachers and M=4.50(0.607) for school leaders. The average mean of the item was 4.18(SD=0.896). Then the mean of the leader was greater than the average mean of the respondent. This shows school leaders agreed that stakeholders believe that their participation indecision-making promotes school improvement. An independent sample t-test was run to compare the two groups' responses. Regarding this, p-value was found to be 0.026, which is less than the significant level 0.05 and t-value was found to be -2.299. This implies there was

statistically significant difference between the two groups' responses. Then the finding was shows that there was no practicing stake holders to promote decision making that it creates a great sense of owner ship, morale and commitment among stake holders. According to De Grauwe et al, (2011), the involvement of parents, teachers, local councilors and education officials in school management can help to promote decision-making at school level, which improves the quality of school and students" achievement.

As can be seen from table 3 item 7, the respondents were requested effective decision made at school level or not. The mean scores rate for teachers was M=3.46(SD=0.910) and M=3.90(SD=0.788) leaders. The average mean of the item was M=3.56(SD=0.898). Then the mean of the teachers was below the average. An independent sample t-test was run to compare the two groups' responses p-value was found to be 0.043, which is less than the significant level 0.05 and t-value which is -2.099. This implies there was statistically significant difference between the two groups' responses. This shows there was no practicing effectiveness of participative decision making at school level.

Item 8, of Table 3, about principals read different situation /option/ for decision. As could be seen from the table the mean scores rate shows that M=3.43(SD=1.048) for teachers and M=3.85(SD=0.988) for leaders. The average mean of the item was M=3.53(SD=1.044). This shows both teachers and leaders agreed that able to read different situations (options) for decision-making at school level. The weighted mean for the item was 3.48. An independent sample t-test was run to compare the two groups' responses. Regarding this, p-value was found to be 0.112 which is greater than the significant level 0.05 and t-value which is -1.634. This implies that there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups' responses. Principals as the school chief educational leader play a major role in shaping the nature of school organization. In supporting this idea, Ministry of education, Government of Ethiopia (2005:16) Commented that; principals as individual leader play a pivotal role in the success of the school. In the successful school, leaders; create a strong sense of vision and mission, build a strong culture of collaboration and creative problem solving situations, plan to facilitate work, set appropriate curriculum implementation mechanism, and possess an instructional leadership that take responsibility for students achievement, develop and communicate plans for effective teaching, and nurture cooperative relationship among all staff members: monitor students learning progress and close work with parents, and community members.

In supporting this idea the data gathered from document review and open ended questions indicate *majority of school leaders from the sample schools motivate stake holders to be involved in school planning, different co-curricular activities (like mini media club, sport club, HIV/AIDS club, and etc.) and different school committee.*

In order to manage and; administer the school efficiently, he must provide organizational leadership in the school. In this respect, he is responsible for planning, organizing, coordinating, cooperating, monitoring the staff and the students, and managing school building and facilities (Mussazi, 1982).He noted that the principal is an organizational man who must plan and sustain an organization of the school. He plays an important role in communicating his ideas to those with whom he works, and he must be responsive to the communication of other.

Table4.3: Participation in school decision making

N0	Item	Position	Resp.	Mean	S.D	Av. Mean	Av. S.D	t-Value	P-value
1	The stakeholders are well informed during decision made at school level.	Teacher	67	3.15	.892	3.21	.865	-1.249	.220
		Leader	20	3.40	.754				
2	There is a clear procedure by which decision are made	Teacher	67	3.43	.957	3.46	.887	-.655	.515
		Leader	20	3.55	.605				
3	Principals make decisions with stakeholder openly.	Teacher	67	3.16	1.226	3.23	1.168	-1.104	.276
		Leader	20	3.45	.945				
4	Participation of stakeholder in decision making is satisfactory.	Teacher	67	3.28	.884	3.31	.826	-.677	.502
		Leader	20	3.40	.598				
5	Principals encourage stakeholder to involve in decision making	Teacher	67	3.19	1.258	3.30	1.182	-1.916	.061
		Leader	20	3.65	.813				
6	Principals accept stakeholders' voice in the process of decision making.	Teacher	67	3.21	1.274	3.25	1.183	-.794	.431
		Leader	20	3.40	.821				
7	Stakeholder actively participate in decision making.	Teacher	67	3.19	1.019	3.24	.940	-1.127	.265
		Leader	20	3.40	.598				
8	Decisions are supported by sufficient number of the stakeholders'	Teacher	67	3.00	1.168	3.08	1.102	-1.515	.137
		Leader	20	3.35	.813				
9	PTSA is makes sound involvement in decisions.	Teacher	67	3.25	.943	3.38	.905	-3.043	.004
		Leader	20	3.80	.616				
10	PTSA makes timely decisions.	Teacher	67	2.99	.945	3.06	.894	-1.685	.099
		Leader	20	3.30	.657				

As data shown in table 4 item 1, the respondents were requested the stakeholders are well informed that decision made at school level, M=3.15(SD=0.892) for teachers, and M=3.14(SD=0.754) for leaders. On the other hand the average mean of the item was

M=3.21(SD=0.80). An independent sample t-test was run to compare the two groups' responses. Regarding this, p-value was to be 0.220 which is greater than the significant level 0.05 and t-value was found to be -1.249. This implies that there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups' responses.

As could observed from Table 4, Item 2, the respondents requested to rate their degree of agreement whether or not clear procedures were there to make decisions consequently, the mean was M=3.43(SD=0.957) for teachers and M=3.55(SD=0.605) for leaders. .The average mean of the item was M=3.46(SD= 0.887). An independent sample t-test was run to compare mean of the response two groups'. Regarding this, p-value was 0.515 which is greater than the significant level 0.05 and t-value was found to be -0.655. This implies that there was no statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups'.

As can be seen Table 4 of Item 3, the respondents requested about principals make decisions with stakeholder openly, the mean response of groups was M=3.16(SD=1.226) for teachers and M=3.45(SD=0.945) for leaders. .The average mean of the item was M=3.23(SD= 1.168). An independent sample t-test was run to compare the response of two groups'. Regarding this, p-value was to be 0.276 which is greater than the significant level 0.05 and t-value which is -1.104. This implies that there was no statistically significant difference between the responses of two groups'.

As can be seen table 4, item 4, the respondents were asked participation of stakeholder in decision making is satisfactory or not, then the mean response of the group was M=3.28(SD=0.884) for teachers and M=3.40(SD=0.598) for leaders. .The average mean of the item was M=3.31(SD= 0.826). An independent sample t-test was run to compare the response of two groups'. Regarding this, p-value was to be 0.502 which is greater than the significant level 0.05 and t-value was -0.677. This implies that there was no statistically significant difference between the responses of two groups'. Some researchers argue that participation of communities and students in the day-to-day activities of the schools (for example, in supervision, monitoring and evaluation) is part of the decentralization of school management (J Naidoo, 2005).In some Asian countries, like Malaysia school management has improved because it involves students and communities in school decision-making (Luck, 2011).The same is true in South Africa where the participation of communities and students in decision-making has played a role in the improved and expanded school based management (J Naidoo, 2005).

