



JIMMA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PLANNING & MANAGEMENT

LEADERSHIP TENURE AND SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS IN
SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF KAFFA ZONE

BY

ABATE HAILE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PLANNING & MANAGEMENT IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS OF MASTER OF ARTS DEGREE IN SCHOOL
LEADERSHIP.

ADVISER: TADESSE ABERA (ASS.PROF)

CO-ADVISER: BEKALU FEREDÉ (ASS.PROF)

NOVEMBER, 2021

JIMMA, ETHIOPIA

Approval Sheet

Jimma University

College of Education and Behavioral Science

Department of Education Planning & Management

Leadership Tenure & School Effectiveness in Secondary Schools Of Kaffa Zone.

Submitted by

Name of student

Signature

Date

Abate Haile

Name of Adviser

Name of Co-Adviser

Examiner Name

Chairperson Name

External Examiner

Internal Examiner

Declaration

I, under signed declare that this thesis entitled “Leadership Tenure & School Effectiveness ” in selected Secondary school of Kaffa Zone, SNNPR, is my original work. I also declare that this thesis has not been presented for a degree in any other university, and that all sources of material used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: Abate Haile

Signature: _____

Date: _____

This thesis entitled “Leadership Tenure & School Effectiveness ” in selected Secondary school of Kaffa Zone, SNNPR, has been submitted for examination with approval as a university advisor.

Name: Tadesse Abera (Asst. professor)

Signature: _____

Date: _____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Pursuing an MA, Thesis is both painful and enjoyable experience. It is just like climbing a high peak, systematically, accompanied with hardship, frustration, encouragement and trust and with so many peoples kind help. Though it will not be enough to express my gratitude in words to all those people who helped me I would still like to give many, thanks to all these people.

First, I would like to give my sincere thanks to my advisor, Tadesse Abera (Asst. professor). Who took the pains to look through the main script of my paper and always guiding me in the right direction.

Finally Special thanks be also given to city Education Office heads, supervisors, school principals and teachers where I conducted my study, for allowing me to do research at their.

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	i
Table of Contents.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
ACRONYMS.....	vi
<i>ABSTRACT</i>	vii
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the problem.....	2
1.3 Objectives of the study	4
1.3.1 General Objectives	4
1.3.2 Specific Objectives	4
1.4. Significance of the Study.....	4
1.5. Delimitation of the Study.....	4
1.6 Limitation of the Study.....	5
1.7. Definition of Key Terms.....	5
1.8. Organization of the study.....	6
CHAPTER TWO.....	7
2. Review of the Related Literature	7
2.1. The Concept and Meaning of Leadership Tenure & school effectiveness	7
2.1.1 Meaning of Leadership Tenure.....	7
2.1.2. Job Level Experience.....	8
2.2 Characteristics of the effective school	11
2.3 Factors affecting the effective school	13
2.4 Role of the school leader in school effectiveness	15
2.5 Leadership Styles.....	19
2.7. Ideal Conception of the Principal ship.....	20
2.8. Historical Development of the Principal ship.....	20
2.8.1. Countries Experience.....	20

2.8.2. Ethiopian Experience.....	21
2.9. The Major Role of a Principal as an school Leader.....	23
2.9.1. Planning.....	23
2.9.2. Organizing.....	24
2.9.3. Leading.....	25
2.9.4. Communicating.....	26
2.9.5. Supervising.....	26
2.9.6. Curriculum Development.....	27
2.9.7. Principals Role and Responsibility for Staff Development.....	28
2.9.8. School Community Relation.....	28
2.9.9. Evaluation of Teachers.....	29
2.10. Qualities of Good Principal as an Instructional Leader.....	29
2.11. Challenges to secondary school leaders.....	30
2.11.1. Lack of Training and Skills.....	30
2.11.2. Lack of Resources.....	30
2.11.3. The Press of Duty /Work Overload/.....	31
2.11.4. The Personal Quality of the leaders.....	31
2.11.5. Shortage of Time.....	31
2.11.6. The Nature of the School.....	32
2.11.7. Lack of Experience.....	32
2.11.8. Other School Related Problems.....	32
CHAPTER THREE.....	34
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY.....	34
3. Research Design.....	34
3.1. The Research Approach.....	34
3.2. Sources of Data.....	34
3.3. Sample size and Sampling Technique.....	34
3.4. Instruments of Data Collection.....	36
3.5.1. Questionnaire.....	36
3.5.2. Interview.....	36
3.5.5. Document Analysis.....	37
3.6. Methods of Data Analysis.....	37

3.7 Ethical Considerations	37
CHAPTER FOUR.....	38
4. Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of Data.....	38
4.1 Background Information.....	38
CHAPTER FIVE	67
5. Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation	67
5.1. Conclusions	67
5.2. Recommendations.....	69
Reference	71
APPENDEX-1	77
Appendex-2.....	82

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Personal characteristics of respondents (Sex and Age) of Respondents.....	39
Table -2: Educational qualification and services year of respondents.....	41
Table-3 Respondents View towards How the School Leadership works in line with School vision	43
Table-4 Respondents View towards School leadership performance related to planning function	48
Table-5: Respondents View towards The participatory practices of School Leadership.....	52
Table-6: Respondents View towards Supervision related practices of School Leadership.....	55
Table-7: Respondents View towards School Leadership practices School Community Relationship	59
Table-8: Respondents View towards Curriculum development functions of the School Leadership	62
Table-9: Respondents View towards Staff development practices of the School Leadership.....	64

ACRONYMS

MOE: Ministry of Education

UNESCO: United Nation Educational Social Cultural Organization

WEO: Woreda Education Office.

PTA: parents & teacher association.

SNNPR: South nations & nationality people region.

SPSS: Statistical Package for Social Sciences

SD: Standard deviation.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate Leadership Tenure & schools effectiveness of the Kaffa Zone. The study reviewed the related literature on leadership aspects, dimensions of school leadership, teaching- learning roles of school leadership, and attempts were also made to identify factors that affect the effectiveness of school leadership. In order to meet the objectives of the study descriptive survey research method was employed. six(6) secondary schools (Shisho inde secondary school, Wareta secondary school, Chena secondary school, Buta Hora secondary school, Kuta shoray secondary school & Bita genet secondary school) were selected by using simple random sampling technique for these study. Out of 282 secondary school teachers in 6 selected woredas of selected secondary schools 85 (30%) of teachers was selected through simple random sampling techniques by considering their proportionality. 12 principals (main & vice), 6 PTA leaders, 6 supervisors and 6 WEOs was included through purposive sampling technique. Questionnaires, interviews and document analyses were used for the purpose of collecting relevant data. Data obtained through questionnaires were analyzed using statistical tools like mean, average mean, standard deviation, Moreover, data gathered through interview and document analysis were considered to complement the questionnaires in narrative form. The finding of this study showed that leadership Tenure (work experiences of secondary School leadership) highly improved the effectiveness of secondary school. Almost all respondents response towards this show that work experiences/service years (leadership tenure) has direct relation with effectiveness of secondary School leaders. But it is not the only means for the effectiveness of the schools. Selection criteria, School leadership were not selected all in all by criteria set by MoE and SNNP regional educational bureau. Rather, the main criteria seen to select school leadership in a position is close involvement in supporting the government policy. But it's better to select and assign school leadership according to the directives set by MoE. In the study it was concluded that the problems that secondary school leadership faces in the study area were lack of training & skill, lack of resources in each secondary schools, lack of experiences personal quality, political influence on leaders, weak participation of PTA, lack of professional support from external supervisors & WEOS are the great problems for the effectiveness of secondary schools. The researcher recommended that inspiring the school vision, preparing an action plan, participating the staff member in decision making, creating school community relationship, staff development and curriculum development should be in place along with the current practice of school leadership in which the school leadership practices to facilitate teaching learning processes productive.

Key Words; *School effectiveness, leadership tenure, Secondary schools, quality education*

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

Education is one of the major driving forces behind economic, social, cultural and political development of a country. It is a key instrument for the overall development of a country so that it is widely recognized as indicator of development. In Ethiopian context, education is highly expected to contribute for the overall development of a country. Realizing this, the government of Ethiopia is placing great attention on education with firm belief that the long term development of the country rests up on the expansion and provision of quality education (MoE, 2005).

In line with this, the most important institutions that support and promote development are schools. Schools like other organization have goal to be achieved. They are agents of transmitting knowledge, skills and desired attitudes to students. They also produce skilled and trained man power that could solve the problems of a country. It is generally believed that the society's future depends on the success of schools effectively carrying out their objectives. In line with this, attentions were given to educational leadership as a major concern, because it plays a considerable role in the process of change and development (Musaazik, 1988:1). Confirming this idea, Ubben and Hughes (1997:121) state that with increased value put on educational leadership, what comes to vision is the school as an environment of change the productivity of which depends mainly on the ability of its leaders in analyzing existing conditions and future challenges and implements strategies for attaining the goals.

In other words, of the forces affecting the school system probably none is more important than the school leaders who have the responsibility for recommending change in educational activities and facilitate learning (Adesina, 1990:186) in realizing this Sammons (1999) cited, in Fullan (2010), asserts that almost every single change or improvement and effectiveness of the school were be rested on leadership. Regardless of this, the role to be played by educational leader is much, and great is expected from him or her because he/she is the one in a position to facilitate conditions and arrange the necessary inputs. However, lack of experience; work over load,

school related problems are those affect the effectiveness of school principals. According to Musaaazi (1988:5) inefficient leadership at the school level is the one that adversely affects the progress of education because success in any educational institution depends significantly on effective and sound leadership. Hence, the school leaders must have the necessary skills, knowledge and understanding in their major functions like, identifying organizational goal, developing and implementing best practices, organizing school activities identifying and solving school problem to be influential leaders in the schools.

As Hopkin (2003:55) argue, the most important single factor in the success of schools is the quality of leadership of the head. In support of this generalization, Millet as cited in Law and Glover (2000; 15) state that the quality of leadership makes the difference between the success and failure of school. MoE (1994) generalizes that although an attempt has been made to make the educational management system decentralized and professional, still a lot remains to be done particularly in the area of training and professionalizing principalship. Thus the main purpose of this study was to assess the current practices and major problems of secondary school principals in instructional leadership in Kaffa zone.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Quality of education is a prominent agenda across the world & countries are looking for various quality improvement initiatives. the Ethiopia education system lasted for a long period is now in the process of implementing school improvement program (SIP) that gives emphasis for quality of education. The education and training policy has been launched in 1994. The most promising results of the 1994 ETP are increasing access to education and then to work with quality of education. Recently, the Ministry of Education has launched General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP) which comprises six programs were school improvement program (SIP) and Leadership and Management (LAMP) are of among the others. The launching of GEQLP shows that the government has now found its attention to improve the quality of education. To this end, the role of leadership is vital to bring transformative change in the school improvement initiatives. Sergiovanni (1991:78) underlines that leaders are key players in the school improvement.

School improvement is the constant theme of visionary school leaders. They scrutinize existing practice to assure that all activities and procedures contribute to quality of education. The success of any school improvement is highly linked to the leadership capacity of the principal. The effectiveness of the school could be described by strong instructional leadership to support the staff in improving instructions for best and high academic achievements of the students. Effective leadership in educational activities is important to achieve success in school objectives. Lassey (1971:14) also states that school Leadership is one of the several significant variables in the life of the institution. Initiative must be taken by school leaders, because they act as a catalyst in the overall efforts of bringing about effective implementation of school plans and performing other managerial roles. To do so school leadership particularly principals have the necessary skills and knowledge. Principals should have the necessary administrative skills, conceptual skill, human and technical skill (Donelan 1993:419). For principals to gain the leading skill training plays a crucial role and educational leaders can be trained to be more effective leaders (Law and Glove, 2000:15). Regarding this currently the government designed different programs to capacitate the leading approach of a principals. Updating and up grading in regular, extension and summer education program are the ways government today employed for improving the quality of education. But as the researcher is a teacher and principal of secondary school of Kaffa-Zone, the observation shows from 58 (fifty eight) government secondary schools, those led by trained principals are only 21 (Twenty one) secondary schools. This may be due to the school leadership lacks training and educational background in Educational leadership. Then most of the school leadership faced great problem to accomplish their duty and responsibility especially in planning, organizing, leading and controlling different educational practices. As the researcher assumed it is because of lack of training in the field of educational planning and management, lack of experience and situational factors. Therefore, to achieve success in the implementation of leadership in Schools of Kaffa-Zone, it is very important to carry out a research in such a way to investigate the way secondary school leadership assigned to the position and to what extent schools have improved with high involvement of effective leadership. Therefore the research would guide by the following basic questions to achieve the objective.

1. How leader ships Tenure improve school effectiveness in secondary school?
2. How school leaders are selected and assigned in secondary schools for the positions?
3. What are the current practices of school leadership in secondary school of Kaffa-Zone?

4. What are the problems that school leadership faces in secondary schools of Kaffa- Zone?

1.3 Objectives of the study

1.3.1 General Objectives

The general objective of this study will to assess the current practice & challenge of secondary school leadership & to identify how leadership tenure hinder the effectiveness of the schools.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of this study were:-

1. To identify How leader ship Tenure improves school effectiveness in secondary school.
2. To examine how secondary school leadership are selected and assigned for position.
3. To assess the current practices of school leadership in secondary school principals.
4. To identify the problems that school leadership faces in secondary schools of Kaffa-Zone.

1.4. Significance of the Study

This study will be expected to benefit as presented here under. It may inform educational officials of different levels: MoE, regional educational bureaus, zonal and woreda education offices about the problems of secondary school leadership and the necessary measures to overcome the problems. It may help informing policy makers about the problems of secondary school leadership and make them to create possible solutions as reference in the study area. It may help secondary school leadership to fully play their roles in solving the problems of educational leadership. Give relevant information to school leaders and teachers of secondary schools in the zone on practice and problem of secondary school leadership. The study will initiate other researchers to undertake detailed research on the problem

1.5. Delimitation of the Study

It is quite unmanageable to study practices and problems of secondary school leadership of all Fifty Eight(58) government secondary schools that are found in 12 woredas and two (2) towns administrative of Kaffa-Zone the study involves principals, vice principals, Teachers & Cluster supervisors to provide information on the school leader ship effectiveness. Within short time and limited materials and problems of school leadership would be observed in the zone. Due to this, the study were delimit to only Six(6) secondary schools from Kaffa Zone . Besides

to the content of the study would delimit to Leadership Tenure & School Effectiveness in Secondary Schools.

1.6 Limitation of the Study

This study has a number of its own limitations.

1- Lack of relevant local review literature on practice of instructional leadership. The researcher feels that, had it been possible to access these literatures. It would have been possible to substantiate, the practice and challenges of instructional leadership more, and come up with

2- Lack of the research limited to only six secondary schools as the result it may affect generalization of the findings to all schools in the Zone. Other important constraints of this study was failure to incorporate school unit leaders, Parent Teacher Association and Kebele Education and Training Board members as data sources who are important stakeholders of education system and who are believed to have some information regarding overall process of instructional leadership. This exclusion was due to shortage of time to collect data from this source. As the result of these above mentioned limitations, the outcomes of the study were not as completed as it was initially anticipated.

3- Lack of previously recorded documents about the Leadership Tenure & schools effectiveness in the sample area of this research study.

4- Besides, shortage of time and finance withheld the researcher from conducting testing of the instrument. Then the study was managed based on the comments given by the advisor and giving to correct and amend the items to seniors.

1.7. Definition of Key Terms

Educational leadership- at the school level it refers to the principal's influence on school community to set and accomplish educational objectives focusing on learning pedagogy and curriculum.i.e.in diagnosing and solving problems in the teaching learning process (Dimnock, 2000;251).

Leadership Tenure-status of having permanent post with enhanced job,security with in an academic institution or aperiod of time which it is possessed.

Leading-describes dynamic efforts such as translating in to action a vision for the Organization and creating change (Ubben and Hughes,1997:2).

Principal:-the administrative head and professional leader in charge of secondary schools (Good; (1973:436).

Secondary schools: The second educational level from grade 9 to grade 12 subdivided in to two cycles grad 9-10 ad grade 11-12 (MoE), 1994)

1.8. Organization of the study

The thesis/study/ consists of five (5) main chapters, The first chapter deals with the introduction part that includes background of the study, statement of the problems, objectives, and significances of the study, delimitation, operational definitions. Chapter two deals with the review of related Literature to the study, the third chapter presents the research design and methodology of the study, Sampling method, data gathering instruments & method of data analysis. Chapter four deals with Presentations, analysis and interpretation of data and finally the fifth chapter presents conclusion and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER TWO

2. Review of the Related Literature

This chapter attempts to review some main ideas raised by different scholars in different times in reference to leadership theories in general and educational leadership (the instructional leadership of the principal ship) in particular. The definitions of leadership and principal ship, back ground history of the principal, major roles (practices and same qualities of a principal as instructional leader are going to be reviewed.

2.1. The Concept and Meaning of Leadership Tenure & school effectiveness

2.1.1 Meaning of Leadership Tenure

Fiedler (1970) argued that the idea that leaders with more experience are more effective was erroneous. However, other studies have found a connection between leader experience and effectiveness (Cannella & Rowe, 1995). Leadership experience can be either the specific experience of the individual, but it can also be measured as the time in leadership, or more commonly called tenure. Bettin and Kennedy (1990) measured tenure in their study using army personnel and found that tenure was less of a predictor of effectiveness than the relevance of the leadership experience.

Eitzen and Yetman (1972) studied the impact that length of tenure of college basketball coaches had on team effectiveness. They found that the longer the coaches remain the more successful they are in terms of winning percentage. However, they found a cut-off point of twelve years where after that point in time effectiveness began to diminish. They conclude that their findings related to tenure in the same role within the same organization.

Fizel and D'Itri (1997) in their study of college basketball programs that determined winning was the key criterion in determining leadership change included tenure as a variable. They defined tenure as years of service in the coaching profession and they do not mention if they discriminated between different levels of coaching. Fizel and D'Itri found that long-tenured coaches were more likely to be dismissed, yet they state that the tenure of the new coaches compared to the tenure of the preceding coach has no impact on effectiveness. They, therefore recommend that this variable be ignored in hiring decisions.

Avery et al. (2000) argue that measures of tenure that do not capture the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) acquired or not acquired during past experiences are not a predictor of leadership effectiveness. However, Avery et al. contend that tenure of relevant experience does matter. In their study of multiple measures of leadership experience they defined tenure of relevant experience as number of years coaching in the NBA, but excluded years coached outside of the NBA. Avery et al. did find that tenure experience in a similar position was a significant predictor of effectiveness, but that there was no significant relationship for tenure experience in a nonsimilar position.

Hadley, Poitras, Ruggiero, and Knowles (2000) examined the role of NFL coaches on the performance of NFL teams. The variable, prior years of coaching in the NFL, that they used to measure experience was actually one of tenure. They found that as length of tenure increases performance also increases. However, they also found that this was a variable of diminishing returns such that there was a greater increase in performance up until 16 years of experience at which point performance declined. They claim that this finding is consistent with human capital theory.