As data can be shown in table 4 item 5, the respondents requested principals encourage stakeholder to involve in decision making. The mean response of the group was M=3.19(SD=1.258) for teachers and M=3.65(SD=0.813) for leaders. The average mean of the item was M=3.30(SD= 1.182). Statically the mean of the leader was above the average mean .An independent sample t-test was run to compare the response of two groups'. Regarding this, p-value was to be 0.061 which is greater than the significant level 0.05 and t-value was -1.916. This implies that there was no statistically significant difference between the responses of two groups'.

As data can be shown in table 4 item 6, the respondents asked about principals accept stakeholders' voice in the process of decision making or not. Then the mean response of the group was M=3.21(SD=1.274) for teachers and M=3.40(SD=0.821) for leaders. The average mean of the item was M=3.21(SD= 1.183). Statically the mean of the leader was above the average mean .An independent sample t-test was run to compare the response of two groups'. Regarding this, p-value was to be 0.431 which is greater than the significant level 0.05 and t-value was -0.794. This implies that there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups' responses.

As data can be shown in table 4 item 7, the respondents requested about stakeholder actively participate in decision making. Then the mean response of the group was M=3.19(SD=1.019) for teachers and M=3.40(SD=0.598) for leaders. The average mean of the item was M=3.24(SD= 0.94). Statically the mean of the leader was above the average mean. An independent sample t-test was run to compare the response of two groups'. Regarding this, p-value was 0.265 which is greater than the significant level 0.05 and t-value was found to be -1.127. This implies that there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups' responses.

As can be seen from Table 4, Item 8, the respondents were asked decisions are supported by sufficient number of members' stakeholders' or not. The mean scores rate found on the above table shows that M=3.00(SD=1.168) for teachers and M=3.35(SD=0.813) for school leaders. The average mean was M=3.08(SD=1.102) for the two groups. This show that the mean of the teacher respondent was less than the average mean and the mean of the leader is greater than the average mean. An independent samples t-test was run to compare the response of two groups. P-value was 0.137, which is greater than the significance level 0.05 and t-value

which is −1.515. The result suggests that there was no significant difference between the responses of two groups the implication being both groups had same attitude.

As can be shown from Table 4, Item 9, the respondents were requested PTSA (parent, teacher, student association) is makes sound involvement in decisions. The mean scores responses for teachers shows that M=3.25(SD=0.943) and M=3.80(SD=0.616) for school leaders. The average mean for the item was M=3.38(SD=0.905). This implies that statically there was a gap between mean of the teachers and leaders. An independent sample t-test was run to compare the two groups' responses. Regarding this, p-value was to be 0.04, which is less than the significant level 0.05 and t-value which is -3.043. This implies there was statistically significant difference between the two groups' responses. These results indicate that the participation of PTAs was very limited issues and also there was no interconnection between the stakeholders.

Similarly the response from the interview *PTSA members' involvement were only in disciplinary issue other than their involvement in instructional and school facilities.*

Community participation contributes to the further decentralization of critical decision-making at school level. One of the advantages of involving communities in school decision-making is that it creates a greater sense of ownership, morale and commitment among the stakeholders. Decisions that are made at local level are arguably more responsive to specific issue related to school contexts (Dunne et al, 2007). An important achievement has been observed in South Africa in the regard, since school-based governance is often integrated with participatory decision-making (Naidoo, 2005). Another advantage is that decentralization empowers communities to mobiles resources (Dunne et al, 2007).

As can be seen from table 4 item 10, the respondents were requested PTSA makes timely decisions. The mean scores rate found on the above table shows that M=2.99(SD=0.945) for teachers and M=3.30(SD=0.657) for school leaders. The average mean was M=3.06(SD=0.894) for the responses of two groups. This show that the mean of the teacher respondent was less than the average mean and the mean of the leader is greater than the average mean. An independent samples t-test was run to determine the responses of the two groups. P-value was 0.099, which is greater than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was– 1.685. The result suggests that there was no significant difference between the responses of two groups, the implication being both groups had same attitude.

In addition, interview from PTSAs and open ended question *most of school leaders in secondary school under the study were not able to properly handle the delegation process. As a result most activities in the school were loaded on school leaders. This implies that there was a gap in collaborative work between school leaders and stakeholders in school decision making.*

Table 4.4: Involvement in decisions concerning school planning and curriculum.

N0	Item	Position	Resp.	Mean	S.D	Av. Mean	Av. S.D	t-Value	P-value
1	Involvement in planning the school activities	Teacher	67	3.48	.841	3.47	.805		
		Leader	20	3.45	.686			.149	.882
2	Involvement in setting the mission, vision and values of the school	Teacher	67	2.66	.538	2.84	.680	-4.358	.000
		Leader	20	3.45	.759				
3	Involvement in participating in preparing school budget	Teacher	67	2.27	.709	2.53	.860	-5.969	.000
		Leader	20	3.40	.754				
4	Involvement in controlling and supervising plan implementation	Teacher	67	2.66	.729	2.78	.769	-2.809	.009
		Leader	20	3.20	.768				
5	Involvement in preparing on the form of lesson plan	Teacher	67	3.43	.957	3.46	.900	-.607	.547
		Leader	20	3.55	.686				
6	Involvement in evaluating how the department is operating	Teacher	67	3.33	.960	3.39	.894	-1.527	.133
		Leader	20	3.60	.598				
7	Involvement in participating in developing teaching methodologies	Teacher	67	3.28	.794	3.32	.755	-1.000	.323
		Leader	20	3.45	.605				
8	Involvement in developing the procedure for assessing student achievement	Teacher	67	3.33	1.050	3.41	1.006	-1.686	.099
		Leader	20	3.70	.801				
9	Involvement in determining when and how instructional supervision can be delivered	Teacher	67	3.18	.626	3.23	.604	-1.625	.112
		Leader	20	3.40	.503				

Item 1, from Table 5, respondents were asked about involvement in planning the school activities. The mean scores were M=3.48 (SD=0.841) for teachers and M=3.45(SD=0.686) for school leaders. The average mean score was M=3.47(SD=0.805). According to the results of independent samples *t*-test, P-value was to be 0.882, which is greater than significance level 0.05 and t-value was 5.1. The results indicate that there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups in relation to the item. This shows that school stake holders were relatively well perform in planning school activities.

Item 2 in Table 5 is about involvement in setting mission, vision and values of the school. The mean scores of the item were M= 2.66 (SD=0.538) for teachers and M=2.53(0.860) for school leaders. The average mean scores were M=2.84(SD=0.680). The result of an independent sample t-test indicated that P-value was 0.000, which is less than the significance level 0.05and t-value which is -4.358. This shows that there was statically significant difference in the mean scores of teachers and school leaders. Therefore, the result implies that the stake holders not effectively participating in setting the mission, vision, and values of the school. But in the successful school, leaders; create a strong sense of vision and mission, build a strong culture of collaboration and creative problem solving situations.