2.1.2. Job Level Experience

Length of experience, tenure, is one way to measure leader experience, but another method is to look at the actual prior experience of the leader. Smith, Carson, and Alexander (1984) studied Methodist ministers and found that those with prior leadership experience were more effective. Furthermore, Pfeffer and Davis-Blake (1986) found that individual with prior coaching experience and good records had a greater positive impact than those with no prior coaching experience or success at winning.

Cannella and Rowe (1995) continued this research by determining if there is a relationship between leader ability, experience and future leader performance. By studying Major League baseball field managers they hypothesized that those that had prior experience would be more likely to improve the performance of an organization than those with no experience. However, they did not find support for this hypothesis in their sample. They argue the reason for this is that succession is so disruptive to an organization, and so many variables impact performance after succession that those variables may override any benefits that may occur from an experienced leader.

Avery et al.(2003) also determined to break down various attributes of leadership experience in subcomponents. Thus, they attempted to study leadership experience relevance, such as experience in the subordinate's job and also experience in high-stress conditions using National Basketball Association (NBA) head coaches.The researchers defined the subordinate's job as an NBA player under the rational that a leader would be more sensitive to subordinate's needs and they would have obtained the knowledge needed for success.

Center for Promoting Ideas,USA.www.ijbhtnet.com They found that there was a significant relationship between experience in a relevant job, the subordinate's position and prior NBA coaching experience, and team performance. Thus, Avery et al. did confirm that various attributes of leadership experience need to be considered when selecting leaders.

Meaning of School effectiveness

To be familiar with the meanings of effectiveness a number of terms and concepts is undergone frequently including competent,development,quality,improvement,evaluation,monitoring,reviewing,skilled,appropriateness,accountability, and performance. The concept of effectiveness is very broad, like rationale, effort and accomplishment. That is why head of the school may perhaps identify the school's effectiveness as the pupils' performance in the external examinations. The parents can distinguish the school's effectiveness in the way the pupils behave at home, and perform at national examinations. Society possibly will observe the school's effectiveness in terms of the good moral behavior of the children. The Commonwealth Secretariat (1993) in its report describes internal performance, working, external concerns and staff output as general markers of the school effectiveness.

As argued by Chapman (1991) an effective school is one that promotes the progress of its students in a broad range of intellectual, social and emotional outcomes, taking in to account socio-economic status, family background and prior learning. An operational definition of an effective school is the school in which students progress further than might be expected from consideration of its intake (Mortimore,1991).

Coleman (1966) while describing, who concludes that schools bring little influence to bear on a child's achievement, and schools did not matter very much when it came down to differences in levels of achievement. In Britain Reynolds and Rutter (1976), and his colleagues (1979) regard change in the intellectual climate as the power of the school. Their

work highlighted those schools with similar intakes serving similar catchment areas had different outcomes.

Mortimore (1988) in his study of London primary schools recognizes this work. Smith and Tomlinson (1989) in their work for multi-racial comprehensive schools also admitted the same. These studies were supported by so many studies conducted in other countries such as Netherlands, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand.

According to Thrupp (2000) the school effectiveness and improvement over claims the success of effective schools and the interest group is characterized as a socially and politically decontextualized body of literature which has provided support for the supervisory system. Most school effectiveness studies show that 80% or more of student achievement can be explained by student background rather than schools (Teddlie & Reynolds, 2000). The school effectiveness supporters believe that only 20% of achievement accounted for by schools, their work has convincingly helped to destroy the belief that schools do not make any difference. Reynolds & Teddlie (2000) argues that schools not only make a difference but they add value despite the strong influence of family background on children's development. The Commonwealth Secretariat (1993) in its report mentioned the indicators of School Effectiveness as; Ijaz Ahmad Tatlah and Muhammad Zafar Iqbal/Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences 69(2012)790 797 Purposeful leadership of the staff by the head, the involvement of the heads of department, the involvement of other teachers, structured lessons, intellectually challenging teaching, work-centered environment, maximum communication between teachers and pupils, efficient and accurate record keeping, parental and community involvement, positive climate, consistency among teachers, productive division of labor among teachers and good parental report. All these indicators have been fashioned under the following major provisions like management, implementation, environment and achievement. These factors are used to observe an effective school and its head.

The leadership styles of school leaders, such as principals, teachers and supervisors are significant in making an efficient academic performance of the school. For efficient academic activities, programs, and performances leaders should assemble to create effective programs for academic excellence that is only possible if they have the ability to acquire effective leadership styles (Lin, 1999). Certainly much research has been reported on styles

of leadership of school leaders` but the impact of a leader on school effectiveness is still blurred. The need of the time is to add information towards leadership styles used by school leaders in administering their respective schools through this study. Measurement of the role of leadership styles in creating and establishing school effectiveness is also required to see the link between school leaders' leadership styles and the school effectiveness. That is why the researcher desires to explore different styles of leadership and their relationship with school effectiveness. The study will be helpful for the Government, policy makers, care takers, teachers, donor agencies and school leaders in better understanding the existing styles adopted by the school leadership. This will help the head teachers and teachers to learn the way to affect students' achievement. Leaders will become aware to cope with the challenges of the time with regards to uplifting and developing a school to be competitive and adoptive to the current changes of the times through this contribution.

2.2 Characteristics of the effective school

Establishing the characteristics of effective schools has long been considered an important issue. Since the mid-1970s a number of studies have focused on this concept. In the mid-1970s in Britain and elsewhere there was a considerable amount of studies undertaken to uncover the characteristics of effective educational institutions. According to Creamers (1994) about 15% of the differences between students' achievements are the result of differences between schools. Reid et al. (1986: 5-32) note a range of factors that have been identified by different studies as being linked to school effectiveness. Though it is not doubted that there must be many interacting causes for a school to be effective, it is sensible to believe that some factors are more important than others in establishing and support the conditions for school effectiveness.

Focusing on the situation in the UK, but drawing on research and inspection evidence from around the world, Sammons et al. (1996), Harris (1996) and others have analyzed the effectiveness of the schools and the ways in which they differ in their approaches. Some British researchers such as Rutter et al. (1979), Rutter (1980), Reynolds et al. (1976), Reynolds (1982,1985), and Mortimore et al. (1988), and a number of American researchers such as Purkey and Smith (1983), Levine and Lezotte (1990) as Reid et al. (1986: 4) state have published books and research reports with similar findings, all of which support the

notion that schools are different and can have an important impact on the lives of their pupils, teachers and communities. After conducting a study of secondary school practice based on a sample of 185 schools the HMI summarizes that an effective school is one which is efficiently governed by leaders who have the ability to stimulate others, have a vision and supported by important agents. They state that there must be effective communication as well as clear shared goals and objectives... good environment that encourages pupils to express their views and interact with the teachers, fostering the pupils' personal and social development, qualified staff and well deployed expertise (DES, 1988 cited in Reynolds and Cuttance,1993:14; Purkey and Smith, 1983) cited in Reid et al., 1990:18) and Sergiovanni (1995) name some of the characteristics of effective schools.

Commenting on the above studies, Reynolds and Cuttance (1993:13) note that it is important not to over emphasize the extent of the agreement between the various British studies and between these British studies and the international literature. Utter et al. (1979) found that high levels of turnover among school staff is the result of levels of effectiveness in schools, which contradicts Reynolds's (1976, 1982) findings about high levels of staff turnover and ineffectiveness. In a similar vein, as Reynolds and Cuttance (1993: 13) note, the consistent American findings on the link between frequent monitoring of pupil progress and academic effectiveness is not in agreement with the findings of Mortimore et al. (1988) that pupil monitoring which involves frequent testing of children is a characteristic of ineffective school. The characteristics of effective schools identified by Purkey and Smith,(1983) and Sergiovanni (1995).

Characteristics of effective schools outlined by Purkey and Smith (1983) :-

1. Curriculum-focused school leadership;
- 2.Supportive climate within the school;
3. Emphasis on curriculum and teaching;
4. Clear goals and high expectations for students;
5. A system for monitoring performance and achievement;
6. Foster collegial interaction
7. Have extensive staff development
8. Foster creative problem solving
9. Involve parents and the community

Characteristics of effective schools outlined by Sergiovanni (1995).

1.Student centred 2. Offer academically rich programs 3. Practice shared leadership
4.Provide instructions that promote student learning 5. Have positive school climate 6.
Ongoing staff development and in-service training;7. Parental involvement and support;
8. LEA support.

2.3 Factors affecting the effective school

Any attempt to improve the standards of education must focus on a number of interrelated factors, related to the curriculum, the skills of education professionals, educational supervision, the quality of financial provision, school buildings and co-operation of and with parents and the wider community. It is often believed that educational development and change is dependent on the quality of teaching and of school management. The duties and responsibilities of school professionals involve enhancing the quality of life, and helping students to show self-awareness, develop themselves, and understand wider issues involving their society and culture. Therefore, education authorities consider teaching an investment in the future of their society, as it helps to nurture and develop the minds of future generations. In order to improve teaching and, therefore, improve the education system as a whole, and to be able to recognize problems and know how to deal with them, it is important to investigate factors which can have an effect on teaching.

Al-Bashaireh (1995) considers that identifying factors that affect teaching will help to provide an accurate picture for parents and those who have responsibility for the education of children. Salamah (1995) supports Al-Bashaireh's (1995) idea, stating that when the factors affecting teaching are made clear, satisfactory solutions can more easily be found.

Factors of effective schools (Mortimore et al.1988)

1.Purposeful leadership of the staff by the head 2 The involvement of teachers
3.The involvement of the deputy head 4.Consistency among teachers 5.Structured sessions
6.Intellectually challenging teaching 7.A work-centred environment 8.Limited focus
within sessions 9.Maximum communication between teachers and pupils 10.Thorough
record keeping 11.Parental involvement 12 A positive climate.

Factors of effective schools (Levine and Lezotte, 1990).

1.Productive school climate and culture
2.Focus on student acquisition of central learning skills
3.Appropriate monitoring of student progress
4.Practice-oriented staff development at the school site
5.Outstanding leadership
6.Salient parent involvement
7.Effective instructional arrangements and implementation
8.High rationalized expectations and requirements for students
9.Other possible correlates.

The earliest major study conducted in this area in the UK was undertaken by Rutter et al. in 1979. They compared the effectiveness of ten secondary schools in inner London in a number of student outcome areas. In doing so they reached a similar conclusion to that in the survey conducted by the HM inspectorate of Education. Both studies found that effective schools benefit from strong leadership and a climate that facilitates growth.

Rutter et al. (1979) found that effective schools are characterized by factors as varied as the degree of academic emphasis, teachers actions in lessons, the availability of incentives and rewards, good conditions for pupils, and the extent to which children are able to take responsibility. In reference to this study by Rutter et al. (1979), Reynolds and Cuttance (1993: 8) point out that the study found that certain factors are not associated with overall effectiveness, among them class size, formal academic or pastoral care organization, school size, school administrative arrangement and the age and the size of school buildings”.

Levine and Lezotte (1990) have produced a general list of the factors of the effective school (presented in Table 3) which is based on 400 studies of school effectiveness in the United States (cited in Reynolds et al., 1998: 113). However, Mortimore et al. (1988: 250-6) only found twelve factors that are comparable with the factors mentioned by Levine and Lezotte (1990).

Commenting on a similar list, Fullan (1985: 400) says that these factors “say nothing about the dynamics of the organization, and goes on to state that: To comprehend what successful schools are really like in practice, we have to turn to additional factors which infuse some meaning and life into the process of improvement within the school”.

Fullan (1985: 400) goes on to note that there are four fundamental factors which lie behind processes that are a success: 1- A feel for the process for leadership 2- A guiding value system 3-Intense interaction and communication 4- Collaborative planning and

implementation These process factors according to Fullan (1985: 400) instigate the dynamics of interaction and development of the earlier organization variables.

However, Macbeath and Mortimore (2001:7) present a later study conducted by Sammons et al. in 1996, in the subject of meta-analysis, where the factors of effective schools were reduced to the following 11 prominent factors:-1- Professional leadership 2- Shared vision and goals 3- A learning environment the earlier organization variables”.4- Concentration on teaching and learning 5- Purposeful teaching 6- High expectations 7- Positive reinforcement 8- Monitoring progress 9- Pupil rights and responsibilities 10- A learning organization 11- Home-school partnership. To summarize it, effectiveness of any school depends mostly on the following three factors: 1- Effective leaders 2- Effective teachers 3- Effective environment

2.4 Role of the school leader in school effectiveness

“The issue of leadership for school improvement is now high on the research and policy agendas of many countries”(Lambert,1998:5).The success of school improvement is dependent upon the way in which it is directed and managed internally (Harris, 2002). The principal of a school in Saudi Arabia is the leader of a school who directs, administrates and manages human and material educational resources as well as performing other administrative tasks and representing the authority role within a school. For this importance of this multi-function role of a school principal, the title leader is used by the researcher in this study instead of the term a school principal as he/she is considered the leader of a school. This part of the literature review will highlight the role of the principles as leaders in the schools effectiveness: Maintaining a consistent set of targets is essential to success, as Sammons et al. (1997: 199) notes: Leadership helps to set up a clear and consistent vision for the school, which emphasizes the prime purposes of the school as teaching and learning and is highly visible to both staff and students. Benefitting from involved guidance and vision from leaders, schools are able to build and focus on sensible goals with regard to their progress. However, as Creemers (2001) argues, it is important to encourage teachers to set targets to get hand to work towards these targets together.

An effective leader adds value to the work of their staff, as well as being responsible for it by contributing to outcomes and giving direction to help the group (Reynold and Cuttance,

1996). This requires involvement in the activities of the classroom, including curriculum, and monitoring students' progress and teaching strategies.

Teachers tend to undervalue the achievements of the school and thereby to detract from the effectiveness of the learning environment in achieving its goals. This will add value and motivation to the work of these members of staff. Under such guidance, education professionals can learn the most effective teaching methods to enable effective learning, so that teachers and students alike will be encouraged to meet as much as possible and schools can develop a purposeful approach to their progress (Cornforth and Evans, 1996).

Leadership is collective and it requires the participation of everyone in an institution. A good leader can build these diverse relationships with others, and knows how to overcome the difficulties that inhere in teaching and learning practices. Sharing in endeavors that require the collaboration of school staff should be encouraged. This means working and learning side by side with the same last targets. An important aspect of this model of leadership is that it concerns the ability of those within a school to work together, constructing meaning and knowledge collectively and collaboratively" (Lambert, 1998:5).

Hopkins et al.(1996:177) points out that successful schools create collaborative environments which encourage involvement, professional development, mutual support and help in problem solving". It concerns the environment in which work takes place and people focus on a shared aim. The learning environment of a school is as Reynolds et al cited in Harris et al. (eds) (1998: 129) state the ethos of a school is partly determined by the vision, value and goals of the staff and also by the climate in which pupils work".

Fullan (1985, 400) states that intense interaction and communication are important to good leadership, to enable the easy and full transmission of important information, as this reduces uncertainty and the risk of run out and misinformation filling the vacuum caused by stoppages in the flow of information(Dunham, 1995:120). As Harris et al (2003) note this kind of leadership shows a sharing out of power and a new type of authority within the organization.

The leader of a school must be able to competently oversee resources. To make sure that their school is effective, leaders should use the resources at their disposal (both physical and

financial) with great care and efficacy, maintaining a focus on sustaining the curriculum. They should keep a checklist of resources and make sure they make allowances for differentiation and allow for the differences in requirements related to the ability levels and ages of pupils. In educational establishments, how they ration their money to cater for the human and material needs and meet their aims is of paramount importance.

Everard et al. (2004: 10) argue that managers can solve many problems related to limited funds by looking after the resources a school does have. Bush and Middlewood (1997) go on to note that by placing emphasis on securing the means for learning, leaders can structures, resources and support to motivate staff and encourage creativity.

Leaders can aid in encouraging developments by taking risks, and by encouraging others to challenge their views about how things should be managed and what can be achieved. Teachers can be encouraged to search for better answers to problems at school (Tomlinson, 2004). Leask et al. (1999: 2) point out that If [school leaders] show in their work that ICT is a genuinely useful tool, then their staff are more likely to accept the challenge of change and development which access to ICT brings. They can encourage teachers to test their circumstances to understand the need for change and the measures that are preferred for facing problems in the learning environment. Moreover, good leaders make it known to teachers why a particular plan is to be preferred to others to create an effective learning.

Teachers must be encouraged to understand how the learning process occurs, and how to use effective teaching approaches to create an effective learning so that pupils and teachers are able to fulfil their potential (Cornforth and Evans, 1996).

Furthermore, sharing leadership positions and involving teachers in curriculum planning and the management of school affairs, and consulting teachers about other practical decisions in school is important for good school leadership. As Harris (2002: 30) points out that: “Essentially, school improvement necessitates conceptualization of leadership where teachers and managers engage in shared decision-making and risk-taking”. To increase motivation, Bush and Middlewood (1997) state that it is essential to include teachers in organizing schools and the curriculum, which will lead them to work as a team. Involving teachers in these ways can bring about effective changes and as Harris (2002: 70-71) notes, these values are “derived from the explicit and shared values of a community. Moreover, as

Field points out, leaders have the “intellectual ability to handle several issues and to integrate the range of skills, knowledge and understanding according to specific context and situations” (Field, 2000: 7).

An important factor of any effective school is a leader with “the ability to think creatively, to anticipate and forecast changes in the subject (internally or externally driven), and to help others prepare for and take greatest advantage of any changes (Field, 2000: 6). Tomlinson (2004) agrees with Field (2000), pointing out that creative people or team leaders must be ready to alter a schools normal practices, which otherwise would only be able to give acceptable or traditional answers to challenges. However, Tomlinson (2004) suggests that if a leader is to be creative and successful he must not be afraid to alter or challenge an educational institutions routines and norms. This outlet for creativity motivates Laila 703 staff and thus helps to build a sense of success in the institution (Bush and Middlewood, 1997). It is important to support teachers to develop their abilities to perform effectively and motivate them in different ways to improve their performance attitude towards work through non-financial aspects such as training as the Teacher Training Agency, (TTA), (1998a: p.4) states, the role of the leader is “to provide professional leadership and management for a subject (or area of work) to secure high quality teaching, effective use resources and improved standards of learning and achievement for all pupils. Supporting teachers to perform as effectively as possible, and motivating them to build upon their performance can be achieved by successful and thorough training and rewards of a nonmonetary nature. As Harris et al. (1998: 1) note, “Effective management should be central to the professional development of all teachers and lectures irrespective of their place within the organization”. Leaders have a responsibility to limit teaching loads to allow for more effective teaching and learning. School leaders must employ their motivational skills to sustain good performance, build high morals and avoid overload (Bush and Middlewood, 1997).

A school leader is responsible for limiting teaching loads, to enable the most effective teaching and learning to take place. The best leaders focus on establishing high morale, sustaining performance levels and avoiding problems related to the stresses of overwork (Bush and Middlewood, 1997).

2.5 Leadership Styles

Leadership style is the relatively consistent pattern of behavior that characterizes a leader (Dubrin, 2007). According to Dubrin the following are some of the leadership styles. a. Participative leadership: share decision making with group members. Participative leadership can be divided into three sub types: consultative, consensus and democratic consultative leaders: confer with group members before making decisions'. b. Consensus leaders: strive for consensus. They encourage group discussion about an issue and then make a decision that reflects general agreement and that group members will support. c. Democratic leaders: confer final authority on the group they function as collectors of group opinion and take a vote before making a decision d. Autocratic leadership: In contrast to participative leaders, autocratic leaders retain most of the authority. They make decisions confidently, assume that group members will comply, and are not overly concerned with group members' attitudes toward a decision. e. Leadership Grid style: leadership grid style is a framework for specifying the extent of a leader's concern for production and people. f. Entrepreneurial leadership: entrepreneur is a person who finds and operates an initiative business.

Educational leadership refers to the leadership that encourages professional development and improvement, initiate educational innovations promotes educational values and professionalism and provides professional guidance on structural matters (Cheng, 2005).

Hopins, (2003) states that it is now more than twenty years since leadership was identified as one of key components of good school. And also states that the most important single factor in the success of the schools is the quality of leadership of the head. The relationship between high quality leadership and educational outcomes is well documented and generations of research on school effectiveness shows that excellent leadership is one of the main factors in high performing schools (Brundrett and Silcock, 2003).

According to Harris and Muijs (2005), the quality of teaching strongly influences pupil motivation and achievement. It has been consistently argued that the quality of leadership matters in determining motivation of teachers and the quality of teaching in the classroom. Thus, leadership, change and school environment are closely related. It is clear from many school improvement studies that have been conducted. Leadership is a key factor in school ability to improve. This form of leadership has often been associated with the leadership of

the head teacher or principals and it has been assumed that this individuals leadership ability or skill is a critical factor in promoting school improvement, change and development. While the education challenges are considerable and the route to reform is complex, the potential of leadership to influence pupil and school performance remain un equivocal. Harris, (2003) on the other hand, Sharma(2005) states that the key factor to the individual school' success is the building principal who sets the tone as the school educational leader, enforces the positive and convince the students, parents and teachers that all children can learn and improve academically.

2.7. Ideal Conception of the Principal ship

Definitions of the principal' role and responsibility have change over time. Traditional definitions focused on change over time and administrative process and functions that must be emphasized for schools to work well. Effective principals, for example, are responsible for planning, organizing, leading and controlling. Planning:- means setting and developing goals, and objectives for the school, and also developing blue print and strategies for implementing them. Organizing:- means bringing together the necessary human, financial and physical resources to accomplish goals efficiently. Leading has to do with guiding, motivating and supervising subordinates. Controlling, refers to the principal evaluation, responsibilities and in clued reviewing and regulation performance, providing feedback, and other wise tending to standards of goal attainment Sergiovanni (2009). Moreover, Good (1973), defines a word “principal” as the administrative head and professional head of a high school.

2.8. Historical Development of the Principal ship

2.8.1. Countries Experience

There are various theories and concepts of management and organization that can be used to describe and direct the practice of school leadership in changing education environment. Due to the cultural, historical, social and other contextual influences and constraints, the application of these theories and the development of school leadership may be different in different countries (Cheng, 2005). It is not a surprise that the characteristics of principals leadership in one area (e.g. Australia) are different from those in other areas (e.g. Japan) to understand how the theories and their application are valid a cross countries or cultural

context, it would be interesting to know how the development of characteristic of principals leadership interacts with the influence of social culture (Cheng 2005). Traditional leadership theory, concentrates on principals management techniques skills. The duality of leadership measured by the leader behavior description questionnaire, as (Cheng, 2005) stated, in terms of initiating structure (Task orientation) and relationship (people orientation) was used extensively in leadership studies during the 1970s and 1980s. On the other hand Monhan and Hengst (1982) and Murphy (1995) stated that the term principal teacher “head master or head mistress” in England is similar to principal in USA. The development of Principal is firmly attached with the history of the principal in the unit states of America. In the early history of American schooling there were no principals like that of today. School administration was not differentiated from teaching implying that everything was done by teachers (Murphy) As Murpy teachers have all rounded qualities from teaching to administration of the condition. As the result in the schooling environment in the teaching learning process all teachers are qualified as having all entities of teaching and administering. So that day to day activities in the school which ranges from teaching to administration is carried out by teachers. Because in such countries schooling is largely abide by sciences and philosophy. Hong Kong being an international city exposed in both western and eastern cultures the development characteristics of principals’ leadership in Hong Kong schools is an interesting case for international understanding of how principals leadership interacts with the societal culture (Cheng, 2005).

According to Cheng, (2005), the Honk Kong education system as repetitive example of an international education system has experienced numerous changes over the last decades. One of the most recent policy moves target the changing role of school principals, particularly in relation to quality education, change and the principal’s place in school based management.

2.8.2. Ethiopian Experience

Principal ship in Ethiopia is strongly connected with the introduction of modern education in the country. According to MoE (2002), it is stated that prior to 1962, expatriate principals were assigned in elementary and secondary school of different provinces of Ethiopia during the 1930s and 1940s predominantly.

Indians were posted to principal ship although the criteria were not at all. Clear, may be for their educational standards and experience in leadership. After the restoration of independence in 1941 education was given high priority which resulted in opening of schools in different parts of the country. As there were no enough educated Ethiopians to teach and run the schools, most of the teachers and head masters in the schools were from foreign countries such as the UK, USA, Canada, Sweden, Egypt and India (ICDR, 1999 as cited in Feseha, 2005).

In 1961/2 one year course in supervision and administration was started at Addis Ababa University. This continued until 1976. Still same periodical letters written before the year 1960 (MoE2002) reveals the Ethiopians who were graduated with first degree in any field were assigned as principals in secondary school by senior officials of the MOE. The major selection requirements were educational standards, services year and work experience. On other hand, scale promotion advertisements that had been issued from 1973-1976 show that secondary school principal were those who held their first degree prefer ability in educational managements field and those who had at least worked for a limited time as a unit leader or the department head, dean or teacher. Then it is stated in job description of the MOE issued in 1989 that secondary school administration including a sufficient work experience that shows an attention to consider principal ship as a professional (Feseha, 2005).

According to Haile Selassie, (1999), cognizant of the fact that any educational reform will not be sustainable without adequate and well qualified personnel and acknowledging that there exists a serious need for effective educational system, and leadership will be professional however, the trend in secondary schools in Oromia Regional State in the past six or seven years was same what different. The trend of placement to day in this region is that principals for this level were assigned based on the guideline prepared by the education bureau. The responsibility of selecting principals was taken by education offices in the woredas. The committee in these offices and political leaders of that woreda as were in charge of properly applying the stated guideline in selecting from among the applicant teachers with BA degree and five years or more service or experience.

2.9. The Major Role of a Principal as an school Leader

McEWan (2003) states that instructional leader must be knowledgeable, knowledge about Learning theory, effective instruction and curriculum. In addition, she describe that instruction leaders must be able to communicate and represent to students, teachers, and parents what is of important and value in the school.

Furthermore, sergiovanni, (2009) believes that, given what we know about effective teaching and learning, principals must know and engage in matters of instructions to a greater extent and with greater depth than others. She suggests the following as examples of things that principals, who are instructional leaders, might do regularly 1.Plan details of professional development plan with individual teachers, student data, and characteristics of the adopted instructional program 2.Build professional development plan with individual teachers, based on classroom observations, students data and characteristics of the adopted instructional program 3. Vist classrooms daily to observe teaching after developing with teachers descriptions and criteria of good teaching 4.Leading a grade level group of teachers in analyzing examples of students work from their classes with reference to bench mark work that meets state or district standards.

In light of the above ideas Sergovanni, (2006) states that a strong consensus is emerging that whatever else do, principals must be instructional teachers who are directly involved in the teaching and learning life of the school. Supporting the above idea, Kruger, Richardson, and Bailey (2002), states that the main function of the principals as instructional leader is making teaching learning effective inside and outside the classroom.

The principal as instructional leader is, therefore expected to make teaching and learning effective and performing a managerial responsibility as well. So, the instructional leader must be knowledgeable about learning theory, effective instructional curriculum, (McEwan, 2003). Besides other scholars have also identified and elaborated same of the roles of the instructional leaders or managerial practices as follows.

2.9.1. Planning

Schools as any institutions require an organizational plan to realize success in this organization. Educators in the field have given a number of definitions for the conduct of planning in school. Ubben and Hughes (1997:25) define planning in schools as a process

that involves the translation of concepts, ideas, beliefs into operational process and measurable outcomes. School plan must be democratically oriented and should involve every one concerned teacher, students, parents and community. It is essential to create additional resources both in terms of human and material inputs. So, effective plans are those that require participation of all stakeholders. The role of the school leaders is very crucial at a time of planning. A principal as a school leader is expected to play a vital role from preparation via to implementation and evaluation.

Supporting the idea, Talesra et.al (2002) stated that the success of institutional planning depends on the dynamism and interest of the head. Effective school leaders should look at the system as whole, assess the strengths and weaknesses and carefully create a feeling of readiness for change.

Principal or school leaders may face problems in their attempt to prepare actionable school plan. Among these problems, teachers conditioned to believe that their job description does not go beyond teaching and conducting a few extra-curricular activities.

2.9.2. Organizing

Organizing is a basic activity of school principal. It is performed to assemble and arrange all required resources including people so that the required work can be accomplished successfully once the objective of the organization and the plans have been established. Knezevich (1969:37) stated that, organizing the institution is one dimension of the tasks of achieving objectives. It is the part of administrative process concerned with determining: 1. how work shall be divided 2 the nature and, number of position to be created 3. What relations shall exist between various positions, and 4. Establishment of communication between positions? Further he said that, organizing provides a systematic means of differentiating and coordinating resources (both human and materials) to attain purposes of the institution. It is a means of harnessing the action of many individual to group members.

Good organization provides the administrative structure, arrangements, and coordinating mechanisms needed to facilitate teaching and learning (Seirgiovanni, 2001:69) on the top of this, he proposed some basic principles of organizing as follows. 1. The principle of cooperation:- Cooperative teaching arrangements facilitate teaching and enhancing learning. In successful schools, organizational structures enhance cooperation among teachers. 2. The principle of empowerment: Feeling of empowerment among teachers contributes to

ownership and increase commitment and motivation to work. When teachers feel like pawns rather than originators of their own behavior they respond with reduced commitment, mechanical behavior, indifference, and in extreme cases, dissatisfaction and alienation. In Successful schools, organizational structure enhances empowerment among teachers.3.The principle of accountability:- Accountability is related to empowerment and responsibility. It provides the healthy measure of excitement, challenge and importance. In successful schools, organizational structures allow teachers to participate in setting local standards and achievements. 4.The principle of responsibility:- Most teachers and other school professionals want responsibility. Responsibility upgrades the importance and significance of their work and provides a basis for recognition of their success. In successful schools, organizational structures encourage teacher responsibility.

In general, school performs well when leaders recognize the need for agreement on goal when resources or both human and material are organized to support goal achievement and when all parts school work consistently and collaboratively towards changing the school environment.

2.9.3. Leading

Leading is one of the key managerial roles of school principals. According to MoE (2002:34), the school principal plays high roles in coordinating, leading and controlling teachers, students and parents to bring them toward education goal in the school. School principals are expected to provide leadership in important educational activities such as organizational planning and goal setting, guiding instruction and monitoring staff and facilitates for effective teaching-learning process.

Leadership is the key way principals use themselves to create school climate characterized student productivity, staff productivity, and creative thought. Because, an orderly school climate which is efficient and well managed provide the precondition for enhanced student learning (Ubben, 1997:10). Moreover, as Kotter (1990) stated, leadership is not only to bring about change but to set the direction and to lead people to that change. Therefore, a school principal as a leader, he has to encourage staff members creativity by seeking out the special talents of individual members and their innovations and experimentation; he assets the need for the use of resources, personnel and deploys them to spots where they may be

Effective.

2.9.4. Communicating

Communicating is, in effect, a means to accomplish the objectives of an organization (Knezevich 1969:67). He also stated that, communication is central for all administrative Function such as planning, organizing, decision making, assembling and allocating resources, coordinating, leading and apprising. This indicate that as communication is one of the duties of leader /principal/ to integrate organized activities and to change people behavior by making information useful to productive and for achievement of objective of the organization.

Communication skills and techniques are necessary for effective educational leader who wants to bring change. Because, it projects how students, staff, parents and community perceive the school. In addition, effective communication helps educational leader to reach subordinates with instruction, directives, policies; and subordinate tasks, performances, Problems and suggestions reach to superiors.

In light of the above idea, Gorton(1972:34) suggested that, as a communicator, an administrative needs to be aware of six basic aspects of communication. These are: 1.The purpose achieved by the message 2. The person(s) to whom the message is directed 3.The sender of the message. 4. The attractive channels for communicating the message, the contact of the message5. The need for feedback to respond to the message generally, school principals should facilitate upward, downward, horizontal and diagonal communication to create conducive environment in order to change the school environment.

2.9.5. Supervising

The secondary school principals are responsible for supervision in the school. In order to improve the teaching-learning process, principals must understand some aspects of good teaching. They must be able to offer suggestion for the general improving of the instructional program.

Bradfield (1964:21) points out the principal supervisory responsibility include the following: 1.helping teachers plan for improvements of teaching and learning conditions 2. Helping teacher's in various class room activities. 3 .Helping teacher's with various school activities for the purpose of improvement of teaching. 4. Helping teachers in conference and meeting The supervisory practices that have been conducted by the principal must be influenced heavily by the concept of clinical supervision in which emphasis is placed up on

improvement of class room teaching and instruction. Clinical supervision is predicted on teacher supervisor mutual trust and close interaction, a presumed desire of teachers to improve and a systematic approach to the observation and analysis of teaching behavior (Guthrie 199:340). Furthermore, he explained as clinical supervision model consists of eight steps. These are:

1. Supervisor teacher trust is established and purpose of clinical supervision is explained
2. Focus on lesson planning, including teaching goals and objectives, teaching techniques and Materials, anticipated problems, general concerns and kinds of teacher feedback desired
3. Determine what classroom techniques will be used and how specific data will be collected
4. The actual classroom observation and data collection from teaching sessions
5. Analysis of classroom observation data by teachers and supervisors independently or jointly
6. Planning the teacher-supervisor feedback conference
7. Conduct feedback conferences.
8. Renew plan to use new targets for classroom outcomes or teaching behavior. Generally, supervisors are a key component of quality monitoring system. Therefore, the role played by the principal is an important element to bring change in school environment.

2.9.6. Curriculum Development

McNergney and Robert (2004) state that the school principals use their visibility to advance ideas that influence curriculum. Public opinion, professional education groups and vocal individuals all work to influence the curriculum in its many forms. In relation to the above idea, Sergovanni (2001:4) confirms that a principal has the proficient persons tends to facilitate the establishment of a curriculum frame work that provides direction for teaching and learning of curriculum and instruction, the proficient representatives to identify a curriculum framework and common care of learning the school and demonstrates to all state holders knowledge of the school's curriculum frame work and common care of learning that support the mission and the goals of the school.

2.9.7. Principals Role and Responsibility for Staff Development

The principal plays vital role throughout all of the stages of staff development. The principals must show a positive attitude. The administrators attitudes and reactions will have a profound effect up on the success of a staff development program Smith, (2009), Smith (2009) that “If the premise is that people are the key to school improvement, then it follows that the fundamental role of the principal is to help create the conditions that enable the staff to develop so that the school can achieve its goals more effectively. In this regard, MoE (1994) EC states that principals have to develop mechanism by which competent teachers share their experience with staff. Furthermore, Ediger and Rao, (2003) explain that he present day principal vital goals of assisting teachers to guide pupils to achieve objectives as whichever level is required be it national, state, district, and or individual classroom level. It should definitely be the principles responsibility to encourage teachers to help pupils achieve optimally.

To generalize the above concepts, smith (2009) states that designed to make a significant difference in the teaching lives of the staff, and thus, make a similar difference in the learning lives of student, the staff development function will take on a greater role in the improvement of instructional and the achievement of students. The principal, likewise, will have greater responsibility for the development of the staff. The principal is the key person in the staff development process, much like the teacher for students.

2.9.8. School Community Relation

School’ does not exist apart from the society to be served according to Gamage, (2006). School is a social system that exists to serve the society by educating and training its younger generation. So that, in exercising leadership behavior the proficient principal demonstrates vision and provides leadership that appropriately involves the school community in the creation of shared beliefs and values demonstrates moral and ethical judgment and also demonstrates creativity and innovative thinking (Sergiovanni, 2001). With respect to the internal school community relation MCNMergeny and Robert, (2004) describe that in effective school, a school act as a community where separate classrooms are connected through a clear and vital mission where by teachers serve as leaders, and the principal act as lead teacher and parents are viewed as partners in the learning process.

Furthermore, Demmock (2000) stated that it is the school leader that has to play central roles in linking internal and external environment of the school.

Regarding the external school community relation, Govinda and Diwan (2007) indicate that the school principals as well as the local community of parents have to acquire new skills in human relations. Parents and the school principals, therefore, have to adopt a positive outlook in their mutual relationship. In addition, principals must also facilitate and engage in activities ensuring that the stake holders are involved in decisions affecting schools and effective conflict resolution skills (Sergiovanni 2001.)

Ubben and Hughes, (1997) stated that principals involve parents who prepare school policy and let the policy to be implemented. Supporting the above ideas, Vashist, (2008) writes that public school principals must always remember that the schools are subject to public control. Therefore, process should be included for the appropriate participation of parents and other citizens in planning activities and establishing goals.

2.9.9. Evaluation of Teachers

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

2.10. Qualities of Good Principal as an Instructional Leader

A principal needs to have certain qualities to perform his/her instructional roles effectively. That is why own in Ayalew (2000) writes that qualities of a good principal in his/her leadership of the instruction are reflected in identifying the needs and preferences of his teachers and students and also to motivate and inspire teachers, and a one who share responsibility, build team work. To achieve instructional goals and to elicit maximum contribution of each teacher and group for development and children is another best quality of principals as an instructional leader, (Kochhar, 1988).

2.11. Challenges to secondary school leaders

The leadership responsibilities of principals play an important role for the achievement of educational objectives. But in carrying out the task of leadership, principals, usually face a lot of challenges, stressing this point, different scholars listed different challenges that impede leadership responsibility of principals. Some of these include lack of training and skills, lack of resource, the press of duties, the personal quality of the principal, shortage of time, the problem of limited acceptance in the nature of the school.

2.11.1. Lack of Training and Skills.

To be influential in discharging their educational leadership responsibilities, principal need to have skills and training that make them effective and efficient leader. In line, with this Glatter (1988:15) states that professional knowledge skill and attitude have great impact on the achievement of organizational goals and objectives and the lack of skills will create an impediment to principals. According to Bennaars (1994:258) Principals are selected from teacher. All of them have barely any leadership experience or prior training in school administration and management.

Suddenly a head teacher finds himself in a leadership position which calls for a lot of commitment dedication and tolerance. Confirming the idea, McWan (2003:12) states that while many institutions are restructuring their administration programs to provide more opportunities to leadership skills in addition to academic knowledge, a gap remains between the academic and real world. Thus lack of skills and training is the common impediments to educational leadership effectiveness.