Item 3 in Table 5 is the respondent asked about involvement in preparing school budget. The mean scores of the item were M=2.27 (SD=0.709) for teachers and M=3.40(0.754) for school leaders. The average mean scores were M=2.53(SD=0.860). The mean score of teacher respondent was below the average mean. The result of an independent sample t-test indicated that P-value was 0.000, which is less than the significance level 0.05and t-value which is -5.969. This shows that there was statically significant difference between the response of teachers and school leaders. Therefore, the result implies that teachers cannot participate in preparing school budget. Therefore, it needs continuous discussion on stakeholders' participation in school budget preparation in order to create conducive school environment and increases transparency in relation to budget rather limiting to a few groups. Thus, the finding implies that absence of stakeholders' participation on the issue has an effect on school decision making.

Item 4 in Table 5 is the respondent requested about involvement in controlling and supervising plan implementation. According to item 4 the mean scores of the item were M=2.66 (SD=0.729) for teachers and M=3.20(SD=0.768) for school leaders. The average mean scores was M= 2.78(SD=0.769). The result of an independent sample t-test indicated that P-value was found 0.009, which is less than the significance level value of 0.05 and t-value was -2.809. This shows that there was statically significant difference between the responses of teachers and school leaders. Therefore, the result implies that most of the stake holders cannot participate in controlling and supervising plan implementation of the school.

Item 5 in Table 5 respondents were asked about stake holders' ability in deciding on the form of lesson plan. The mean scores were M=3.43 (SD=0.957) for teachers and M=3.55(SD=0.686) for school leaders respectively. The average mean score was

M=3.46(SD=0.900). According to the results of independent samples *t*-test, P-value was to be 0.547, which is greater than significance level 0.05 and t-value was found to be, -0.607. The results indicate that there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups in relation to the item. This shows that school stake holders were relatively well perform in deciding in the form of lesson plan.

Item 6 in Table 5 respondents were asked about evaluating how the department is operating. The mean scores were M=3.33 (SD=0.960) for teachers and M=3.60(SD=0.598) for school leaders respectively. The average mean score was M=3.39(SD=0.894). According to the results of independent samples *t*-test, P-value was to be 0.133, which is greater than significance level 0.05 and t-value was found to be, -1.527. The results indicate that there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups in relation to the item. This shows that the two groups have the same attitude.

Item 7 in Table 5 respondents were asked about participating in developing teaching methodologies. The mean scores were M=3.28 (SD=0.794) for teachers and M=3.45(SD=0.605) for school leaders respectively. The average mean score was M=3.32(SD=0.755). According to the results of independent samples *t*-test, P-value was to be 0.323, which is greater than significance level 0.05 and t-value was found to be, -1.000. The results indicate that there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups in relation to the item. This shows that the two groups have the same attitude towards participating in developing teaching methodologies.

Item 8 in Table 5 respondents were asked about developing the procedure for assessing student achievement. The mean scores were M=3.33 (SD=1.050) for teachers and M=3.70(SD=0.80) for school leaders respectively. The average mean score was M=3.41(SD=1.006). According to the results of independent samples *t*-test, P-value was to be 0.099, which is greater than significance level 0.05 and t-value was found to be, -1.686. The results indicate that there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups in relation to the item. This shows that the two groups have the same attitude towards developing the procedure for assessing student achievement.

Finally Item 9, in Table 5, respondents were asked about involvement in determining when and how instructional supervision can be delivered. The mean scores were M=3.18(SD=0.626) for teachers and M=3.40(SD=0.503) for school leaders respectively. The average mean score was M=3.23(SD=0.604). According to the results of independent

samples *t*-test, P-value which is 0.112, greater than significance level 0.05 and t-value was, -1.625. The results indicate that there was no statically significant difference between the responses of the two groups. The implication being the two groups had the same attitude towards involvement in determining when and how instructional supervision can be delivered

Overall, of the total 9 Items administered to the respondents in relation to involvement in decision concerning school planning and curriculum item 2, 3, and 4 were statically significance. The focuses of these items were involvement in: setting mission, vision and values of the school, preparing school budget, and controlling and supervising plan implementation. The result was computed by an independent samples *t*-test and indicate that, p-value was less than the significance level 0.05. But the rest item 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 was not significant. The focus of the item was involvement in: planning the school activity, preparing on the form of lesson plan, evaluating how the department is operating, developing teaching methodology, developing the procedure for assessing student achievement and determining when how instructional supervision can be delivered. The result was computed by an independent samples *t*-test and indicate that, p-value was greater than the significance level 0.05.

Table 4.5: Involvement in decisions concerning school rules and policies, budget and student disciplinary problems

N0	Item	Position	Resp.	Mean	S.D	Av. Mean	Av. S.D	t-Value	P-value
1	Involvement in administrative and school structure	teacher	67	2.87	.489	3.37	.929	-3.263	.003
		Leader	20	3.50	.827				
2	Participation in setting school rules and regulations	teacher	67	3.18	.777	3.54	.938	-1.180	.244
		Leader	20	3.35	.489				
3	Participation in developing school disciplinary policies	teacher	67	3.19	.743	3.29	1.018	-1.097	.278
		Leader	20	3.35	.489				
4	Participation in evaluating school performance.	teacher	67	2.91	.753	3.40	.933	-3.910	.000
		Leader	20	3.55	.605				
5	Participation in creating preferable working environment	teacher	67	2.97	1.000	3.34	1.199	-3.228	.002
		Leader	20	3.60	.681				
6	Participating in determining school expenditure priorities	teacher	67	2.64	1.069	2.98	1.171	-2.694	.011
		Leader	20	3.30	.923				
7	Deciding on how to generate income for the school.	teacher	67	3.07	.958	3.37	1.024	-2.175	.036
		Leader	20	3.55	.826				
8	Participation in budget allocation for different activities.	teacher	67	2.99	.788	3.28	.872	-4.084	.000
		Leader	20	3.65	.587				
9	Participation in informing students right and responsibilities	teacher	67	3.37	.795	3.70	.966	-1.696	.097
		Leader	20	3.65	.587				
10	Participation in identifying students disciplinary problems.	teacher	67	3.37	.735	3.63	.864	-1.956	.056
		Leader	20	3.65	.489				
11	Participation in solving students problems with parents	teacher	67	3.31	.925	3.87	1.098	-.598	.554
		Leader	20	3.45	.887				

In the first Item of Table 6, was about stake-holders' involvement in administrative and school structure. The mean scores were M=2.87(SD=0.489) for teachers and M=3.50(SD=0.827) for school leaders respectively. The average mean was M=3.37(SD=0.929). In order to compare the response of two groups' an independent samples *t*-test was computed. Therefore, the results indicate that, p-value was found to be 0.003, which is less than the significance level 0.05 and t-value which is -3.263. This shows that, there was statically significant difference between the responses of two groups'. The results shows that, there was less attention in regarding to teachers participation in administrative and school structure like different co-curricular activities and different school committee (like school improvement committee, expenditure committee, inspection committee and etc.)