2.11.2. Lack of Resources

Resources are the means to the end. They matter in terms of school improvement and long term effectiveness. In research synthesis about practices in high performance schools, the finding that relate to resource is evident Ubben and Hughes (1997:304). In other words, a lack of resource (Financial, physical or human) can be a serious obstacle to principal. A principal may want to lead and the situation and expectations of others may call for his leadership but if the resource necessary to implement his or her leadership are inadequate, the principals will face a significant impede (Gorton, 1983:264).

2.11.3. The Press of Duty /Work Overload/

The principal is the one person in a school who oversees the entire program and holds great responsibility of his/her school. Confirming the above idea, Barth, (In Sergiovanni, 2001:13) states that the principal is ultimately responsible for almost everything that happens in the school and out. Strengthening the idea Gorton (1983:263) states the exercising instructional leadership takes time and energy over and above that which must be spent on administering a school or school district. Responsibility other than instructional leadership will frequently press for the principals time and drain his/her energy leaving him/her with the feeling that he/she is spread too thin and even though the principal would like to be an instructional leader he/she really does not have the time to function as one. Explaining the above idea, Shields (2004:111) state that principals are expected to develop learning communities, build the professional capacity of teacher, take advice from parents, engage in collaborative and consultative decision making, resolve conflicts, engage in effective instructional leadership, and attend respectfully, immediately and appropriately to the needs and requests of families with diverse cultural ethnic and socio-economic grounds.

2.11.4. The Personal Quality of the leaders

Schools really can make a difference in the achievement levels of students, but a school is most often only as good or bad, as creative or sterile as the person who serves as the head of the school Ubben and Hughes (1997:104). The principals own personality, vision, extent of commitment, human relation skills etc can serve to constrain/hamper the exercise of leadership. Strengthening this idea, Gorton (1983; 264) stated that if the principal does not possess the appropriate personal qualities needed, the absence of these characteristics can be seen as constraining in carrying out leadership responsibilities properly.

2.11.5. Shortage of Time

Principals are school representative. They have responsibilities over many areas of their respective school. Hence, they become busy in dealing with these responsibilities the whole work days. According to Ubben and Hughes (1997:327) a school executive day is characterized by one encounter after another with staff members, student's parents, community members, politicians and others kind of individual or sub groups are myriad and diverse, all of whom have questions and requests and problems demanding principal's time.

Thus, lack of time, due to variety of tasks that principals deal with is another biggest problem in principals work (McEwane, 2003:13) .

2.11.6. The Nature of the School

There are many different institutions that exist to give different services for human being. Among them, school is one. Schools are different from these social institutions and perhaps are the most complex of all our social inventions. In relation to this Hanson (1996:1) states that unlike most other formal organizations, the school has a human product that gives rise to unique problem of organization and management. This is because the main participants in the school system are parents, students, teachers, principals and other staff with different backgrounds and interests. However, the interaction of these groups and individuals in the dynamic school context may not always be harmonious and conflicts may be some of the outcome thus the process of school governance became exceedingly complex. The challenge of educational leadership becomes even more complex as the school can again be differentiated from other type of institutions in relation to values structure of the community. Schools bring individuals of different backgrounds and culture that may hold quite different values yet be thrown as to increasingly closer interactions with each other (Ayalew, 1991:11 and Dimmock 1993:96).

2.11.7. Lack of Experience

Harris, Day, Hopkins Hadfield, Hargreaves and Chapman (2003) state that beginning, in experienced head teaches principals usually face greater amount of uncertainty difficulties than the previously experienced principals to perform their jobs. Moreover, the variety of new roles that beginner, in experienced head teachers/principal perform during the first year of their leadership create confusion to them, where their vital task in the beginning would be to learn about these roles.

2.11.8. Other School Related Problems

Jaiyeoba and Jibril, (2006) explain that same of the problem that secondary school principals may face include over population of students, problem with school plant, ill equipped and inadequate teachers, to cope with the work load, students with poor academic background, poor funding that affects management, students negative attitude towards learning, parents am bivalence towards the educational wellbeing of their children, low motivation, low

performance and personal problems including role conflict, social problems and pressures, financial problems and a lot more. Confirming the above idea, Vashist, (2008) added that due to the great growth of pupils enrollments heavy leadership burdens up on school administrators to provide new school plant facilities which costs many billions of dollars. In general, MoE (2006-2007) writes that as important as sufficient teachers are for the quality education, so is the overall quality of the teachers. In contrast with primary education over all the percentage of qualified teachers is lower in secondary education. Nationally only 49.8% of all secondary school teachers are qualified for their level of teaching. Even if yet we do not have exact statistics it is likely that preparatory cycle (11-12) teachers may be even less qualified for their level than those teaching first cycle (grade 9-10), general secondary. This means teachers teaching on preparatory cycle still majority of them were first degree holders. They were not fulfilling the requirement set by ministry of education.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3. Research Design

3.1. The Research Approach

To undertake the study, combinations of quantitative and qualitative approaches were employed to address basic research questions. It was believed that, these approaches would help to improve the quality of research since, it enables to collect multiple sets of data using different research method (Johnson and Christenson, (2008:51). It was planned that the study design to be used and employed was correlational study. In order to undertake this research descriptive survey method was used to present the result. It helps to provide a description of current practices, trends, attitudes or opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population. Hence, it is believed that this method would help the researcher to obtain contemporary data on the Practices and problems of secondary school leadership, supporting this Kamar (2005) has suggested that the choice of a research method has to base on its objectives and the research questions that ask about the current state or condition require a strategy of descriptive method.

3.2. Sources of Data

To achieve the objectives of this study the combination of both primary and secondary sources of data were employed. Primary data was collected from teachers, principals, PTA leaders, supervisors of government secondary schools, and WEOs of the sampled woredas. Secondary sources of data were collected from quarter and annual reports and supervision comment, document at school and woreda Education office.

3.3. Sample size and Sampling Technique

The researcher selected Kaffa zone using purposive sampling method. Because the researcher observed the problem of school leadership in providing the necessary leading practices and familiar with the study area since he has taught and educated there and thus hope that he can obtain adequate information from the respondents. And also I am working in the area of school leadership, then wants to conduct a research to investigate the practices and problems in the area of school leadership. Therefore, with regard to Kaffa zone, there are twelve (12) woredas and two (2) towns' administrative. from these six(6) secondary schools (Shisho inde secondary

school, Bita Genet secondary school, Chena secondary school, Buta Hora secondary school, Kuta shoray secondary school & Warata secondary school) were selected by using simple random sampling technique for these study. Because simple random sampling techniques were used in selecting a sample in a such way that all individuals in the defined population have equal and independent chance of selecting for the sample (). And also Out of 282 secondary school teachers in 6 selected woredas of selected secondary schools 85 (30%) of teachers was selected through simple random sampling techniques by considering their proportionality. 12 principals, 6 PTA leaders, 6 supervisors and 6 WEOs was included through purposive sampling technique. Because their involvement in this study recognized their critical role in the school leadership and believed that they were offer adequate, quality and relevant information to the issue under study.

Table-1. Total sampled population of the study with the respective school and Woreda

No	Name of school	Principals	School Supervisor	WEO from each woreda	PTA from each woreda	Teachers popn	Sample teacher
1	Shishinda secondary school	2	1	1	1	47	14
2	Bitu secondary school	2	1	1	1	39	12
3	Chena secondary school	2	1	1	1	54	16
4	Wareta secondary school	2	1	1	1	40	12
5	Kuta-Shoray secondary school	2	1	1	1	52	16
6	Buta-Hora secondary school	2	1	1	1	50	15
	Total	12	6	6	6	282	85

3.4. Instruments of Data Collection

3.5.1. Questionnaire

Both open and closed ended questionnaire items were used in this study. The need to use questionnaire as a research instrument in this study was related for the following reasons. First, the researcher enables to obtain information about the thought, feeling, attitudes, beliefs, value, personality and intentions of the research participants (Johanson and Christensen 2008:203). Hence different kinds of characteristics from participant's perspective can be measured by questionnaire. Second, the questionnaire enables the research to collect data involving large number of participants in an efficient way. Finally, since the researcher uses the survey method, it is the most important method in collecting data than others. Five point Likert Scale question would be developed for the closed ended questionnaire so as to elicit information about how the practice of secondary school leadership is carried in promoting instructional, curriculum and staff development and on challenges related with leadership practices of secondary school. The need to use this scale stems from the reason that it offers high coverage of all significant aspects of the content, and permits detailed and accurate comparability between sets of data (Sarantakos, 2005). Open ended questions prepared to allow participants to respond by writing their answers in their own words about their general perceptions, understanding and views toward the practices and problems of school leadership in leading and implementing of the managerial roles(practices). Thus open ended questions were prepared and used to elicit general information so as to supplement information obtained from close ended questions.

3.5.2. Interview

Interview was the second important data gathering instrument in this study. This data gathering instrument was selected with the belief that deeper information is obtained on issues critical to the study underway. It was also being used to cross-check the responses obtained through questionnaire and it let the interviewee to express her/his feeling freely and knowledge of people in a program in depth (Best and Kahn, 2003). In order to obtain deeper information related to the leadership tenure & school effectiveness in the study area, a semi structured interview was held with two groups of respondents six PTAs and six Woreda Education Office Heads were interviewed. These two groups of respondents are selected for interview in the ground that more information can possibly obtained from them due to their position in the school leadership and

daily engagements in the core activities of school leadership. In addition, it is believed that they are very close to the day to day challenges exist in the schools.

3.5.5. Document Analysis

Document analysis was the other essential data collecting tool. Various documents including school performance reports, guidelines of the MoE, minutes that show what leadership decisions made and discussed, and records were explored in the process of the study. It is believed that the data obtained in this method was used to validate and substantiate the information gathered by the questionnaire and semi-structured interview

3.6. Methods of Data Analysis

Data analysis consists of examining, categorizing, tabulating or recombining the evidence to address the initial propositions of the study (Yin in Gentry 2002:62). Therefore, data analysis requires going through all the raw data and bringing order and meaning to all the information gathered. Therefore, the gathered data were edited for accuracy and completeness. Then the edited data were classified in the respective group and schools. And then, arranged and organized in table. Data that obtained from questionnaire were analyzed quantitatively through descriptive statistical computations. Among various descriptive statistics percentage, mean score standard deviation and average mean were preferred to analysis all the basic questions. Because they are very important in identifying the difference and similarity of respondents judgments on variables and easily understood by different stakeholders at different levels. Percentage was used to analyze the difference and similarity of respondents judgments to each variable out of hundred. The mean score & was used to analyze the middle of the two extremes (extremely agree and extremely disagree in each item).

3.7 Ethical Considerations

First contact made with six(6) secondary school leadership, teachers, and PTA representative and information was given to them about the purpose of the research project. The respondents were told about the confidentiality of the data that is obtained through the interview made with them. Hence, after gaining verbal consent the interview was conducted and pseudo names are used to quote the response to be collected from interview

CHAPTER FOUR

4. Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of Data

This chapter deals with presentation, analysis and interpretation of data obtained from teachers, principals, vice principals, supervisors, heads of WEOs & PTAs. The study employed questionnaires for teachers, vice-principals and principals & supervisors, interviews for heads of WEOs & PTAs. Besides, additional information was gathered through document analysis. Thus, the quantitative as well as qualitative analysis of data was incorporated in to this chapter. The qualitative part was supposed to be complementary to the quantitative analysis. It consists two parts. The first part is concerned with description of the background information of the sample population and the second part concerned with analysis and interpretation of data.

4.1 Background Information

Based on the sampling procedure described in Chapter three from the sampled six(6)woredas government secondary schools, total of 142 respondents were selected. That is, 12 principals,85 teachers from sampled Secondary School, 6 Secondary School supervisors of sampled School, 6 WEOs from Sampled woredas and 6 PTA members from sampled Schools were included. Questionnaires were prepared and distributed to 85 secondary School teachers and 12 main & vice principals & 6 Secondary School supervisors. all teachers, principals & supervisors were filled and returned the questionnaires to the researcher properly. This increases the validity of the study. The interview held with PTA representative and WEOs.

Personal characteristics of respondents

Table 1: the sex and age of the Respondents

	Items	teachers		Principals(main & vice)		WEOS officials		Supervisors		PTA	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Sex	Male	73	86%	11	92%	6	100	6	100	6	100
	Female	12	14%	1	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	85	100%	12	100%	6	100%	6	100%	6	100%
Age	18-20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	21-30	27	32%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	31-40	34	40%	6	50%	4	75%	5	83%	-	-
	41-50	17	20%	6	50%	2	25%	1	17%	3	50%
	51&above	7	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	50%
	Total	85	100%	12	100%	6	100%	6	100%	6	100%

Table-1 indicated that 7386% of sample teacher's respondents were males and only 14% of the sample teachers were females and 92% of sampled secondary School principals were, male & 8% of the sample principals were females. But 100% of Supervisors, WEOs & PTA were males. None of females was participating in assignment related to Secondary school leadership, supervisors, WEOs & PTA except one principal was assigned as the performer in school principal. So that as female teachers involvement in secondary school was low they could not participate equally in sampled population with their male counter parts

Table-1 show that none of teachers were in the age range of 18-20 years, only 32% of teachers were in the age range between 21-30 years.40% of teachers, 50% of principals, 83% of WEOs and 75% of Secondary School supervisors were in the age range between 31-40 years. Moreover 20% of teachers, 50% of principals,50% of WEOs, and 25% of

Secondary School supervisors & 50% PTA were in the age range between 41-50 years. Finally 8% of teachers and 50% of PTA were in the range of 51 and above years.

As reflected in table majority of teachers, principals, WEOs, supervisors & PTA of the sampled Secondary Schools were found to be in the age range of 31-40 years. So that as the information obtained from the age of the respondents it is possible to obtain matured idea about the Leadership Tenure & school effectiveness.

Table 2: Educational qualification and services year of respondents

	Items	Teachers		Principals(main & vice)		WEOs officials		Supervisors		PTA	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Qualification	Below grade-12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	17%
	Grade-12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	83%
	Diploma	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	BA/BSC/BE D	50	59%	6	50%	6	100%	4	67%	-	-
	MA/MSC	35	41%	6	50%	-	-	2	33%	-	-
	Total	85	100%	12	100%	6	100%	6	100%	6	100%
Years of service	1-10	10	12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	11-20	53	62%	6	50%	3	50%	3	50%	-	-
	21-30	17	20%	6	50%	3	50%	3	50%	-	-
	31 & above	5	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	85	100%	12	100%	6	100%	6	100%	-	-

As indicated in table-2 above 1(17%) of PTA leaders were below grade 12 and 5(83%) of PTA leaders were grade 12 and none of teachers & none of PTA leaders were diploma holders. But majority of teachers 50(59%), principals 6(50%) and all of WEOs 6(100%) and supervisors 4(67%) were BA/BSC/Bed holders & 35(41%) of teacher,6(50%) of principals & 2(33%) of supervisors were MA/MSC holders.it can be concluded that most secondary

school teachers have BA/BSC/BED holders. But only 35(41%) of teachers 3(50%) of principals & 2(33%) of supervisors were MA/MSc degree holders. According to table 2 most of the principals were not qualified or trained in educational leadership. From the sampled secondary school only half of 6(50%) principals were qualified in educational leadership that indicates under the minimum requirement assigned for secondary school leadership by the MoE(MA/MSc). From the table above all supervisors & WEOs were not qualified for secondary school leadership. Therefore, leading a secondary school without having the necessary qualification in the position will not bring the school effectiveness.

As Okumber (1998) stated that modern educational reform places a great amount on the effective leadership and management of school. Due to this fact, secondary school leadership should be professionally trained in educational leadership.

As indicated in the Table 2 Total work experience of the respondents 12% of teacher respondents have the work experience of 1-10 years and majority of teacher respondents (62%) had the work experience of 11-20 years, 20% of teachers had 21-30 years work experience & 6% teacher respondents had 30 years & above work experience. Principals had the range of work experience between 11-20 years were 50%, & 50% of Principals were range of work experience between 21-30 years.

From above data we can conclude that Majority of secondary school Leaders had the work experience between the range of 11-30 years(11-20 & 21-30). Similarly WEOS & Supervisors had the work experience between the range of 11-30 years. From the data one can observe that majority of teachers, principals; supervisors and woreda educational officials have more than 10 years of total work experience. Due to this it was believed that this group could give relevant information for the first objective of this research. Because as one stay for a long time (leader ship Tenure/work experience of leaders) in a specific job, can observe the way the school leadership acts or implement the good practices and solve the problems that the school faces; and having more experience has a great contribution in leading and supervising a school for effective teaching and learning process for school leaders, supervisors and woreda educational officials.

Fielder and Chemers (1983) indicate that without adequate training and work experience leadership task structuring ability will be lower or lack of experience can decrease his potential for effectiveness. From this idea we can conclude that leadership Tenure(work experience) were very wanted for school effectiveness.

How the School Leadership works in line with School vision

Concerning setting school vision and defining school mission, seven items that describe the extent of implementation of the dimension were presented to the group of teachers, main & vice principals & supervisors analyzed under table 3. all respondents were asked to rate from strongly agree to strongly disagree depending on the degree of implementation of the items in their schools. In the process of data analysis, the scales strongly agree and agree indicate effective implementation of each item in the dimension; whereas undecided presents neither positive nor negative agreement. On the other hand, the scales disagree and strongly disagree indicate low implementation of the items in the sample school.

Table-3 Respondents View towards How the School Leadership works in line with School vision

No	ITEMS	Resp onde nts	RESPONSE										Total	Mean	AV. Mean	St.dv
			5		4		3		2		1					
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%				
1	The School Leadership is capable in providing clear vision	Teach	43	51%	42	49%	-	-	-	-	-	-	85	4.5	4.6	0.5
		Prinp.	9	75%	3	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.7		0.4
		Sup	5	83%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.8		0.4
2	The School Leadership is skilled in developing the school mission, goals and objective	Teach	23	27%	45	53%	10	12%	7	8			85	4.0	4.3	0.8
		Prinp.	5	42%	7	58%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.4		0.5
		Sup	3	50%	3	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.5		0.5
3	The School Leadership is	Teach	32	38%	43	50%	10	12%	-	-	-	-	85	4.3	4.3	0.7

	communicating the vision in order to have common understanding with staff and community	Prinp.	6	50%	5	42%	1	8%	-	-	-	-	12	4.4	3	0.7
		Sup	3	50%	2	33%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	6	4.3		0.8
4	The school principal brought change based on school vision which is perceived by the school community	Teach	25	29%	44	52%	19	18%	-	-	-	-	85	4.1	4.3	0.7
		Prinp.	3	25%	8	67%	1	8%	-	-	-	-	12	4.1		0.6
		Sup	4	67%	2	33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.7		0.5
5	The School Leadership is capable in setting directions to word the implementation of School vision.	Teach	25	29%	40	47%	10	12%	10	12	-	-	85	3.9	4.5	0.9
		Prinp.	9	75%	2	17%	1	8%	-	-	-	-	12	4.7		0.6
		Sup	5	83%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.8		0.4
6	Leadership Collect data from multiple sources to create a common vision for the school.	Teach	31	37%	41	48%	13	15%	-	-	-	-	85	4.2	4.5	0.7
		Prinp.	5	42%	6	50%	1	8%	-	-	-	-	12	4.3		0.6
		Sup	3	50%	2	33%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	6	4.3		0.8
7	Leadership Use students performance results to develop the school's missions	Teach	30	35%	41	48%	10	12%	4	5	-	-	85	4.1	4.2	0.8
		Prinp.	3	25%	6	50%	3	25%	-	-	-	-	12	4.0		0.7
		Sup	3	50%	3	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.5		0.5

Mean scores =Strongly Disagree (1.00-1.80),Disagree(1.81-2.60), Undecided,(2.61 -3.40)

Agree (3.41-4.20) and Strongly Agree (4.21-5.0).

Table-3,item-1 indicated that 51% of teachers,75% of principals & 83% of supervisors rated strongly agree and 49% of teachers,25% of principals & 17% of supervisors rated agree. This shows that leadership were capable in providing clear vision. it indicated in table-3 item, 1 respondents were asked whether or not the school leadership is capable in providing clear vision, So The mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were (mean=4.5) (mean 4.7) & (mean 4.8) respectively and the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.6. Therefore based on the overall score value, it can be concluded that School leadership were capable in providing clear vision.

In line with this the information gathered through Interview made with PTA leaders and WEOs were also confirmed that School leadership was capable in providing clear vision. Leadership can be defined as providing vision, direction and support towards a different and preferred state suggesting change (Harris and Muijis, 2005).

In addition Louis and Miles (in Harris and Muijis 2005) suggests that successful change leaders consistently articulated a vision for their Schools, so that everyone understood the vision, most importantly; they shared influence, authority, responsibility and accountability with the staff in shaping the vision. Scholars also underlined the importance of inspiring school vision. Leaders are able to bring their vision to everyone's level, breathing life into other individuals' hopes and dreams. This strengthens the individuals, strengthens the team, and strengthens the vision. When leaders believe that they can make a difference, others see that the vision can be for the common good of all involved (Kouzes and Posner, 2010). A vision is an image that heals the psychological and material wounds that leaders and followers share. It soothes present anxieties and offers hope for the future (Black, 2007).

Supporting this during the interview one PTA leader stated that: 'Our school vision was written in visible form and posted in the school compound and it always inspired me...'

Interview was held with woreda education office heads, PTA & analysis of the various documents that show the various roles undertaken by the leaders (department heads, vice principal and main principals, etc) was conducted to triangulate the methodology. The interview results quite complement the findings obtained through questionnaire. According to the majority of interviewees the instructional leaders in the preparatory schools were better or high in identifying the impediments that hinder the achievement of missions of the school and design strategies to address the impediments in advance and developing a set of annual school-related goals focused on student learning. Lastly, the researcher checked the written documents regarding the effectiveness of the implementation of school vision and missions. The checked written materials were: stated vision of the schools defined mission and developed school-wide goals. The document reviewed also showed that in most of the schools, instructional leaders had stated vision, defined mission and developed a set of school-wide goals and that were posted in the office of the heads and bulletin of the schools.

Item-2 of table- 3 indicates that 27% of teachers 42 % of principals & 50% of supervisors rated their response strongly agree. 53% of teachers, 58% of principals & 50% of supervisors rated agree. 12% & 8% of Teachers rated undecided respectively. So that majority of teachers ,principals & supervisors rated agree and s strongly agree. This means the School Leadership is skilled in developing the school mission, goals and objective, In addition. The mean value of Teachers,Principals & supervisors were Teachers(mean=4.0 & SD=0.8)principals(mean 4.4,SD=0.5) & supervisors(mean 4.5,SD=0.5) Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.3. Therefore based on the overall score value, it can be concluded that secondary School leadership were skilled in developing the school mission, goals and objective.

Item-3 of table 3 reflected that 38% of teachers,50% of Principals & 50% of supervisors were rated strongly agree.50% of Teachers,42 of Principals & 33% of supervisors were rated agree on the School leadership practices of communicating the vision in order to have common understanding with the staff and community. Finally 12% of teachers,8% of Principals & 17% of supervisors rated undecided. The mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were teachers (mean=4.3 & SD=0.7), principals (mean 4.4, SD=0.7) & supervisors (mean 4.3,SD=0.8) Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.33. From the above response we can conclude that, the School leadership had practices of communicating the vision in order to have common understanding with the staff and community.

Item-4 of table 3 reflected that 29% of teachers,25% of Principals & 67% of supervisors were rated strongly agree.52% of Teachers,67 of Principals & 33% of supervisors were rated agree. Finally only 18% of teachers & 8% of Principals rated undecided. From this The school principal brought change based on school vision which is perceived by the school community. Because most of the respondents was rated agree & strongly agree. The mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were teachers (mean=4.1 & SD=0.7), principals (mean 4.1, SD=0.6) & supervisors (mean 4.7,SD=0.5) Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.3. From the above response we can conclude that, the secondary School leadership had the school principal brought change based on school vision which is perceived by the school community.

Item-5 of table 3 reflected that 29% of teachers,75% of Principals & 83% of supervisors were rated strongly agree.47% of Teachers,17 of Principals & 17% of supervisors were rated

agree.12% of teachers,8% of Principals were rated undecided. 12% of teachers,8% of Principals were rated undecided & Finally 12% of Teachers rated disagree. This shows that most of the respondents were positive attitudes towards The School Leadership is capable in setting directions to word the implementation of School vision. Because above half of the respondent was rated strongly agree & agree. The mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were teachers (mean=3.9 & SD=0.9), principals(mean 4.7,SD=0.6) & supervisors (mean 4.8,SD=0.4). Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.5. From the above response we can conclude that secondary School leadership had capable in setting directions to word the implementation of School vision.

Item-6 of table 3 reflected that 37% of teachers,42% of Principals & 50% of supervisors were rated strongly agree.48% of Teachers,50% of Principals & 33% of supervisors were rated agree. Finally 15% of teachers,8% of Principals & 17% of supervisors rated undecided. From the above data we can conclude that Leadership Collect data from multiple sources to create a common vision for the school. Because majority of the respondents were rated strongly agree & agree. Beside The mean values of teachers,principals & supervisors were teachers (mean=4.21 & SD=0.7),principals(mean 4.3,SD=0.6) & supervisors (mean 4.3,SD=0.8) Finally the average mean values of teachers,principals & supervisors were 4.5.From the above response we can conclude that secondary School leadership had Collected data from multiple sources to create a common vision for the school.

Item-7 of table 3 reflected that 35% of teachers, 25% of Principals & 50% of supervisors were rated strongly agree.48% of Teachers,50% of Principals & 50% of supervisors were rated agree.12% of teachers,25% of Principals were rated undecided. Finally 5% of Teachers rated disagree. This means Secondary School Leadership use students' performance results to develop the school's missions. Because all most above 75% of the respondents were rated strongly agree & agree. In addition The mean value of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were found to be the mean values of teachers,principals & supervisors were teachers(mean=4.1 & SD=0.8),principals(mean 4.0,SD=0.7) & supervisors (mean 4.5,SD=0.5) Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.2. From the above response we can conclude that The secondary School leadership Use students performance results to develop the school's missions.

Table-4 Respondents View towards School leadership performance related to planning function

No	ITEMS	Resp onde nts	RESPONSE										T ot al	M ea n	Av. mea n	St. dv
			5		4		3		2		1					
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%				
1	Carry out analysis of the School environment before preparing school plan.	Teach	28	33%	35	41%	16	19%	4	5%	2	2%	85	4.0	4.4	1.0
		Prinp.	8	67%	3	25%	1	8%	-	-	-	-	12	4.6		0.7
		Sup	3	50%	3	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.5		0.5
2	Plans and work toward changing the school.	Teach	30	35%	40	47%	10	12%	5	6%	-	-	85	4.1	4.5	0.8
		Prinp.	9	75%	2	17%	1	8%	-	-	-	-	12	4.7		0.6
		Sup	5	83%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.8		0.4
3	Making the school plan flexible.	Teach	20	23%	40	47%	12	14%	10	12%	3	4%	85	3.8	4.3	1.1
		Prinp.	7	58%	5	42%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.6		0.5
		Sup	3	50%	3	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.5		0.5
4	Encouraging the staff to participate in school Planning.	Teach	40	47%	30	35%	15	18%	-	-	-	-	85	4.3	4.5	0.8
		Prinp.	6	50%	6	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.5		0.5
		Sup	3	50%	2	33	1	17%	-	-	-	-	6	4.7		0.5
5	Does leaders duration of the time in the specific school bring effectiveness in particular school.	Teach	47	55%	22	26%	13	15%	3	4%	-	-	85	4.3	4.4	0.9
		Prinp.	6	50%	3	25%	3	25%	-	-	-	-	12	4.2		0.9
		Sup	4	67%	2	33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.7		0.5

Mean scores =Strongly Disagree (1.00-1.80),Disagree(1.81-2.60), Undecided,(2.61 -3.40)

Agree (3.41-4.20) and Strongly Agree (4.21-5.0).

Table-4, Item-1 indicated that 33% of teachers, 67% of Principals & 50% of supervisors were rated strongly agree. 41% of teachers, 25% of Principals & 50% of supervisors were rated agree. 19% of teachers & 8% of Principals were rated undecided. Finally 5% of Teachers & 2% of Teachers rated disagree & strongly disagree respectively. Beside The mean value of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were found to be teachers (mean=4.0 & SD=1.0), principals mean (4.6, SD=0.7) & supervisors (mean 4.5, SD=0.5). Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.4. From the above response we can conclude that secondary School leadership had carry out analysis of the School environment before preparing school plan.

Table-4, Item-2 indicated that 35% of teachers, 75% of Principals & 83% of supervisors were rated strongly agree. 47% of teachers, 17% of Principals & 17% of supervisors were rated agree. 12% of teachers & 8% of Principals were rated undecided. Finally only 6% of Teachers were rated disagree. From the above data we can conclude that Secondary Schools Leadership Plans and work toward changing the school. Because at least above 75% of the respondents were rated strongly agree & agree. Beside The mean value of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were found to be teachers (mean=4.1 & SD=0.8), principals (mean 4.7, SD=0.6) & supervisors (mean 4.38, SD=0.4) Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.5. From the above response we can conclude that secondary School leadership had Plans and work toward changing the school.

Table 4, Item-3 indicated that 23% of teachers, 58% of Principals & 50% of supervisors were rated strongly agree. 47% of teachers, 42% of Principals & 50% of supervisors were rated agree. And 14% of teachers rated undecided & 12% & 4% of teachers rated disagree & strongly disagree respectively. Beside The mean value of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were teachers (mean=3.8 & SD=1.1), principals (mean 4.6, SD=0.5) & supervisors (mean 4.5, SD=0.5) Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.3. From the above data we can conclude that Secondary Schools Leadership Making the school plan flexible. because most respondents rated strongly agree & agree & the average mean were in highest level..

Table-4, Item-4 indicated that 47% of teachers, 50% of Principals & 50% of supervisors were rated strongly agree. 35% of teachers, 50% of Principals & 33% of supervisors were rated agree 18% of teachers & 17% of supervisors were rated undecided. Beside The mean value of

Teachers, Principals & supervisors were found to be teachers (mean=4.3 & SD=0.8), principals (mean 4.5, SD=0.5) & supervisors (mean 4.7, SD=0.5) the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.5. From the above response we can conclude that secondary School leadership Encouraging the staff to participate in school Planning.

In addition, document analysis in all sample secondary schools revealed that there was the trend to participate all teachers in school planning. On the top of this the interview made with WEOs and PTA, even though they have trends in encouraging the staff to participate in school planning. They show weak initiation to participate all stake holders during the preparation of school planning. Due to this most of the time the school leadership face problem in implementing the plan through the participation of the stake holders. Therefore we can conclude that school leaders in preparing the school plan in collaboration with the staff were not to the level required. The result of document analysis was almost similar to the data obtained from Questionnaire.

Ubben and Hughes (1997:25) indicated for effective implementation of intended goals, the School leadership should allow concerned bodies such as Teachers, students and the community to participate in planning and goal setting. Here it is possible to conclude that school principals in the study area were in better position to participate all teachers in school planning. It is believed that collaboration is the heart of successful planning and implementation.

Supporting this Hopkins(2001) suggest that, collaborative planning is a base to set common goals, resolve differences and to take action. Also the quality of school level planning has been identified as a major factor in a number of studies of school effectiveness.

In addition to this Purkey and Smith (in Hopkins 1994) describe that both collaborative planning and clear goals as a key process dimensions. Caldwell and Spinks(as cited in Hopkins 1994) also indicate that goal-setting and planning as the two of the phases of the collaborative school management model which, linking this two activities within one cycle of the management process.

Table-4, Item-5 indicated that 55% of teachers, 50% of Principals & 67% of supervisors were rated strongly agree. 26% of teachers, 25% of Principals & 33% of supervisors were rated agree. 15% of teachers & 25% of Principals were rated undecided. Finally 4% of Teachers were rated disagree. In addition The mean value of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were teachers

(mean=4.3 & SD=0.9), principals (mean 4.2, SD=0.9) & supervisors (mean 4.7, SD=0.5). Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.4. This means secondary schools leaders duration of the time (Leadership Tenure) in the same school bring effectiveness in particular school. because almost above 50% of the respondents were rated strongly agree & agree. & the average mean values were at highest range.

In addition Fielder and Chemers (1983) indicate that without adequate training and work experience leadership task structuring ability will be lower or lack of experience can decrease his potential for effectiveness.

Table-5 Respondents View towards The participatory practices of School Leadership

No	ITEMS	Respon dents	RESPONSE										T ot al	M ea n	A v. m ea n	St. dv
			5		4		3		2		1					
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%				
1	The School Leadership work with the staff members to improve the School	Teach	39	46%	46	54%	-	-	-	-	-	-	85	4.5	4.6	0.5
		Prinp.	5	42%	6	50%	1	8%	-	-	-	-	12	4.3		0.6
		Sup	5	83%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.8		0.4
2	The ability to delegate and share responsibility	Teach	30	35%	30	35%	15	18%	10	12%	-	-	85	3.9	4.4	1.0
		Prinp.	6	50%	6	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.5		0.5
		Sup	4	67%	2	33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.7		0.5
3	Provide opportunity for collaborations and shared decision making	Teah	32	38%	30	35%	10	12%	10	12%	3	3%	85	3.9	4.2	1.1
		Prinp.	5	42%	4	33%	2	17%	1	8%	-	-	12	4.0		1.0
		Sup	4	67%	2	33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.7		0.5
4	Making relationship based on collegiality and mutual trust.	Teach	28	33%	40	47%	11	13%	6	7%	-	-	85	4.0	4.16	0.9
		Prinp.	5	42%	3	25%	4	33%	-	-	-	-	12	4.0		0.9
		Sup	3	50%	3	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.5		0.5

Mean scores =Strongly Disagree (1.00-1.80),Disagree(1.81-2.60), Undecided,(2.61 -3.40)

Agree (3.41-4.20) and Strongly Agree (4.21-5.0).

Table-5,Item-1 indicated that 46% of teachers,42% of Principals & 83% of supervisors were rated strongly agree,54% of teachers,50% of Principals & 17% of supervisors were rated agree.& 8% of Principals were rated undecided. None of the respondents were rated disagree & strongly

disagree. Most respondents rated (at least above 75% of respondents) rated strongly agree & agree. The mean value of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were teachers (mean=4.5 & SD=0.5), principals (mean 4.3, SD=0.6) & supervisors (mean 4.8, SD=0.4) Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.6. Here it is possible to conclude that The School Leadership work with the staff members to improve the School.

In line with this the information gathered through interview with PTA leaders and WEOs were also confirmed that school leadership was working with the staff members to improve the school. Here it is possible to conclude that school principals in the study area were in better position in working with the staff members to improve the school. So that effective leaders give more attention to work with the staff members to improve the school.

Table-5, Item-2 indicated that 35% of teachers, 50% of Principals & 67% of supervisors were rated strongly agree, 35% of teachers, 50% of Principals & 33% of supervisors were rated agree. & Finally 18% of teachers & 12% of principals were rated undecided & disagree respectively. The mean value of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were teachers (mean=3.9 & SD=1.0), principals (mean 4.5, SD=0.5) & supervisors (mean 4.7, SD=0.5) Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.4. From this we can conclude that secondary schools leaders were the ability to delegate and share responsibility.

Table-5 Item-3 indicated that 38% of teachers, 42% of Principals & 67% of supervisors were rated strongly agree, 35% of teachers, 33% of Principals & 33% of supervisors were rated agree. 12% of teachers & 17% of Principals were rated undecided, 12% of teachers & 8% of Principals were rated disagree & finally 3% of teachers were rated strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were teachers (mean=3.9 & SD=1.1), principals (mean 4.0, SD=1.0) & supervisors (mean 4.7 SD=0.5). Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.2. From this we can conclude that secondary schools leaders were Provide opportunity for collaborations and shared decision making.

In line with this the information gathered through interview with PTA leaders and WEOs were also confirmed that the school leadership provides opportunity for shared decision making. Here it is possible to conclude that school principals in the study area were in better position in participating teachers in decision making process.

The data obtained From Questionarie & Interview this response we can conclude that secondary schools leaders were Provide opportunity for collaborations and shared decision making.

So mech (2002) suggested that involving teachers in the decision-making process offers a variety of potential benefits, which can generate the social capacity necessary for excellent schools: improving the quality of the decisions, enhancing teacher motivation and contributing to the quality of their work life. In addition to these allowing teachers in decision making process can develop trust and initiation between school leadership and teachers. Because, the school improvement is the result of a joining and coordinated activities of the school community in decision making processes. The principal has to involve the staff in the process (Hoy and Miskel cited in Morphet, Reller, and Johns(1982:126).

In supporting this during interview one of PTA leaders stated that:“...principals always willing to involve teachers in decision making process but teachers work load not allowed them to do so.

Table-5 Item-4 indicated that 33% of teachers,42% of Principals & 50% of supervisors were rated strongly agree,47% of teachers,25% of Principals & 50% of supervisors were rated agree. 13% of teachers & 33% of Principals were rated undecided.Finally 7% of teachers were rated disagree. The mean value of Teachers,Principals & supervisors were teachers (mean=4.6 & SD=0.9),principals(mean 4.0,SD=0.9) & supervisors (mean 4.5,SD=0.5) Finally the average mean values of teachers,principals & supervisors were 4.16. From this we can conclude that secondary schools leaders Making relationship based on collegiality and mutual trust.