Item 2, of Table 6, relates to participation in setting school rules and regulation. The mean scores were M=3.18 (SD=0.777) for teachers and M=3.35(SD=0.489) for school leaders respectively regarding, participation in setting school rules and regulation. The average mean score was found to be 3.54(SD=0.938). Furthermore, in order to determine if there was difference between the responses of two groups, an independent samples *t*-test was computed. The results indicate that, p-value was found to be 0.244, which is greater than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was -1.180. This shows that, there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups the implication being both groups had same attitude towards participation in setting school rules and regulation. In school organization, policies, rules and regulations are usually set by school members. Because they are the one who carry out the policy designed, rules and regulation developed.

Item 3 of Table 6, is about participation in developing school disciplinary policies. Accordingly the mean scores were M=3.19 (SD=0.743) for teachers and M=3.35(SD=0.489) for school leaders respectively. The average mean score was found to be 3.29(SD=1.018). In order to compare the responses of two groups, an independent samples *t*-test was computed. The result indicated that, p-value was found to be 0.278, which is greater than the significance level 0.05. The t-value was -1.097. This shows that, there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

Item 4 of Table 6, respondent were asked about participation in evaluating school performance. The mean scores were M=2.91(SD=0.753) for teachers and M=3.55(SD=0.605) for school leaders. The average mean was M=3.40(SD=0.933). In order to compare the responses of two groups' an independent samples *t*-test was computed. Therefore, the results indicate that, p-value was found to be 0.000, which is less than the significance level 0.05 and t-value which is-3.910. This shows that, there was significant difference between the two groups' responses. The intention of this responses shows the performance of the school is not properly evaluated by stake holders.

Item 5 of Table 6, respondent were asked about participation in creating preferable working environment. The mean scores were M=2.97(SD=1.000) for teachers and M=3.60(SD=0.681) for school leaders respectively. The average mean was M=3.34(SD=1.199). In order to compare the responses of two groups' an independent samples *t*-test was computed. Therefore, the results indicate that, p-value was found to be 0.02, which is less than the

significance level 0.05 and t-value was -3.228. This shows that, there was significant difference between the two groups' responses.

Item 6 of Table 6 relates participating in determining school expenditure priorities. Accordingly the mean scores of the item were M=2.64 (SD=1.069) for teachers and M=3.30(SD=0.923) for school leaders. The average mean scores were M= 2.98(SD=1.171). This shows the mean score of the teacher was below the average mean. The result of an independent sample t-test indicated that P-value was found to be 0.011, which is less than the significance level value of 0.05 and t-value was -2.694. This shows that there was statically significant difference between the responses of teachers and school leaders. Therefore, the result implies that most of the teachers cannot participate determining school expenditure priorities.

Item 7 in Table 6 is the respondent requested about participation in deciding on how to generate income for the school. Accordingly the mean scores of the item were M=3.07 (SD=0.958) for teachers and M=3.55(SD=0.826) for school leaders respectively. The average mean scores were M= 3.37(SD=1.024). The result of an independent sample t-test indicated that P-value was found to be 0.036, which is less than the significance level value of 0.05 and t-value was -2.175. This shows that there was statically significant difference between the responses of teachers and school leaders. Therefore, the result implies that most of the teachers cannot participate decision regarding how to generate income for the school.

Additionally, result obtained from some documents support the finding was; the minute indicate that there were no evidence which shows the involvement of teachers concerning school budget in sample school.

The interview from one PTA members realize that, most of the time the issue of the agenda was like student disciplinary problems, income generation, and resource mobilization. Then decision concerning school budget is not a mandate of teachers; rather the mandate is given to PTA.

Item 8 of Table 6 is the respondent requested about participation in budget allocation for different activities. Accordingly the mean scores of the item were M=2.99 (SD=0.788) for teachers and M=3.65(SD=0.587) for school leaders. The average mean scores were M= 3.28(SD=0.872). This shows the mean score of the teacher was below the average mean. The result of an independent sample t-test indicated that P-value was found to be 0.000, which is

less than the significance level value of 0.05 and t-value was -4.084. This shows that there was statically significant difference between the responses of teachers and school leaders. Therefore, the result implies that most of the teachers cannot participate budget allocation for different activities and the view from response of the school leaders indicate most of the time the budget the school was allocated by school leaders itself.

Item 9 of Table 6, about participation in informing student right and responsibilities. The mean scores were M=3.37 (SD=0.795) for teachers and M=3.65(SD=0.587) for school leaders. The average mean score of the item was to be 3.70(SD=0.966). In order to determine the responses of two groups, an independent samples t-test was computed. The results indicate that, p-value was found to be 0.097, which is greater than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was found to be -1.696. This shows that, there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. The implication of this result was more of the teachers and school leaders were participated in informing students about the rights and responsibilities. Because, Knowing rights and responsibilities is crucial for student discipline as a result the school compound suitable for teaching and learning.

Item 10 of Table 6, the respondent requested about participation in students disciplinary problems. The mean scores were M=3.37(SD=0.735) for teachers and M=3.65(SD=0.489) for school leaders respectively. The average mean score of the item was to be 3.63(SD=0.864). In order to determine the responses of two groups, an independent samples t-test was computed. The results indicate that, p-value was found to be 0.056, which is greater than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was found to be -1.956. This shows that, there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. And the two groups have similar attitude on student disciplinary problems and give guidance.

Finally, Item 11 of Table 6 respondents were asked participation in solving student problems with parents. The mean scores rate found on the above table shows that M=3.31(SD=0.925) for teachers and M=3.45(SD=0.887) for leaders. The average mean of the item was M=3.87(SD=1.098). This shows both teachers and leaders agreed that participating in solving student problems with parents. The average mean for the item was 3.48. An independent sample t-test was run to compare the responses of two groups'. Regarding this, p-value was found to be 0.554 which is greater than the significant level 0.05 and t-value was found to be -0.598. This implies that there was no statistically significant difference between the responses of two groups'.

Table 4.6: Factors affecting the school leaders to make quality decision in the school

N0	Item	Position	Resp.	Mean	S.D	Av. Mean	Av. S.D	t-Value	P-value
1	Lack of vision	Teacher	67	2.91	1.011	2.80	1.077	1.523	.139
		Leader	20	2.45	1.234				
2	Principals lack of training	Teacher	67	3.18	1.058	3.10	1.089	1.119	.273
		Leader	20	2.85	1.182				
3	Principals lack of transparency	Teacher	67	2.99	1.080	2.87	1.098	1.738	.092
		Leader	20	2.50	1.100				
4	Work load of school principals	Teacher	67	3.60	.954	3.64	.889	-1.125	.266
		Leader	20	3.80	.616				
5	Absence measurable performance evaluation.	Teacher	67	3.24	1.046	3.22	1.039	.335	.740
		Leader	20	3.15	1.040				
6	Lack of acceptance of ideas and views of stakeholders during decision making process.	Teacher	66	3.27	1.089	3.12	1.162	2.138	.041
		Leader	20	2.60	1.273				
7	Student discipline problems	Teacher	67	3.93	1.159	3.85	1.084	1.826	.075
		Leader	20	3.50	0.827				
8	Failure to share leadership roles to teachers.	Teacher	67	3.31	1.076	3.13	1.169	2.587	.015
		Leader	20	2.50	1.277				
9	Failure to make the decision participatory.	Teacher	67	3.12	1.023	2.94	1.124	2.483	.020
		Leader	20	2.35	1.268				
10	School principals lack of self-confidence.	Teacher	67	2.66	1.332	2.45	1.301	3.479	.001
		Leader	20	1.75	.910				
11	School principals less concern for people.	Teacher	67	2.30	.853	2.30	.779	-0.10	.992
		Leader	20	2.30	.470				
12	Absence of coordination and cooperation between school principals and stakeholders.	Teacher	67	2.78	.755	2.68	0.842	1.703	.101
		Leader	20	2.35	1.040				

As can be seen from Table 7, with Item 1 the respondents were requested to rate weather or not lack of vision affected the quality of decisions in the schools under the study. As to this the mean scores were M=2.91(SD=1.011) for teachers, M=2.45(SD=1.234) for school leaders. This shows that the teachers' responses were moderate whereas leaders' responses was low. The average mean of the item was M=2.80(SD=1.077). In order to compare the mean of the two groups of respondents, an independent samples *t*-test was computed. P-value was found to be 0.139 which is greater than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was 1.523.

This shows that, there was no statically significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

From Item 2 of Table 7, the respondents were asked principals' lack of training. The mean scores shows that M=3.18(SD=1.058) for teachers, and M=2.85(SD=1.182) for leaders. This shows that both teachers and leaders responses were moderate. The average mean of the item was M=3.10(SD=1.089). In order to compare the responses of two groups, an independent samples t-test was computed. The results indicate that, p-value was found to be 0.273, which is greater than the significance level 0.05 and t-value which is 1.119. This shows that, there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

As can be seen from Table 7, with Item 3 the respondents were requested principals lack of transparency or not .The mean scores were M=2.99(SD=1.080) for teachers, and M=2.50(SD=1.100) for leaders. The average mean of the item was M=2.87(1.098). In order to compare the responses of two groups, an independent samples t-test was computed. The results indicate that, p-value was found to be 0.092, which is greater than the significance level 0.05 and t-value 1.738. This shows that, there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups

From Item 4 with Table 7, the respondents were asked work load of principals. The mean scores rate found M=3.60(SD=0.964) for teachers, and M=3.80(SD=0.616) for leaders. This mean score of both group shows that, work load on school principals were high. The average mean was M=3.64(SD=0.889). In order to compare the responses of two groups, an independent samples t-test was computed. The results indicate that, p-value was found to be 0.266, which is greater than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was -1.125. This shows that, there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

In supporting this, idea from the interview regarding to the major problems you observed in decision making, one of the PTA members stated that his views saying, *"I believe that our school principals have no times and adequate facilities to think about innovative ideas. They*
are busy as they engage in all aspects of activities."

From Item 5 of Table 7, the respondents were asked absence of measurable performance evaluation. The mean scores rate found on the above table shows that M=3.24(SD=1.046) for teachers, and M=3.15(SD=1.040) for leaders. The average mean was M=3.22(SD=1.039). In

order to compare the responses of two groups, an independent samples *t*-test was computed. The results indicate that, p-value was found to be 0.740, which is greater than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was 0.335. This shows that, there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

From Item 6 of Table 7, the respondents were asked lack of acceptance ideas and views during decision making process. The mean scores rate shows that M=3.27(SD=1.089) for teachers, and M=2.60 for leaders. This shows that the teachers' lack of acceptance ideas and views during decision were moderate, whereas leaders responses were low. The average mean was M=3.12(SD=1.162). In order to compare the responses of two groups, an independent samples *t*-test was computed. The results indicate that, p-value was found to be 0.041, which is less than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was 2.138 which is greater than the table value 2. This shows that, there was statically significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

Item 7 of Table 7, the respondents were asked students discipline problems. The mean scores rate shows that M=3.93(SD=1.159) for teachers, and M=3.50(SD=0.827) for leaders. This shows that the responses of both teachers and leaders regarding students discipline problems were high. The average mean of the both group was M=3.85(SD=1.084). In order to compare the responses of two groups, an independent samples *t*-test was computed. The results indicate that, p-value was found to be 0.075, which is greater than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was 1.826. This shows that, there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

Item 8 of Table 7, the respondents were asked failure to share leadership roles to teachers. The mean scores rate found on the above table shows that M=3.31(SD=1.076) for teachers, and M=2.50(SD=1.277) for leaders. This shows that teachers, responses failure to share leadership roles to teachers were high. While the leader response were moderate. The average mean of this item was M=3.13(SD=1.169). In order to compare the responses of two groups, an independent samples *t*-test was computed. The results indicate that, p-value was found to be 0.015, which is less than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was 2.587 which is greater than the table value 2. This shows that, there was statically significant difference between the responses of the two groups. These revels that there is a failure to share leadership role to teachers.

Delegation usually began with the identification of an individual suitable to perform a particular

task .The person needed to be prepared, and above all, given the authority in order to carry out the job properly. Further, delegation required the leader to support and monitor progress, and once the tasks were completed, to acknowledge that the job was completed successfully (Sutherland and Canwell, 2004).

From Item 9 of Table 7, the respondents were requested student discipline. The mean shows that M=3.12(SD=1.023) for teachers, and M=2.35(1.268) for leaders. The mean of the teachers' responses were moderate while the leaders' responses were high. The average mean of the item was M=2.94(SD=1.169). In order to compare the responses of two groups, an independent samples *t*-test was computed. The results indicate that, p-value was found to be 0.020, which is less than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was 2.483 which is greater than the table value 2. This shows that, there was statically significant difference between the responses of the two groups. This indicate there is a failure to make the decision participatory. Then participatory leadership focuses on participatory decision making and appropriate for the school then it needs high attention solving school problems together with school stakeholders.

From Item 10 of Table 7, the respondents were asked school principals lack of self-confidence. The mean scores rate shows that M=2.66(SD=1.332) for teachers, and M=1.75(0.910) for leaders. This shows that teachers response were moderate .While leaders was low. The average mean of the item was M=2.45(SD=1.301). In order to compare the response of two groups an independent samples *t*-test was computed. The results indicate that, p-value was found to be 0.001, which is less than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was 3.479 which is greater than the table value 2. This shows that, there was significant difference between the responses of the two groups. Then the lack of self-confidence affecting to make decisions in the school.