Table-6 Respondents View towards Supervision related practices of School Leadership

No	ITEMS	respondents	RESPONSE										T O T A L	M e a n	A v. m e a n	St. d v
			5		4		3		2		1					
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%				
1	Visiting the classroom to ensure classroom instruction align with the school goal	Teach	35	41%	48	56%	2	3%	-	-	-	-	85	4.3	4.5	0.5
		Prinp.	7	59%	3	25%	1	8%	1	8%	-	-	12	4.3		0.9
		Sup	5	83%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.8		0.4
2	Observe teachers for professional development rather than evaluation	Teach	31	36%	38	45%	11	13%	5	6%	-	-	85	4.1	4.6	0.8
		Prinp.	10	83%	2	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.8		0.4
		Sup	6	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	5.0		0
3	The School Leadership Encouraging in built supervision within the school	Teach	31	36%	50	59%	4	5%	-	-	-	-	85	4.3	4.4	0.7
		Prinp.	6	50%	3	25%	3	25%	-	-	-	-	12	4.2		0.9
		Sup	4	67%	2	33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.7		0.5
4	Supervising teachers to improve instructional practices	Teach	36	42%	46	54%	3	4%	-	-	-	-	85	4.3	4.7	0.6
		Prinp.	9	75%	3	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.7		0.4
		Sup	6	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	5.0		0
5	Give adequate time after class visit to discuss the problems and plan improvement together	Teach	64	75%	11	13%	10	12%	-	-	-	-	85	4.6	4.7	0.7
		Prinp.	9	75%	3	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.7		0.5
		Sup	4	67%	2	33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.7		0.5
6	Encourage teachers to use different instructional	Teach	40	47%	30	35%	15	18%	40	-	-	-	85	4.2	4.3	0.8
		Prinp.	6	50%	6	50%	-	-	6	-	-	-	12	4.5		0.5

	methods.	Sup	3	50%	2	33	1	17%	3	-	-	-	6	4.3	3	0.8
7	Make regular follow-up and feedback to teachers	Teach	39	46%	46	54%	-	-	39	-	-	-	85	4.5	5	0.5
		Prinp.	5	42%	6	50%	1	8%	5	-	-	-	12	4.3		0.6
		Sup	5	83%	1	17%	-	-	5	-	-	-	6	4.8	0.4	

Mean scores =Strongly Disagree (1.00-1.80),Disagree(1.81-2.60),Undecided,(2.61 -3.40)

Agree (3.41-4.20) and Strongly Agree (4.21-5.0).

Table-6 Item-1 reflected that 41% of teachers,59% of Principals & 83% of supervisors were rated strongly agree.56% of Teachers,25% of Principals & 17% of supervisors were rated agree 3% of Teachers & 8% of Principals were rated undecided. Finally 8% of Principals disagree. The mean value of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were teachers (mean=4.3 & SD=0.5),principals(mean 4.3,SD=0.9) & supervisors (mean 4.8 SD=0.4). Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.5. From this we can conclude that secondary schools leaders were Visiting the classroom to ensure classroom instruction align with the school goal.

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

Table-6 Item-2 reflected that 36% of teachers,83% of Principals & 100% of supervisors were rated strongly agree.45% of Teachers & 17% of Principals were rated agree. Finally 13% of

teachers & 6% of teachers rated undecided & disagree respectively. The mean value of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were teachers (mean=4.1 & SD=0.8), principals (mean 4.8, SD=0.4) & supervisors (mean 5.0 SD=0). Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.6. From this we can conclude that secondary schools leaders were Observe teachers for professional development rather than evaluation.

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

Table-6 Item-3 reflected that 36% of teachers, 50% of Principals & 67% of supervisors were rated strongly agree, 59% of Teachers, 25% Principals & 33% of supervisors were rated agree. Finally 5% of teachers & 25% of Principals were rated undecided. The mean value of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were teachers (mean=4.3 & SD=0.7), principals (mean 4.2, SD=0.9) & supervisors (mean 4.7 SD=0.5). Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.4. From this we can conclude that secondary schools leaders were Encouraging in built supervision within the school.

As the researchers attempt to observe and revised the documents and interview made with the PTA leaders and WEOs revealed that, the responses of Teachers, principals & supervisors were lack reality. Therefore, based on the responses of the majority of teachers and the researcher's document analysis, it can be said that the school leadership was not properly encourage in built supervision within the school So that the variation of response of teachers

and principals show that the school leaderships were deficient in encouragement of inbuilt supervision. Because developing inbuilt supervision in school needs the knowledge of supervision or training in the area of supervision.

Table-6 Item-4 reflected that 42% of teachers, 75% of Principals & 100% of supervisors were rated strongly agree. 54% of Teachers & 25% of Principals were rated agree. Finally 4% of teachers were rated undecided. The mean value of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were teachers (mean=4.3 & SD=0.6), principals (mean 4.7, SD=0.4) & supervisors (mean 5.0 SD=0). Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.7. From this we can conclude that secondary schools leaders were Supervising teachers to improve instructional practices.

Table-6 Item-5 reflected that 75% of teachers, 75% of Principals & 67% of supervisors were rated strongly agree with Give adequate time after class visit to discuss the problems and plan improvement together. 13% of Teachers, 25% of Principals & 33% of supervisors were rated agree. Finally 12% of teachers were rated undecided. The mean value of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were teachers (mean=4.6 & SD=0.7), principals (mean 4.7, SD=0.5) & supervisors (mean 4.7 SD=0.5). Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.7. From this we can conclude that secondary schools leaders were Give adequate time after class visit to discuss the problems and plan improvement together. This can also be confirmed from the output of interview held with WEos. They reported that school leaders in the schools they provide with support conduct ones or twice per year a class visit and they also indicated that the time taken to comment after class was very minimal.

Table-6 Item-6 reflected that 47% of teachers, 50% of Principals & 50% of supervisors were rated strongly agree. 35% of Teachers, 50% of Principals & 33% of supervisors were rated agree. Finally 18% of teachers & 17% of supervisors rated undecided. The mean value of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were teachers (mean=4.2 & SD=0.8), principals (mean 4.5, SD=0.5) & supervisors (mean 4.3 SD=0.8). Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.33. From this we can conclude that secondary schools leaders were Encourage teachers to use different instructional methods.

Table-6 Item-7 reflected that 46% of teachers, 42% of Principals & 83% of supervisors were rated strongly agree. 54% of Teachers, 50% of Principals & 17% of supervisors were rated agree. Finally 8% of Principals were rated undecided. The mean value of Teachers, Principals &

supervisors were teachers (mean=34.5 & SD=0.5), principals (mean 4.3, SD=0.6) & supervisors (mean 4.8 SD=0.4). Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were **4.5. From this we can conclude that secondary schools leaders were Make regular follow-up and feedback to teachers.**

Table 7 Respondents View towards School Leadership practices School Community Relationship

No	ITEMS	respondents	RESPONSE										Total	Mean	a.v. mean	St. dv
			5		4		3		2		1					
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%				
1	Inviting parents and guardians to actively involved in their children's learning	Teach	31	36%	39	46%	15	18%	-	-	-	-	85	4.2	4.3	0.7
		Prinp.	4	33%	5	42%	2	17%	1	8%	-	-	12	4.0		0.9
		Sup	5	83%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.8		0.4
2	Creating effective communication between the School and parents	Teach	30	35%	35	41%	15	18%	5	6%	-	-	85	4.1	4.06	0.8
		Prinp.	5	42%	3	25%	3	25%	1	8%	-	-	12	4.0		1.0
		Sup	2	33%	3	50%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	6	4.1		0.7
3	Encouraging community, parents school relationship to bring change in students academic achievements	Teach	31	36%	32	38%	19	22%	3	4%	-	-	85	4.0	4.43	0.9
		Prinp.	6	50%	6	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.5		0.5
		Sup	5	83%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.8		0.4
4	Works to strengthen PTA and allows them take part in school leadership	Teach	26	31%	43	51%	16	18%	-	-	-	-	85	4.1	4.4	0.7
		Prinp.	6	50%	4	33%	2	17%	-	-	-	-	12	4.3		0.8
		Sup	5	83%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.8		0.4
5	Treat school community equitably and fairly	Teach	31	37%	42	49%	12	14%	-	-	-	-	85	4.2	4.6	0.7
		Prinp.	9	75%	3	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.7		0.4
		Sup	5	83%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.8		0.4
6	Listen to and accept teachers suggestions	Teach	23	27%	45	53%	10	12%	7	8%	-	-	85	4.0	4.3	0.8
		Prinp.	5	42%	7	58%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.4		0.5
		Sup	3	50%	3	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.5		0.5

Mean scores =S trongly Disagree (1.00-1.80), Disagree (1.81-2.60), Undecided,(2.61 -3.40) Agree(3.41-4.20) and Strongly Agree(4.21-5.0).

Table-7 Item-1 indicated that 36% of teachers,33% of Principals & 83% of supervisors were rated strongly agree.46% of Teachers,42% of Principals & 17% of supervisors were rated agree.18% of Teachers & 17% of Principals were rated undecided. Finally 8% of Principals rated disagree. The mean value of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were teachers (mean=4.2 & SD=0.7), principals(mean 4.0,SD=0.9) & supervisors (mean 4.8 SD=0.4). Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.3. From this we can conclude that secondary schools leaders were Inviting parents and guardians to actively involved in their children's learning.

Table-7 Item-2 reflected that 35% of teachers,42% of Principals & 33% of supervisors were rated strongly agree.41% of Teachers,25% of Principals & 50% of supervisors were rated agree 18% of Teachers,25% of Principals & 17% of supervisors were rated undecided. Finally 6% of Teachers & 8% of Principals disagree. The mean value of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were teachers (mean=4.1 & SD=0.8),principals(mean 4.0,SD=1.0) & supervisors (mean 4.1 SD=0.7). Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.06. From this we can conclude that secondary schools leaders were Creating effective communication between the School and parents.

Supporting this, Marx (2006) stated that school leaders establish and maintain open and productive relations among the school community by working with teachers, students, parents and the community at large and need to be able to develop and maintain positive relationship with all.

Table-7 Item-3 reflected that 36% of teachers,50% of Principals & 83% of supervisors were rated strongly agree.38% of Teachers,50% of Principals & 17% of supervisors were rated agree. Finally 22% of Teachers & 4% of Teachers were rated undecided & disagree respectively. The mean value of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were teachers (mean=4.0 & SD=0.9), principals(mean 4.5,SD=0.5) & supervisors (mean 4.87 SD=0.4). Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.43. From this we can conclude that secondary schools leaders were Encouraging community, parents school relationship to bring change in

students' academic achievements. School leadership plays a great role to establish link with parents, other organizations and the wider community to promote care of students and enhance learning (ACT Government. 2009).

In line with this (Kocher, 1991) suggest that the existence of smooth school community relation enables the school to make all sorts of change required in a given community. If the school fails to do so, it will not keep pace with the change it tends to be outdated, backward looking, when this happens, schools cease to be meaningless institute.

Table-7 Item-4 reflected that 31% of teachers,50% of Principals & 83% of supervisors were rated strongly agree.51% of Teachers,33% of Principals & 17% of supervisors were rated agree & 18% of Teachers & 817% of Principals were rated undecided. The mean value of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were teachers (mean=4.1 & SD0.7), principals(mean 4.3,SD=0.8) & supervisors (mean 4.8 SD=0.4). Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.4. From this we can conclude that secondary schools leaders were Works to strengthen PTA and allow them take part in school leadership.

An opinion of teachers, principals & supervisors regarding the school leadership work to strengthen PTA and allows them take part in school leadership. This implies that PTA's are actively involved in the school management. Here it is possible to conclude that school principals in the study area were in better position to strengthen PTA and allows them take part in school leadership.

Hopkins,(1994) Developing partnerships with parents and society enables schools to provide quality education. So, it is vital to mobilize pupils, parents, and other members of the community in support of the school activities. Hopkins, 1994

Supporting this (MoE,2005) suggest that, PTAs and communities still need further capacity enhancement in carrying out quality support to help schools to function as desired.

Table-7 Item-5 reflected that 37% of teachers,75% of Principals & 83% of supervisors were rated strongly agree.49% of Teachers,25% of Principals & 17% of supervisors were rated agree. Finally 14% of Teachers were rated undecided. The mean value of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were teachers (mean=4.2 & SD=0.7), principals (mean 4.7, SD=0.4) & supervisors (mean 4.8 SD=0.4). Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were

4.6. From this we can conclude that secondary schools leaders were Treat school community equitably and fairly.

Table-7 Item-6 reflected that 27% of teachers,42% of Principals & 50% of supervisors were rated strongly agree.53% of Teachers,58% of Principals & 50% of supervisors were rated agree. Finally 14% of Teachers & 8% of Teachers were rated undecided & disagree respectively. The mean value of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were teachers (mean=4.0 & SD=0.4), principals (mean 4.4,SD=0.5) & supervisors (mean 4.5 SD=0.5). Finally the average mean values of teachers, principals & supervisors were 4.3. From this we can conclude that secondary schools leaders were Listen to and accept teachers suggestions.

Table-8 Respondents View towards Curriculum development functions of the School

Leadership

No	ITEMS	Resp onde nts	RESPONSE										To tal	Me an	av.m ean	St.dv			
			5		4		3		2		1								
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%							
1	Identifying students and community need so as to improve curriculum.	Teah	20	23%	32	38%	28	33%	5	6%	-	-	85	3.9	4.0	0.9			
		Pcpl	3	25%	6	50%	1	8%	2	17%	-	-					12	3.8	1.0
		Sup	3	50%	3	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-					6	4.5	0.5
2	Work as a resource person in curriculum improvement	Teah	16	19%	41	48%	28	33%	-	-	-	-	85	3.8	3.9	0.7			
		Pcpl	3	25%	6	50%	2	17%	1	8%	-	-					12	3.9	0.9
		Sup	2	33%	3	50%	1	17%	-	-	-	-					6	4.1	0.5
3	Identifying the problems in implementing the existing curriculum as per the education	Teah	22	26%	39	46%	12	14%	12	14%	-	-	85	3.8	3.96	0.9			
		Pcpl	3	25%	5	42%	3	25%	1	8%	-	-					12	3.8	0.9
		Sup	3	50%	2	33%	1	17%	-	-	-	-					6	4.3	0.7

	policy.															
4	Involving stakeholders in curriculum improvement	Teah	22	26%	41	48%	16	19%	4	5%	2	2%	85	3.9	3.9	0.9
		Pcpl	5	42%	4	33%	3	25%	-	-	-	-	12	4.1		0.8
		Sup	1	17%	2	33%	3	50%	-	-	-	-	6	3.7		0.5

Mean scores =Strongly Disagree (1.00-1.80),Disagree(1.81-2.60),Undecided,(2.61 -3.40)

Agree (3.41-4.20) and Strongly Agree (4.21-5.0).

Table-8 Item-1 reflected that 23% of teachers,25% of Principals & 50% of supervisors were rated strongly agree.38% of Teachers, 50% of Principals & 50% of supervisors were rated agree.33% of Teachers & 8% of Principals were rated undecided. Finally 6% of Teachers & 17% of Principals disagree. The mean value of Teachers were(mean=3.9&ST.DV=0.9,meanvalue of Principals were(mean=3.8,ST.DV=1.0)& mean value of supervissors were(mean= 4.5 ST.DV=0.5).The average mean of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were 4.0. From this result we can conclude that secondary school leaders had Identifying students and community need so as to improve curriculum.

Table-8 Item-2 reflected that 19% of teachers, 25% of Principals & 33% of supervisors were rated strongly agree,48% of Teachers, 50% of Principals & 50% of supervisors were rated agree.33% of Teachers,17% of Principals & 17% of supervisors were rated undecided. Finally 8% of Principals were rated disagree. The mean value of Teachers were (mean=3.8 & ST.DV=0.7,mean value of Principals were(mean=3.9,ST.DV=0.9)& mean value of supervissors were(mean=4.1 ST.DV=0.5).The average mean of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were 3.9.From this we can conclude that all respondents were agreement with the point.so secondary school leaders had Work as a resource person in curriculum improvement.

Table-8 Item-3 reflected that 26% of teachers, 25% of Principals & 50% of supervisors were rated strongly agree.46% of Teachers,42% of Principals & 33% of supervisors were rated agree.14% of Teachers,25% of Principals & 17% of supervisors were rated undecided. Finally 14% of Teachers & 8% of Principals were rated disagree. The mean value of Teachers were (mean=3.8 & ST.DV=0.9, mean value of Principals were(mean=3.8,ST.DV=0.9)& mean value of supervissors were(mean=4.3 ST.DV=0.7).The average mean of Teachers,

Principals & supervisors were 3.96. From this we can conclude that all respondents were agreement with the point. so secondary school leaders had Identifying the problems in implement. School leadership has become a priority in education policy because it believe to play a key role in improving classroom practice, school policies and the relations between individual schools and the outside world. As the key intermediary between the classrooms, the individual school and the whole education system, effective school leadership is essential to improve the efficiency and equity of schooling (Pont et al., 2008).

Table-8 Item-4 reflected that 26% of teachers, 42% of Principals & 17% of supervisors were rated strongly agree. 48% of Teachers, 33% of Principals & 33% of supervisors were rated agree. 19% of Teachers, 25% of Principals & 50% of supervisors were rated undecided. Finally 5% of Teachers & 8% of Principals were rated disagreeing the existing curriculum. The mean value of Teachers were (mean=3.9 & ST.DV=0.9, mean value of Principals were (mean=4.1, ST.DV=0.8) & mean value of supervisors were (mean=3.7 ST.DV=0.5). The average mean of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were 3.9. From this secondary school leaders had Involving stake holders in curriculum improvement.

Table-9 Respondents View towards Staff development practices of the School Leadership

No	ITEMS	respondents	RESPONSE										Total	Mean	Av. mean	St.dv
			5		4		3		2		1					
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%				
1	Developing mechanisms by which competent teachers share their experiences with their colleagues	Teach	31	36%	41	49%	8	9%	5	6%	-	-	85	4.1	4.4	0.8
		Prinp.	5	42%	6	50%	1	8%	-	-	-	-	12	4.3		0.6
		Sup	3	50%	2	33%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	6	4.7		0.5
2	Helping the teacher to attend CPD/continuous professional development	Teach	40	47%	30	35%	15	18%	-	-	-	-	85	4.2	4.6	0.7
		Prinp.	10	83%	2	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.8		0.4
		Sup	3	50%	2	33%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	6	4.7		0.5
3	Helping the teachers to read different current educational publications	Teach	23	27%	25	29%	25	29%	7	9%	5	6	85	3.6	3.7	1.1
		Prinp.	6	50%	6	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.5		0.5
		Sup	-	-	2	33%	3	50%	1	17%	-	-	6	3.1		0.8

Mean scores =Strongly Disagree (1.00-1.80),Disagree(1.81-2.60), Undecided,(2.61 -3.40) Agree (3.41-4.20) and Strongly Agree (4.21-5.0).

Table-9 Item-1 Indicated that 36% of teachers, 42% of Principals & 50% of supervisors were rated strongly agree.49% of Teachers, 50% of Principals & 33% of supervisors were rated agree. 9% of Teachers,8% of Principals & 17% of supervisors were rated undecided. Finally 6% of Teachers were rated disagree. The mean value of Teachers were (mean=4.1 & ST.DV=0.8,mean value of Principals were(mean=4.3,ST.DV=0.6)& mean value of supervisors were(mean=4.7 ST.DV=0.5).The average mean of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were 4.4.From this we can conclude that secondary school leaders had Developing mechanisms by which competent teachers share their experiences with their colleagues.

Table-9 Item-2 reflected that 47% of teachers,83% of Principals & 50% of supervisors were rated strongly agree.35% of Teachers,17% of Principals & 33% of supervisors were rated agree.18% of Teachers,& 17% of supervisors were rated undecided. The mean value of Teachers were(mean=4.2& ST.DV=0.7,mean value of Principals were(mean=4.8,ST.DV=0.4 & mean value of supervisors were(mean=4.7 ST.DV=0.5).The average mean of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were 4.6.From this we can conclude that secondary school leaders highly Help the teacher to attend CPD/continuous professional development.

Supporting this Marezely (1996) point out that in addition to a supportive attitude and creating an atmosphere where there is a love of learning, school principals must be the primary CPD developers, because it is the principal who has the greatest direct control over the factors affecting school environment. Marezely further stated that identifying the development needs of each teacher and the school staff as a whole, developing and arranging CPD opportunities, monitoring progress and evaluating performance must be undertaken by school principal.

Table-9 Item-3 deals secondary school leader Helping the teachers to read different current educational publications. Regarding this 27% of teachers,50% of Principals were rated strongly agree.29% of Teachers,50% of Principals & 33% of supervisors were rated agree.29% of Teachers & 17% of supervisors were rated disagree. Finally 6% of Teachers were rated

strongly disagree. The mean value of Teachers were (mean=3.6 & ST.DV=1.1), mean value of Principals were (mean=4.5, ST.DV=0.5 & mean value of supervisors were (mean=3.1, ST.DV=0.8). The average mean of Teachers, Principals & supervisors were 3.7. From this we can conclude that secondary school leaders help the teachers to read different current educational publications were not satisfactory.

Finally, the information that was obtained open ended question, interview made with PTA leaders & WEOS indicated that, selection criteria, School leadership were not all in all by criteria set by MoE and SNNP regional educational bureau. Rather, the main criteria seen to select school leadership in a position is close involvement in supporting the government policy. But it's better to select and assign school leadership according to the directives set by MoE. As the result of this school leadership face problem in leading school for effective teaching-learning process.

Regarding to this, Stoops (1981:90) suggested that the selection and placement of the School leadership should be up on the basis of merit and merit only.

In open-ended question teachers, Principals & supervisors & in interview PTA leaders & WEOS are asked to answer leadership Tenure (work experiences of secondary School leaders) improve school effectiveness of secondary school. all respondents views towards this question were almost similar. They said work experiences/service years (leadership tenure) play a great role on the effectiveness of secondary School leaders/all leaders. but it is not the only means for the effectiveness of the schools.

Supporting this Fielder and Chemers (1983) indicate that without adequate training and work experience leadership task structuring ability will be lower or lack of experience can decrease his potential for effectiveness.

Harris, Day, Hopkins, Hadfield, Hargreaves and Chapman (2003) state that beginning, in experienced head teaches principals usually face greater amount of uncertainty difficulties than the previously experienced principals to perform their jobs. Moreover, the variety of new roles that beginner, in experienced head teachers/principal perform during the first year of their leadership create confusion to them, where their vital task in the beginning would be to learn about these roles.

Finally in open-ended question teachers, Principals & supervisors & in interview PTA leaders & WEOS are asked to answer the problem that secondary School Leadership faces during their School Leadership and suggest solution to solve the problem, the response of each respondents were lack of training & skill, lack of resources in each secondary schools, lack of experiences personal quality, political influence on leaders, weak participation of PTA, lack of professional support from external supervisors & WEOS are the great problems for the effectiveness of secondary schools.& the solutions for this problems are creating connection b/n schools & community.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation

5.1. Conclusions

Based on the major findings of the study presented above the following conclusions were done.

In open-ended question teachers, Principals & supervisors & in interview PTA leaders & WEOS are asked to answer leadership Tenure(work experiences of secondary School leaders)improve school effectiveness of secondary school.all respondants views towards this question were almost similar. They said work experiences/service years (leadership tenure) play a great role on the effectiveness of secondary School leaders/all leaders. But it is not the only means for the effectiveness of the schools.

- Information gathered from teachers, Principals, supervisors, PTA leaders & WEOS indicated that, selection criteria, School leadership were not all in all by criteria set by MoE and SNNP regional educational bureau. Rather, the main criteria seen to select school leadership in a position is close involvement in supporting the government policy. But it's better to select and assign school leadership according to the directives set by MoE. As the result of this school leadership face problem in leading school for effective teaching-learning process.
- The school leaderships are accountable for the overall operations of the school. That is, they should show good leadership practices that currently ensure efficiency and effectiveness in the provision of quality education. However, from the study it can be concluded that inspiring the school vision, preparing an action plan, participating the staff member in decision making, creating school community relationship, staff development and curriculum development are the current practice of school leadership in which the school leadership practices to facilitate teaching learning processes. The school leadership practices in giving academic and administrative guidance follow up (supervision) and giving support, evaluation and giving feedback are also the current practices of school leadership.

- Finally the problems that secondary school leadership faces in secondary schools of Kaffa Zone were lack of training & skill, lack of resources in each secondary schools, lack of experiences professional quality, political influence on leaders, weak participation of PTA, lack of professional support from external supervisors & WEOS are the great problems for the effectiveness of secondary schools.& To overcome the problems the school leadership should take responsibility to create good relation with the community and create opportunity to discuss with the community. And also to overcome the problem related to internal and external facilities,

5.2. Recommendations

On the basis of the finding and conclusion drawn the following recommendations were forwarded.

- ❖ If a challenge of educational administration increases the need to assign appropriate person in the leadership position is very important. Thus, the directives for selecting and assigning school leadership are prepared at federal or regional level and implemented at woreda or school level. Effective and efficient implementation of the directives demands the availability of human resources that fulfills the prerequisites criteria. However the problem lies on the fact that the qualified human resources who fulfill the prerequisites criteria are not available at woreda or school level. For example, one of the prerequisite criteria to compete for the position of a secondary school principal is having an MA degree in educational leadership or any other subject. Because if the unavailability of such qualified teachers in woreda or schools, the woreda education office is usually invite first degree holders to the position by violating the criteria set by MOE/ SNNPR regional education bureau. Thus, the researcher recommends that the ministry of education and the regional education bureau better to assess the qualification of the existing human resource available in lower structures before setting and sending directives which cannot be operational at lower structures such as zones, woreda and schools and it were advisable the ministry of education to revise the directives.
- ❖ In this research, it was revealed that the practices of School leadership in visiting the classroom, observing teachers for professional development and encouraging inbuilt supervision were inadequate. Therefore it is recommended that the school principals included themselves in supervision practice of the school and also as they are head teachers and leaders of their respective schools they give administrative guidance and instructional leadership to teachers.
- ❖ To reduce the problem related to lack of experience to tackle the problem and training on area of leadership, it is recommended that the woreda education office in collaboration with the regional educational bureau and zone education office has to arrange short and long term training to equip the school leaderships with basic knowledge and skills of leading.

In order to avoid the problems related to organizing like lack of delegating the job to the staff member, work overload and inability to create team building, it is recommended that the school leadership strengthen the collaboration among teachers by making discussion and share experiences in their departments and staff meetings and the school leadership to develop trust share the job to the staff member and should develop team between the staff. To overcome the problems related to situational problems it is recommend that the school leadership should take responsibility to create good relation with the community and create opportunity to discuss with the community. And also to overcome the problem related to internal and external facilities, it is recommended that the school leadership influence the woreda or zone education office representative to provide the necessary facilities timely and adequately, the other possibility to be recommended is that the school leadership should create mechanisms by which individual schools form good relation with the community and initiate the community to provide the available facilities.

Reference

- ACT. (2009). School Improvement Framework: Better Schools... Better Futures Rising Quality and Achieving Excellence in ACT Public Schools. Canberra. Retrieved from: http://www.det.act.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file?0011/64298/SchoolImprovementFramework.pdf
- Adesina, Segun (1990). Educational Management, Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishing Co.ltd.
- Ayalew Shibeshi. (1999/2000). Theories of Educational Management EdAd 611, AAU (unpublished).
- Avery, D. R., Tonidandel, S., Griffith, K. H. Quinones, M. A. (2003). The impact of multiple measures of leader experience on leader effectiveness: New insights for leader selection. *Journal of Business Research*, 56, 673-679.
- Bennaars, A. (1994). Theory and Practice of Education Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers Ltd.
- Bettin, P.J. & Kennedy, J. K. (1990). Leadership experience and leadership performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(4), 219-228.
- Brundrett, M. and Silcock, P. (2003). Leadership in Education (1sted). London: Sage Publications.
- Bush T, Middiewood D. (1997). Managing people in Education, London: champman publications.
- Cannella, A. A. & Rowe, W. G. (1995). Leader capabilities, succession, and competitive context: A study of professional baseball teams. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(1), 69-88
- Chapman, J.D. (1991) 'the role of school leadership in enhancing the effectiveness of schools and developing a capacity to innovate and experiment', paper presented to OECD, Paris.
- Cheng, Y. C. (2005). New Paradigm Re-engineering in Education (Vol.6) Beijing; Springer.
- Clatter, R. (1988). Understanding School Management Phildeephion, open University.
- Cornforth A, Evans T (1996). Striving for quality in school. London: Latchemre press.
- Creemers B. (2001) Comphresive framework for effective schools improvement, Breifing

- paper 27, Nezerland: institution for Educational Research,
- Dimmock, C. (2000). *Designing The Learning Centered School* London; Floner Press.
- Döş, İ. & Savaş, A. C. (2015). Elementary school administrators and their roles in the context of effective schools. *SAGE Open*, 1-11.
- Dubrin, A. J. (2007). *Leadership: Research Findings, Practices, and Skill* (5th ed). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Dunham J (1995) *Developing Effective School Management*. London: Routledge.
- Ediger, M and Rao, D. B. (2003). *Improving School Administration*. Delh: Arora Offse
- Earl L, Lee L (1998). *Evaluation of the Manitoba School Improvement Programme*. Tornto: walter and Duncan Gordan.
- EIC (2000). *School Improvement Planning a Handbook for Principals, Teachers, and School Councils*. Retrieved from: <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/document/reports/sihend.pdf> .
- Everard K, Morris G, Wilson I (2004) *Effective School Management*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Feseha Haileselassie (2005). *Major Problem of Secondary School Principals in Educational Leadership in Tigray Region* (M.A. Thesis material).
- Eitzen, D.S. & Yetman, N.R. (1972). Managerial change, longevity, and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Sciences Quarterly*, 17, 110-116.
- Fiedler, F. (1970). Leadership experience and leader performance: Another hypothesis shot to hell. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 5, 1-14.
- Field K, Holden P, Lawlor H (2000) *Effective Subject Leadership*. London: Routledge.
- Fizel, J.L. & D'Itri, M. P. (1997). Managerial efficiency, managerial succession, and organizational performance. *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 18, 295-308.
- Fullan M (1985) *Change Processes and Strategies at the Local Level, Elementary School Journal* 85, 3, 391-421. 71.
- Gamage, D. (2006). *Professional Development for Leadership and Managers of Self-Governing Schools*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Gamage, T. (2006). *Professional Development for Leaders and Managers of Self-Governing Schools*. Amsterdam: Spinger.

- Good .CV (1973). Dictionary of Editions, New York: McGraw Book Company
- Gorton, RA. (1983). School Administration and Supervision Leadership Challenge and Responsibility Dubugue, IA, W.M.C. Brown.Co-public.
- Govinda, R. and Diwan, R. (2007).Community Participation and Empowerment in Primary Education (3rded.). New Delhi: sage Publications. Inc.
- Grint, K. (2005). Leadership: Limits and Possibilities London: Palgrave. Macmillan
- Haile Selassie W/Gerima (1999). Human Resource Management. Teaching Material Prepared for Distance Learning (Unpublished Material, Addis Ababa University).
- Hallinger, P & Murphy, J. (1985).Assessing the Instructional Management Behaviors of Principals. The Elementary School Journal, 86 (2), 217-247.
- Harris, A, day, C., Hopkins, D., Hadfield, M., Harjreaves, A. and Chapman, C. (2003). Effective Leadership for school Improvement, New York: Rutledge Falmer. Harris, A. and Muijs, D. (2005).Improve School through Teachers Leadership: Milton keys: Open University.
- Harris, A. &Muijs, D. (2005).Improving Schools through Teacher Leadership: Open University press McGraw-Hill Education, London.
- Hopkin, D. (2003). “Instructional Leadership and School Improvement” In Harris et al (Eds) effective Leadership for school improvement. New York: Routledge flamer.
- Hopkins, D. (2001). School Improvement for Real. Routledge. Flamer.
- Hopkin, D. (2003). “Instructional Leadership and School Improvement” In Harris et al (Eds) effective Leadership for school improvement. New York: Routledge flamer.
- Husen, T. and Postlwaite, N. (Eds.) (1994).*The International Encyclopedia of Education* (2nd Ed). Oxford: Elsevier science Ltd
- Jaiycoba, A. O and Jibril, M.A. (2006:2). *Source of Occupational Stress among Secondary School Administrators in keno State*: Addis Ababa: IER-Addis Ababa University.
- James, M. Kouzes, B. and Posner, Z. (2010). *Making the Most of the Leadership Challenge and the Leadership Practices Inventory*. Published by Pfeiffer, S and Francisco.
- Kamar. J (2005). *Research methodology, A step by step guide for beginner*, London: Sage Publication Inc
- Kohchar, S. K.(1988). *Secondary School Administration*, NewDelhi: Sterling Publishers Ltd.

- Kruger, R. Richardson, E. and Bailey W. (2002). *School Management*, Pretoria: Muckleneuk.
- Lambert, (1998) *Leader capacity in school*. Association for supervision & curriculum development: Alexandria, Virginia: USA.
- Lassey, W.R. (1971). *Leadership and Social Change*, Iowa University Associate Press.
- Leask J, Terrell N Falconer P (1999). *in middle wood*, D(2001) *Leadership of curriculum*. setting the vision, saga publication.
- Law, Sue and Derek Glover (2000). *Educational Leadership and Learning Practice*, Policy and Research, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Levine DU, Lezotte LW (1990) *Usually effective schools: Review & analysis of Research & practice*. Madlson WL: National center for effective schools Research & Development.
- McNergney, R. F and Robert, F. (2004). *Foundations of Education: The Challenge of Professional Practice* (4th ed) Boston: Pearson Education. Inc.
- McEwan, E. (2003). *Seven Steps of Effective Instructional Leadership*, (2nd ed). California: COW in Press Inc.
- Marezely (1996). *Personalizing Professional Growth: Staff Development that works*. California: Crownin Press.
- Ministry of Education (2002). "Responsibility and Practice of School Principals" (unpublished) Ministry of Education (2005). *Education Sector Development Program II*. Addis Ababa MoE. Ministry of Education (2006-2007). *Educational Statistics Annual Abstract*, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Mitchell C, Sackney L (2000) *Profound Improvement: Building Capacity for a Learning Community*. Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger
- MoE (2005). *Education Sector Development Program III*. Addis Ababa: MOE
- MoE (1994). *Education and Training Policy of Ethiopia*, Addis Ababa MoE.
- Monahan, W. G. and H.R. Hengst (1982). *Contemporary Educational Administration*. New York.
- Mortimore, P., Sammons, P., Stoll, L., Lewis, D. and Ecob, R. (1988) *School Matters: The Junior Years*, Somerest, Open Books (Reprinted in 1995 by Paul Chapman: London.
- Murphy, J and Karen Seashare Louise (1999). *Hand Book of Research On Education*

- Administration*. (2nd ed) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Murphy, J.(1995). *Reshaping the Principalship*: New York.
- Musaazi, J.S.S. (1988). *The Theory and Practice of Educational Administration*, London: Macmillan Publishers.
- Pfeffer, J.&Davis-Blake, A.(1986). Administrative succession and organizational performance: How administrator experience mediates the succession effect. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29, 72-83.
- Purkey S, Smith M (1983) Effective Schools: A Review. *Elementary school J.* 83:427-52.
- Reynold D, Jones D, St Leger S (1976) School Do Make a Difference, *New Society* 37(721):223-5.
- Reynolds D, Cuttance P (eds.) (1993) *School Effectiveness: Research, Policy and Practice*, London: Cassell.
- Rutter M, Maughan B, Mortimore P, Ouston J (1979) *Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children*, Wells: Open Books. 74
- Rutter M (1980) *Changing Youth in a Changing Society*, Oxford: Nuffield Provincial Hospital Trust.
- Sammons P, Thomas S, Mortimore P (1996). Do School Perform Consistently Across Outcomes and Areas? In Gray, J., Reynolds, D.
- Sarantakos, S. (2005). *Social Research (3rd ed)*. New York: Palgrav Macmillan Company.
- Sergiovanni, T.T.(2001). *The principal ship: a Reflective practice perspective* (4th ed). London: Allyn and Bacon.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2001). *The Principalship: A Reflective Practice Perspectives*: New York Pearson.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2009). *The Principals: A Reflective Practice Perspective*, New York: Pearson Education: Inc
- Sharma, B.M. (2005). *School Administration*. New Delhi; Common Wealth Publisher.
- Shields, Carolyn. (2004). "Dialogue Leadership for Social Justice." *Educational Administration Quarterly*. Vol 40, No.1.
- Smith, R.E. (2009). *Human Resource Administration: A School Based Perspective* (4th ed). USA; Eye on Education
- Somech, A., 2005. Directive Versus Participative Leadership: Two Complementary

- Approaches to Managing School Effectiveness. *Educational Leadership Quarterly*, 39, 1-24.
- Teddlie, C., & Reynolds, D. (2000). *International handbook of school effectiveness research*. London: Falmer.
- Thrupp, M. (2000, April). Sociological and political concerns about school effectiveness research: Time for a new research agenda. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Tomlinson, H (2004) *Educational Leadership: Personal Growth for Professional Development*. London: Sage.
- TTA (1998a) *National Standard for Subject Leaders*. London: TTA
- Tomlinson, (2004) *Educational Leadership: Personal Growth for Professional Development*. London: Sage.
- Ubben G.C. and Hughes, L. W. (1997). *The Principal: Creative Leadership for Effective Schools*. USA; Aviacom Company.
- Ubben, G. C. and Larry. W. Hughes (1997). *The Principal Creative Leadership for Effective School* (3rd ed). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Vashist, S.R. (2008). *Encyclopedia of Educational Administration* (Vol.1). New Delhi: Mohra Offset Press.
- Walker k, Shakotko D, Pullman E (1998) *Towards a Further Understanding of Trust and Trustworthiness*, Paper Presented to the Values and Educational Leadership Conference, Ontario: University of Toronto
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in Organization* (6th ed). New York: Pearson Education.
- Zebebe Barki, (1992), *Leaders role behaviors of senior Secondary school principals in Ethiopia*. /unpublished thesis/.

APPENDEX-1

Jimma University

College of Education and Behavioral Studies

Department of Educational Planning and Management

A questionnaire to be filled by Teachers, principals Vice principals and supervisors.