Item 11 of Table 7, the respondents were asked school principals less concern for people. The mean scores rate shows that M=2.30(SD=0.853) for teachers, and M=2.30(SD=0.470) for leaders. This shows that the response of teachers and leaders was low. The average mean was M=2.30(SD=0.779). Statically the response of the two groups has no difference. In order to compare the responses of two groups, an independent samples *t*-test was computed. The results indicate that, p-value was found to be 0.992, which is greater than the significance

level 0.05 and t-value was -0.10. This shows that, there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

From Item 12 of Table 7, the respondents were asked absence of coordination and cooperation between school principals and stakeholders. The mean scores rate found on the above table shows that M=2.78(SD=0.755) for teachers, and M=2.33(SD=1.040) for leaders. The average mean of the item was M=2.68(SD=0.842). In order to compare the responses of two groups, an independent samples t-test was computed. The results indicate that, p-value was 0.101, which is greater than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was 1.703. This shows that, there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

The analysis of open ended question collected from respondents as shown in the findings factors affecting the quality decision in the school were; low social respect given to teachers, lack of financial incentives, low concern of teachers to solve problems and un willingness of giving recognition to wards motivating rewarding teachers according to their effort by concerned leaders or administration body and lack of transparency and barriers of communication between teachers and principals, lack of school leadership skill of principals were some factors that affects their to make quality decision in the schools. Due to these factors there is a problem to decide the quality decision of various school activities in general and school improvement particular.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section deals with summary, conclusions and recommendations. First, summary of the study and the major findings were made. Second, depending on the findings, conclusions are drawn. Lastly, recommendations are forwarded on the basis of the findings.

5.1. Summary of the major findings

The objective of this study was to investigate the practice and challenges of decision making in secondary school of Ilu Aba Bor Zone. In order to achieve the objectives of this study, the following basic questions were raised

1) What is the current practice of decision-making in the secondary schools of Ilu Aba Bor Zone?

2) To what extent do the stakeholders take part in the decision-making in secondary schools?

3) What are the areas where stakeholders must participate in decision making of secondary schools?

4) What are the major challenges affecting the proper practice of decision-making quality in secondary schools of Ilu Aba Bor Zone?

The study was conducted in eight secondary schools. The schools were taken as a sample by multistage cluster sampling method. The subjects of the study were school leaders, teachers, and PTAs. As a source of data, 67 teachers, 7 school principals, 9 school vice principals 4 supervisors and 6 PTA chair persons a total of 93 respondents were involved in this study. The result of personal information of the respondent show that, there was a wide difference between sample population of males and female respondent. For the study a total of 87 usable questionnaires were provided and collected as the basic data. Additionally, six of semi structured interviews were provided for interviewing six PTAs chair person. The data obtained were analyzed using statistical tools such as percentage, frequency, mean, standard deviation and independent t-test. Based on the results of the analysis, the following major findings were obtained:

1. Personal information of the respondents have revealed that, there was a wide proportional variation between males and females of the sample population, and 1 (one) female vice principals in the sample school and there were only 12 (14%) female out of 87(100%) respondents.

With regard to their age, most of the age of respondents is in between 26 and 50 years of age. Thus, there would no barrier that the age difference might have caused for principals, department heads, teachers and supervisors to work cooperatively and collaboratively in decision making practice.

Regarding the respondents years of experience most of the respondents were in between 11-20 years. Thus more of the respondents were well experienced.

Concerning, the respondent's level of qualification there was no much variation in qualifications between school principals and staff members because 18(90%) of the school leaders were MA/MSc and 66(98.5%) of teachers were BA/BSC/BED/MA/MSc holders. According to the guideline of MoE (2009) the recruitment and assigned criteria indicated in the document of secondary school principals and supervisors required to have second degree in required field of study. Thus school principals were assigned to the position without having management qualification and necessary training that enables them for participating teachers' in decision making. In researcher's view even though, holding MA is no guarantee to enhance participation in decision making, it empowers the one in the leadership position to identify and implement different strategies for more participation of stakeholders. I believe that leaders should exceed their followers in academic qualification. It is argued this is lack of relevant qualification might have deterred the principals from participate stake holders in the decision making process of various school activities.

2. Concerning perception about the decision making practice the data revealed that, principals communicate the staff regarding problems that need decision, decision are made timely, stakeholders believe that their participation in decision making promotes school improvement, there is an effective participation decision making made at school level and principals are able and skillful to read different situations/options/ for decision making were statically significant and the ideal differentiation between the response of the teachers and school leaders because the p-value of those item was less than the significance level 0.05. Whereas the item staff members believe decisions are implemented properly, staff members acceptance of decision is based on actual problem, staff members agree that decision regarding every problem should be correctly identified, and principals are able and skilful to read different situations /options/ for decision making were not statically significant and the response of the teacher and school leaders were approach to each other. This indicate the practice of decision making in secondary school were below the expected level.

3. Regarding participation in school decision making; the stakeholders are well informed that decision making is at school level, there is a clear procedure by which decision are made, principals make decisions with stakeholder openly, participation of stakeholder in decision making is satisfactory, principals encourage stakeholder to involve in decision making, principals accept stakeholders' voice in the process of decision making, stakeholders actively participate in decision making, decisions are supported by sufficient number of members of stakeholders', and PTSA makes timely decision were found relatively not statically significant and moderate response. However PTA is makes sound involvement in decisions was relatively statically significant and the response of the two groups were not approach each other. There was the mean difference between the responses of two groups.

4. The finding of this study also about involvement in decisions concerning school planning, and curriculum, the study indicate that; involvement in planning the school activities, preparing in the form of lesson plan, evaluating how the department is operating, in developing teaching methodologies, developing the procedure for assessing student achievement and determining when and how instructional supervision can be delivered were not statically significance and high response. While involvement in planning the school activities, preparing school budget and controlling and supervising plan implementation was statically significant and the mean responses of the teachers was low while high for school leaders.

5. Regarding involvement in decisions concerning school rules and policies, budget and student disciplinary problems, most of respondents showed their agreement on participation in: setting school rules and regulation, developing school disciplinary policies, determining school expenditure priorities, informing students right and responsibilities, identifying students disciplinary problems, and solving students problems with parents was high response and statically not significant. The response of the teachers regarding to participation in evaluating school performance, determining school expenditure, budget allocation for different school activities was low while the leaders' responses were high. Statically there is significance difference between the responses of two groups. In general, the extents of stakeholders' participation in determining school expenditure and budget allocation were found to be low.

6. Concerning factors affecting the quality of decision making, the study revealed that there were major factors in school decision; lack of acceptance of ideas and views of stakeholders during decision making process, failure to share leadership role to teachers, failure to make the decision participatory and school principals lack of self-confidence, work load of school principals, student discipline problems, were considered to be the major once. Moreover, the analysis of open-ended questions and interviews from PTAs indicated that, lack of commitments of principals, close communication between parents and school communities, interference of politics and low social respect given to teachers were some of the challenges affecting school decision making process.

5.2. Conclusions

Based on the findings, the following conclusions are drawn: A great deal of decision making in school organization is achieved through the participation of teachers, parents, school leaders, students and other concerned groups. From the findings of this study, the perception about the decision making practice: principals communicate the staff regarding problems that need decision, decision are made timely, stakeholders believe that their participation in decision making promotes school improvements, and there is an effective participation in decision making made at school level were found to be below the average. This implies that less attention was given to the contribution of good decision making practice by involving concerned bodies.

Regarding to involvement in decision concerning school planning and curriculum: setting mission vision and values of the school, involvement in preparing school budget, and controlling and supervising plan implementation was low. This needs more attention to scale up the extent of involvement of stakeholders to the needed requirements.

Concerning the factors affecting quality of decision making the analysis of this study revealed that the following factors as major barrier to stake holders' low participation in school decision making: lack of acceptance of ideas and views of stakeholders during decision making process, failure to share leadership roles to teachers, and school principals lack of self-confidence. Moreover, the analysis of open-ended question indicated low social respect given to teachers, lack of financial incentives, lack of secularism, low concern of teachers to solve school problems, unwillingness of giving recognition towards motivating and rewarding teachers according to their effort by concerned leaders or administration body,

lack of transparency and barriers of communication between teachers and principals, lack of school leadership skill of principals some of the factors that affect their participation.

5.3. Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study and the conclusion drawn, the following recommendations are
forwarded.

1. Providing proper orientation on the rights, duties and responsibilities of stakeholders in each areas of decision making and involve them to bring a change in teaching and learning process and other related school activities.

2. It is also advisable for school leaders to be committed in leading schools. Thus, the woreda/town education office and higher political leaders let school leaders manage their school without unnecessary interferences.

3. Stakeholders' participation in decision making was found to be inadequate as result of low motivational trends in the schools. So, to enhance their participation at school level school principals provide different incentives like award, recognition and other motivational means to stakeholders to high up morale which ends with more participation in decision makings and with high students learning outcomes.

4. As the result revealed, school leaders were not effective in most activities that directly affect their leadership role. Therefore, it is useful for school leaders to share responsibilities among teachers by showing their commitments through discussion, and conducting regular meetings.

5. The school leaders need to communicate, involve and give clear information to teachers on the issue related with school budget and school expenditure priorities to develop the sense of transparency between teachers and school leaders.

6. School principals create positive work relationship between stakeholders and encourage to participate and empower them to be leaders.

Finally this study focus on the practice and challenges of decision making in selected secondary school. But it is recommended that for further study to be conducted in all secondary schools (not selected schools) for the root cause of low participation of stakeholders in school decision making.

REFERENCES

Abraham M. 2018. *An assessment of participative decision making practice in private secondary school of Bole sub city*. Addis Ababa University

Act (2015) The Assisted Decision-Making (Capacity), A guide by Kate Butler BL

Ahmed, P. K. 2011. Innovative management: Context, strategies, systems, and processes. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall

Alvani, S. M. 2001. *Decisions making and identifying of public policy, ninth edition*, Tehran, thesamt, Press

Bell, L., Haplin, D. and Neill, S. 1996. Managing self-governing Primary Schools in locally maintained, grant-maintained and private sectors. *Educational Management and Administration*, 24(2): 253-261.

Bimber, A.B. 1994. The Decentralization Mirage: Comparing Decision-Making Arrangements in Four High Schools, Santa Monica, Calif: RAND Corporation, California,USA.

Brain, R. and Kinight, J. 1993.Financial Management for School: The thinking Manger‟s guide. Athenaeum Press Ltd.

Brundrett, M. 2003. Leadership in Education: Sage Publications, London, England.

Caldwell and Brain J,2005 .School-Based Management. Education Policy series. UNESCO/International Institute for Educational Planning and International Academy of Education , Paris .France

De Grauwe et al. (2011).Strengthening Local Actors: The Path to Decentralizing Education, Kenya, Uganda, and Lesotho, Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning and UNESCO.

Desalegn G. 2014.*The practice of teachers' involvement in decision making in government secondary school of Jimma Town*. Jimma University

Eisenfuhr ,F . 2011 Decision making. New York, NY: Springer .

Fullan M.(2007). The New Meaning of Educational Change. (4th.Ed). New York: Teachers
College press.

Fuij Genemo (2016) *Practice of Principals in Enhancing Participatory Decision-Making in
Secondary Schools of West Arsi zone,Oromia Regional State*. Unpublished Master
Thesis,Haramay U, Haramaya, Ethiopia Gilboa, I. 2011. Rational Choice.

Hicks, M. J. 2005.Problem solving and decision making: Hard, soft, and creative approaches.
Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning

John W. Creswell, Educational research planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and
qualitative research; fourth edition.

Leta Erena. 2018.*Teachers participation in decision making in government secondary
schools in Nekemte Town* . Addis Ababa University

Lunenburg, F.C. and Ornstein, A.O. 2008.Educational administration: Concepts and
practices, 5th Edition. CA: Wadsworth/Cengage, Belmont, USA.

Marshall,V. 2006 Causal inferences between participation in decision making, task
attributes ,work effort , rewards ,job satisfaction an commitment .Leadership and
Organization Development Journal 27: 399-414

Mendel, J. 2011. Perceptual Computing: Aiding People in Making Subjective Judgments.
NY: Wiley, New York, USA.

MoE 1994 Education and training policy. Ministry of education. Addis Ababa Ethiopia.

MOE. 2002. Education Sector Development Program ii: Program Action Plan. Addis Ababa,
Ethiopia.

MOE.2005 Education Sector Development Program (ESDP-III). Program Action Plan. Addis
Ababa, Ethiopia.

MOE (2010a) Education Sector Development Program IV (ESDP IV) Addis Ababa; Ministry
of Education.

Naidoo, Jordan P. 2005. Educational Decentralization and School Governance in South Africa: From Policy to Practice. International Institute for Education Planning. UNESCO

Okumbe, J.A. 1998 Educational management: Theory and Practice. Nairobi University Press, Nairobi, Kenya

Sadaf Z. Ahimed, Samina M. & Hina Z. Ahmed. 2019. Role of High School teachers in academic Decision Making Practices. Vol. 41.s

Schoenfeld, A. H., 2011. How We Think: A Theory of Goal-oriented Decision Making and its Educational Applications. NY: Routledge, New York, USA

Somech, A. (2010) *Participative decision making in school*: A Mediating –Moderating Out comes Analytical Framework for Understanding School and Teacher.

Steinheider , B. 2006 . The Effects of Participative Management on Employee Productivity, and Community Satisfaction in a Police

UNESCO. 2010. Education for all Global Monitoring Report. Paris. France.

UNESCO 2016 Education Sector Division for Policies and Lifelong Learning System.

Verschaffel, L. 2011 Use of External Represent alionsin Reasoning and Problem Solving Analysis and Improvement. NY: Taylor and Francis, New York, USA

Wayne K. Hoy, Cecil G. Miskel.1995. Educational administration, theory research and practice. sixth edition

Yukl, G. 2006. Leadership in organizations, 6th Edition.Upper Saddle, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

APPEDICES
APPEDIX I

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHEVERAL SCIENCE

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATINAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Questionnaire to be filled by: Teachers, Department Head, Principal, & Supervisor

Dear respondent

This questionnaire is designed to assess the practice of decision making in secondary school of Ilubabor zone. The objective of this research is all in all academic and information gathered through this questionnaire will be only for academic purpose. Your carful and honest response to the questionnaire determine the success of the study. Thus you are kindly requested to complete the questionnaire carefully and honestly. Your response will be kept confidential. Please read the directions given in each of the item in the questionnaire carefully before respond to it. If you want to change any of your responses, make sure that you have cancelled unwanted ones.

Thank you in advance to your kind cooperation!

Direction: Please, read and try to understand the following guidelines to fill the questionnaire.

- No need to write your name
- Read the instruction of the questionnaire very carefully
- Discussion on the given questionnaire is strictly forbidden as it is an individual work
- To give your own answer put a tick mark "√" on the space provided under the column

Part one: General information about the respondent

Instruction: please answer the question below by putting (√) mark where necessary.

Woreda _____   Name of School _____

A) Sex   1) Male ☐   2) female ☐

B) Age   1) Age ≤ 20 years ☐   2) 21-25 years ☐   3) 26-30 year ☐

   4) 31-35 year ☐   5) 36 - 40 years ☐   6) 41- 50 years ☐   7) 51 and above

C) Your current position in school

 1) Principal ☐   2) Vice Principal ☐   3) Supervisor ☐   4) Teacher ☐

 5) Department Head ☐   Others please specify _____

D) Please indicate your years of experience

  1) Five and below ☐   2) 6-10 years ☐   3) 11-15 years ☐

  4) 16-20 years ☐   5) 21 and above years ☐

E) Level of your qualification

1) Diploma ☐   2) BA/BSc/BEd ☐   3) MA/MSc/MEd ☐   4) others ☐

Part Two: Perception of principals, Vice principal, teachers Department head and supervisors towards the decision making practice of school leaders.

Direction: I The following are items about your perception regarding school principals practices in decision-making Please rate each items from strongly agree to strongly dis agree and thick''√'' the number which most closely represents your opinion using the following rating scales.   5= Strongly Agree   4= Agree   3= Somehow Agree   2= Disagree   1= Strongly Disagree

No	Items	Rating Scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Staff member's believe in various types of decisions are implemented properly.					
2	Acceptance of staff member's on decision making is based on actual problem.					
3	Staff members agree that decision making in every problem should be correctly identified.					
4	Principals communicate with staff regarding problem that need decision.					
5	Decisions are made timely.					
6	Stakeholders (leaders and teachers) believe that their participation in decision making promotes school improvement.					
7	Effective participative decision making made at school level					
8	Principals ability to read different situation /option/ for decision making					

Part Three: Participation of school stakeholders in school decision making.

Direction II: The following are statements about represent participation of school stakeholders in decision making in your school .Please rate each statement from strongly agree to strongly disagree and tick (√) the numbers which most closely represent your opinion using the following 5 point scale.   5= Strongly Agree   4=Agree   3=Somehow Agree   2= Disagree   1=Strongly Disagree

No	Items	Rating Scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	The school stakeholders are well informed that decision making is centralized to school level.					
2	There is a clear procedure by which decision are made					
3	School principals make decision with stakeholder openly on different aspect of school problems.					
4	Believe that participation of stakeholder in decision making is satisfactory at your school.					
5	School principals encourage the stakeholder to involve in decision making					
6	School principals accept stakeholders' voice in decision making.					
7	School stakeholder are actively participate in decision making in different aspect of school issue.					
8	School principals' decisions are supported by sufficient numbers of stakeholders' members.					
9	PTA is making sound in decisions					
10	PTA is under taking timely decision.					

Direction III. In this section, you are kindly requested to give focused /short response to the following question.

1. What is the role you have been playing in promoting decision making?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

Part Four: The areas of stakeholder participation in decision making

Direction IV: The following items are some of the decision areas in which stakeholder expected to be participated. Please indicate the extent of teachers and leaders involvement in decision making individually or as a group in your school. Indicate your answer by putting a tick (√) mark in the box given across each statement.

Very low = 1 Low = 2 Medium = 3 High = 4 Very high = 5

No	Items	Rating Scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Stakeholder involvement in decision concerning school planning					
1.1	Planning the school activities					
1.2	Setting the mission, vision and values of the school					
1.3	Participating in preparing school budget					
1.4	Controlling and supervising plan implementation					
2	Stakeholder involvement in decision concerning curriculum					
2.1	Deciding on the form of lesson plan					
2.2	Evaluating how the department is operating					
2.3	Participating in developing teaching methodologies					
2.4	Developing the procedure for assessing student achievement					
2.5	Determining when and how instructional supervision can be delivered					
3	Stakeholder involvement in decision concerning school rules and policies					
3.1	Participating in administrative and organizational structure					
3.2	Participation in setting school rules and regulation					
3.3	Participation in developing school disciplinary policies					
3.4	Participation in evaluating school performance on deciding rules and procedure					
3.5	Participation in establishing relationship among principals and teachers					
4	Stakeholder involvement in decision concerning school budget or income generation					

4.1	Participating in determining school expenditure priorities					
4.2	Deciding in means of income generation					
4.3	Deciding budget allocation for instructional materials.					
5	Stakeholder involvement in decision concerning student disciplinary problem					
5.1	Determining student right and responsibilities					
5.2	Identify student disciplinary problems and give guidance					
5.3	Participating in solving students problems with parents					

Part Five: Factors affecting the quality decision in the school

Direction V. The following are assumed to be the major factor that may hinder school leader's practices regarding in decision making in your school. Please rate each factor to what extent to it affected practices of school leaders from very high to very low and tick (√) the number which closely represents your opinion.

 Very high = 5   High = 4   Medium = 3   Low = 2   Very low = 1

No	Items	Rating Scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Lack of vision					
2	Lack of training in school principals					
3	Lack of transparency of school principals					
4	Work load of school principals					
5	Absence of uniform regulation for performance judgment of staff in school					
6	Lack of acceptance of ideas and views of stakeholders during decision making process.					
7	Student discipline problems					
8	Failure to share leadership roles to teachers.					
9	Failure to make the decision participatory.					
10	School principals lack of self-confidence.					
11	School principals less concern for people.					
12	Absence of coordination and cooperation between school principals and stakeholder.					

Part Six: For the following open ended questions please, write your idea openly.

1 Please you are kindly requested to list down other factors may affect your school principal's decision-making practices with their respective solution.

_____

_____

_____

_____

___ _____

2 What are the possible mechanisms that can increase staff participation in school decision-making?

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPEDIX II

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHEVERAL SCIENCE

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATINAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Interview question for PTA

Direction I: General information of respondent

 1. Sex _____2. Age_____   3. Qualification _____ current position------------------

Direction II: Give your response to the questions in short and make it precise.

1. To what extent do you participate in decision-making in your school?

2. Do you have regular meeting program with other PTA members?

3. Do all stakeholders in this school participate in decision-making?

4. On what major issues do you are involve in decision making?

5. Did you participate in decision making process in your schools?

6. What are the major problems you observed in decision-making in your school?

7. What possible solutions could you suggest to solve the problems?

APPEDIX III

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHEVERAL SCIENCE

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATINAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Document Review Checklist

The document review checklist conducted will be based on the following school documents:

No	Items	Scales	
		Yes	No
1.	Decisions concerning school planning ❖ The school annual plan ❖ The school strategic plan		
2.	Participatory decision making plan		
3.	Documents that show community contribution about the school issues		
4.	Written documents indicate that all school issues have their own records		
5.	Written documents indicate that there are: ❖ Discussion minute on different school issues ❖ Discussion minute on periodic evaluation on implementation of school plan		
6.	Decisions concerning school budget and income generation		
7.	Decision concerning students disciplinary problems		