Dear Respondents

The main purpose of this questionnaire is to gather information on the Leadership Tenure and School Effectiveness in Secondary Schools of Kaffa-Zone. The information gathered through this questionnaire will be used for academic purpose. Your careful and honest response determines the success of the study and the researcher as well. Thus you are kindly requested to complete the questionnaire carefully and honestly. Your response will be kept confidential. Please read the instructions to each part and items in the questionnaire before respond to it. If you want to change any of your response, make sure that you have cancelled the unwanted ones.

Part-1 Direction

Give response by putting (‘√’) in the appropriate box against each closed ended items and by giving brief descriptions of your opinion for open ended questions. Every response has to be based on your school context.

Give only a single answer to each item unless you are requested to do so.

No need to write your name in any part of the questionnaire.

Give your own response without consulting others.

Please try all questions and do not leave a question not answered

Thank you in advance for your cooperation

Part-2 Background Information

Name of the school Woreda /city.....

Sex: A. Male B. Female

Age: A. 20-25 B. 26-30 C. 31-35 D.36-40 E. 41 and above

Level of educational or qualification:

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

Area of specialization or field of study:

A. Subject Major B. EDPM/ Pedagogical Science C. Other specify.....

Total work experience or service year:

A. under 5 years B.6-10 C.11-15 D.16-20 E.21 years above

Service year in current position: A. under 5 years B.6-10 years C.11years and above

Part-3

Below are Tables that consist of questions that show the Leadership Tenure and School Effectiveness in Secondary Schools of Kaffa-Zone. Each Table contains five responses. Please indicate the extent to which each statement represents your school by putting tick mark (√) in one of the boxes against each item. Every response has to be based on your school context.

The numbers shows: 5=Strongly Agree (SA) 4=Agree (AG) 3=Undecided (UD)

2=Disagree (DISAG) 1=Strongly Disagree(SDAG)

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

No	ITEMS	RESPONSE				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	The School Leadership is capable in providing clear vision					
2	The School Leadership is skilled in developing the school mission, goals and objective					
3	The School Leadership is communicating the vision in order to have common understanding with staff and community					
4	The school principal brought change based on school vision					

	which is perceived by the school community					
5	The School Leadership is capable in setting directions to word the implementation of School vision.					
6	Collect data from multiple sources to create a common vision for the school.					
7	Use students' performance results to develop the school's missions					

B. School leadership performance related to planning function

No	ITEMS	RESPONSE				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Carry out analysis of the School environment before preparing school plan					
2	Plans an work toward changing the school					
3	Making the school plan flexible					
4	Encouraging the staff to participate in school planning					
5	Does leaders duration of the time in the same school bring effectiveness in particular school.					

C. The participatory practices of School Leadership

No	ITEMS	RESPONSE				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Work with staff members to improve the schools.					
2	The ability to delegate and share responsibility					
3	Provide opportunity for collaborations and shared decision making					
4	Making relationship based on collegiality and mutual trust.					

D. Supervision related practices of School Leadership

No	ITEMS	RESPONSE				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Visiting the classroom to ensure classroom instruction align with the school goal					
2	Observing teachers for professional development rather than evaluation					

3	Encouraging in built supervision within the school					
4	Supervising teachers to improve instructional practices					
5	Give adequate time after class visit to discuss the problems and plan improvement together					
6	Encourage teachers to use different instructional methods.					
7	Make regular follow-up and feedback to teachers					
8	Hold regular meetings with each department for the purpose of improving curriculum and instruction					

E. School Leadership practices School-Community relationship

No	ITEMS	RESPONSE				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Inviting parents and guardians to actively involved in their children's learning					
2	Creating effective communication between the School and parents					
3	Encouraging community, parents school relationship to bring change in students academic achievements					
4	Works to strengthen PTA and allows them take part in school leadership					
5	Treat school community equitably and fairly					
6	Listen to and accept teachers suggestions					

F. Curriculum development functions of the School Leadership

No	ITEMS	RESPONSE				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Identifying students and community need so as to improve curriculum					
2	Work as a resource person in curriculum improvement					
3	Identifying the problems in implementing the existing curriculum as per the education policy					
4	Involving stake holders in curriculum improvement					

G. Staff development practices of the School Leadership

No	ITEMS	RESPONSE				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Developing mechanisms by which competent teachers share their experiences with their colleagues					
2	Helping the teacher to attend CPD/continuous professional development					
3	Helping the teachers to read different current educational publications					

Part-2:-Below are some open-ended questions related to the Leadership Tenure and School Effectiveness in Secondary Schools of Kaffa-Zone. Please state them as much as possible in the space provided.

1. Do you believe that leadership Tenure(work experiences of secondary School leaders)improve school effectiveness of secondary school? If so how?

2. Lack of experience to tackle the problem that encounter the school leadership?

3. Write problem that secondary School Leadership faces during their School Leadership and suggest solution to solve the problem you mentioned?

Appendix-2

Jimma University

College of Education and Behavioral Studies

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Interview guideline for PTA & Woreda Education Bureau Officials (WEO)

Part-1: Personal Information

1. Name of the school _____ Woreda _____
2. Sex: A. Male B. Female
3. Age: A. 20-25 B. 26-30 C. 31-35 D.36-40 E. 41 and above
4. Level of educational or qualification:
A. Diploma B. B.A/BED/BSc Degree C. M.A/MSc Degree
5. Area of specialization or field of study:
A. Subject Major B. EDPM/ Pedagogical Science C. Other specify.....
6. Total work experience or service year:
A. under 5 years B.6-10 C.11-15 D.16-20 E.21 years above
7. Service year in current position: A. under 5 years B.6-10 years C.11years and above

Interview guideline for PTA Leaders

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

1. How school leaderships are assigned at your school?
2. Do you believe that leadership Tenure(work experiences of leaders) improve school effectiveness in secondary school?
3. To what extent PTA members are involved in secondary school leadership?
4. Does the school leadership encourage the PTA members to mobilize the community to Participate in secondary school leadership?
5. Does the secondary School leadership promote participatory decision making process?
6. Can you suggest the major problems that secondary schools leaders faces during their Secondary school leadership related to conditions like Politics, Economy, Social, and cultural Conditions?
7. What possible solution you suggest to tackle the problems facing secondary schools leaders in their school leadership?

B Interview guideline for Woreda Education Bureau Officials (WEO)

1. What are the selection criteria agreed to, for the leadership position in secondary Schools of your Woreda?
2. How school leaderships are assigned in current situations?
3. Do you believe that leadership Tenure(work experiences of leaders) improve school effectiveness in secondary school?
4. Are educational leaders adequately trained, qualified and experienced enough to lead secondary schools?
5. Do you believe that lack of experience affects the effectiveness of secondary school leadership
Do you believe that your office is giving the necessary support to all secondary school leaders to enhance their leadership effectiveness? If so, how?
6. How do you suggest the practices of your secondary school leadership in implementing the key managerial and instructional role.
7. To what extent secondary school leadership initiates the participation of community in school affairs?
8. What are the major challenges that hinder the effectiveness of leadership activity and what mechanism do you use to solve the problem?
9. How often woreda supervisors monitor secondary schools?

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Appendex-3

Jimma University

College of Education and Behevioural Studies

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Check List for Document Analysis

1. Does the school have stated Vision and mission?

2. Does the schools have strategic plan?

3. Do they have the written report documents or minutes?

4. Do they have self-assessment documents and data?

5. Does the schools have regular check list?

Table-3 Respondents View towards How the School Leadership works in line with School vision

No	ITEMS	Resp onde nts	RESPONSE										Tot al	Me an	A V. M ea n	St. dv
			5		4		3		2		1					
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%				
1	The School Leadership is capable in providing clear vision	Teach	43	51%	42	49%	-	-	-	-	-	-	85	4.5	4.6	0.5
		Prinp.	9	75%	3	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.7		0.4
		Sup	5	83%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.8		0.4
2	The School Leadership is skilled in developing the school mission, goals and objective	Teah	23	27%	45	53%	10	12%	7	8	-	-	85	4.0	4.3	0.8
		Prinp.	5	42%	7	58%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.4		0.5
		Sup	3	50%	3	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.5		0.5
3	The School Leadership is communicating the vision in order to have common understanding with staff and community	Teach	32	38%	43	50%	10	12%	-	-	-	-	85	4.3	4.33	0.7
		Prinp.	6	50%	5	42%	1	8%	-	-	-	-	12	4.4		0.7
		Sup	3	50%	2	33%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	6	4.3		0.8
4	The school principal brought change based on school vision which is perceived by the school community	Teach	25	29%	44	52%	19	18%	-	-	-	-	85	4.1	4.3	0.7
		Prinp.	3	25%	8	67%	1	8%	-	-	-	-	12	4.1		0.6
		Sup	4	67%	2	33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.7		0.5
5	The School Leadership is capable in setting directions to word the implementation of School vision.	Teach	25	29%	40	47%	10	12%	10	12	-	-	85	3.9	4.5	0.9
		Prinp.	9	75%	2	17%	1	8%	-	-	-	-	12	4.7		0.6
		Sup	5	83%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.8		0.4
6	Leadership Collect data from multiple sources to create a common vision for the school.	Teach	31	37%	41	48%	13	15%	-	-	-	-	85	4.2	4.5	0.7
		Prinp.	5	42%	6	50%	1	8%	-	-	-	-	12	4.3		0.6
		Sup	3	50%	2	33%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	6	4.3		0.8
7	Leadership Use students' performance results to develop the school's missions	Teach	30	35%	41	48%	10	12%	4	5	-	-	85	4.1	4.2	0.8
		Prinp.	3	25%	6	50%	3	25%	-	-	-	-	12	4.0		0.7
		Sup	3	50%	3	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.5		0.5

Mean scores =Strongly Disagree (1.00-1.80),Disagree(1.81-2.60), Undecided,(2.61 -3.40)

Agree (3.41-4.20) and Strongly Agree (4.21-5.0).

Table-4 Respondents View towards School leadership performance related to planning function

No	ITEMS	Resp onde nts	RESPONSE										T ot al	M ea n	Av.m ean	St. dv
			5		4		3		2		1					
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%				
1	Carry out analysis of the School environment before preparing school plan.	Teach	28	33%	35	41%	16	19%	4	5%	2	2%	85	4.0	4.4	1.0
		Prinp.	8	67%	3	25%	1	8%	-	-	-	-	12	4.6		0.7
		Sup	3	50%	3	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.5		0.5
2	Plans and work toward changing the school.	Teach	30	35%	40	47%	10	12%	5	6%	-	-	85	4.1	4.5	0.8
		Prinp.	9	75%	2	17%	1	8%	-	-	-	-	12	4.7		0.6
		Sup	5	83%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.8		0.4
3	Making the school plan flexible.	Teach	20	23%	40	47%	12	14%	10	12%	3	4%	85	3.8	4.3	1.1
		Prinp.	7	58%	5	42%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.6		0.5
		Sup	3	50%	3	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.5		0.5
4	Encouraging the staff to participate in school Planning.	Teach	40	47%	30	35%	15	18%	-	-	-	-	85	4.3	4.5	0.8
		Prinp.	6	50%	6	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.5		0.5
		Sup	3	50%	2	33%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	6	4.7		0.5
5	Does leaders duration of the time in the same school bring effectiveness in particular school.	Teach	47	55%	22	26%	13	15%	3	4%	-	-	85	4.3	4.4	0.9
		Prinp.	6	50%	3	25%	3	25%	-	-	-	-	12	4.2		0.9
		Sup	4	67%	2	33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.7		0.5

Mean scores =Strongly Disagree (1.00-1.80), Disagree(1.81-2.60), Undecided,(2.61 -3.40)

Agree (3.41-4.20) and Strongly Agree (4.21-5.0).

Table-5 Respondents View towards The participatory practices of School Leadership

No	ITEMS	Respo ndent s	RESPONSE										T ot al	M ea n	A v. m ea n	St. dv
			5		4		3		2		1					
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%				
1	The School Leadership work with the staff members to improve the School	Teach	39	46%	46	54%	-	-	-	-	-	-	85	4.5	4.6	0.5
		Prinp.	5	42%	6	50%	1	8%	-	-	-	-	12	4.3		0.6
		Sup	5	83%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.8		0.4
2	The ability to delegate and share responsibility	Teach	30	35%	30	35%	15	18%	10	12%	-	-	85	3.9	4.4	1.0
		Prinp.	6	50%	6	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.5		0.5
		Sup	4	67%	2	33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.7		0.5
3	Provide opportunity for collaborations and shared decision making	Teach	32	38%	30	35%	10	12%	10	12%	3	3%	85	3.9	4.2	1.1
		Prinp.	5	42%	4	33%	2	17%	1	8%	-	-	12	4.0		1.0
		Sup	4	67%	2	33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.7		0.5
4	Making relationship based on collegiality and mutual trust.	Teach	28	33%	40	47%	11	13%	6	7%	-	-	85	4.0	4.6	0.9
		Prinp.	5	42%	3	25%	4	33%	-	-	-	-	12	4.0		0.9
		Sup	3	50%	3	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.5		0.5

Mean scores =Strongly Disagree (1.00-1.80), Disagree(1.81-2.60), Undecided,(2.61 -3.40)

Agree (3.41-4.20) and Strongly Agree (4.21-5.0).

Table-6 Respondents View towards Supervision related practices of School Leadership

No	ITEMS	Respo ndent s	RESPONSE										T O T A L	Me an	Av .m ean	St. dv
			5		4		3		2		1					
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%				
1	Visiting the classroom to ensure classroom instruction align with the school goal	Teach	35	%	48	%	2	%	-	-	-	-	85	4.3	4.5	0.5
		Prinp.	7	59%	3	25%	1	8%	1	8%	-	-	12	4.3		0.9
		Sup	5	83%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.8		0.4
2	Observe teachers for professional development rather than evaluation	Teach	31	36%	38	45%	11	13%	5	6%	-	-	85	4.1	4.6	0.8
		Prinp.	10	83%	2	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.8		0.4
		Sup	6	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	5.0		0
3	The School Leadership Encouraging in built supervision within the school	Teach	31	36%	50	59%	4	5%	-	-	-	-	85	4.3	4.4	0.7
		Prinp.	6	50%	3	25%	3	25%	-	-	-	-	12	4.2		0.9
		Sup	4	67%	2	33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.7		0.5
4	Supervising teachers to improve instructional practices	Teach	36	42%	46	54%	3	4%	-	-	-	-	85	4.3	4.7	0.6
		Prinp.	9	75%	3	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.7		0.4
		Sup	6	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	5.0		0
5	Give adequate time after class visit to discuss the problems and plan improvement together	Teach	64	75%	11	13%	10	12%	-	-	-	-	85	4.6	4.7	0.7
		Prinp.	9	75%	3	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.7		0.5
		Sup	4	67%	2	33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.7		0.5
6	Encourage teachers to use different instructional methods.	Teach	40	47%	30	35%	15	18%	40	-	-	-	85	4.2	4.3	0.8
		Prinp.	6	50%	6	50%	-	-	6	-	-	-	12	4.5		0.5
		Sup	3	50%	2	33	1	17%	3	-	-	-	6	4.3		0.8
7	Make regular follow-up and feedback to teachers	Teach	39	46%	46	54%	-	-	39	-	-	-	85	4.5	4.5	0.5
		Prinp.	5	42%	6	50%	1	8%	5	-	-	-	12	4.3		0.6
		Sup	5	83%	1	17%	-	-	5	-	-	-	6	4.8		0.4

Mean scores =Strongly Disagree (1.00-1.80),Disagree(1.81-2.60), Undecided,(2.61 -3.40) Agree (3.41-4.20) and Strongly Agree (4.21-5.0).

Table 7 Respondents View towards School Leadership practices School Community

Relationship

No	ITEMS	Respo ndent s	RESPONSE										T ot al	M ea n	a v. m ea n	St. dv
			5		4		3		2		1					
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%				
1	Inviting parents and guardians to actively involved in their children's learning	Teach	31	36%	39	46%	15	18%	-	-	-	-	85	4.2	4.3	0.7
		Prinp.	4	33%	5	42%	2	17%	1	8%	-	-	12	4.0		0.9
		Sup	5	83%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.8		0.4
2	Creating effective communication between the School and parents	Teach	30	35%	35	41%	15	18%	5	6%	-	-	85	4.1	4.06	0.8
		Prinp.	5	42%	3	25%	3	25%	1	8%	-	-	12	4.0		1.0
		Sup	2	33%	3	50%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	6	4.1		0.7
3	Encouraging community, parents school relationship to bring change in students academic achievements	Teach	31	36%	32	38%	19	22%	3	4%	-	-	85	4.0	4.43	0.9
		Prinp.	6	50%	6	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.5		0.5
		Sup	5	83%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.8		0.4
4	Works to strengthen PTA and allows them take part in school leadership	Teach	26	31%	43	51%	16	18%	-	-	-	-	85	4.1	4.4	0.7
		Prinp.	6	50%	4	33%	2	17%	-	-	-	-	12	4.3		0.8
		Sup	5	83%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.8		0.4
5	Treat school community equitably and fairly	Teach	31	37%	42	49%	12	14%	-	-	-	-	85	4.2	4.6	0.7
		Prinp.	9	75%	3	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.7		0.4
		Sup	5	83%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.8		0.4
6	Listen to and accept teachers suggestions	Teach	23	27%	45	53%	10	12%	7	8%	-	-	85	4.0	4.3	0.8
		Prinp.	5	42%	7	58%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.4		0.5
		Sup	3	50%	3	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.5		0.5

Mean scores =S trongly Disagree (1.00-1.80),Disagree(1.81-2.60), Undecided,(2.61 -3.40)

Agree(3.41-4.20) and Strongly Agree(4.21-5.0).

Table-8 Respondents View towards Curriculum development functions of the School

Leadership

No	ITEMS	Respo ndents	RESPONSE										To tal	Me an	av. me an	St.d v
			5		4		3		2		1					
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%				
1	Identifying students and community needs so as to improve curriculum.	Teach	20	23%	32	38%	28	33%	5	6%	-	-	85	3.9	4.0	0.9
		Prinp.	3	25%	6	50%	1	8%	2	17%	-	-	12	3.8		1.0
		Sup	3	50%	3	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.5		0.5
2	Work as a resource person in curriculum improvement	Teach	16	19%	41	48%	28	33%	-	-	-	-	85	3.8	3.9	0.7
		Prinp.	3	25%	6	50%	2	17%	1	8%	-	-	12	3.9		0.9
		Sup	2	33%	3	50%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	6	4.1		0.5
3	Identifying the problems in implementing the existing curriculum as per the education policy.	Teach	22	26%	39	46%	12	14%	12	14%	-	-	85	3.8	3.9	0.9
		Prinp.	3	25%	5	42%	3	25%	1	8%	-	-	12	3.8		0.9
		Sup	3	50%	2	33%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	6	4.3		0.7
4	Involving stakeholders in curriculum improvement	Teach	22	26%	41	48%	16	19%	4	5%	2	2%	85	3.9	3.9	0.9
		Prinp.	5	42%	4	33%	3	25%	-	-	-	-	12	4.1		0.8
		Sup	1	17%	2	33%	3	50%	-	-	-	-	6	3.7		0.5

Mean scores =Strongly Disagree (1.00-1.80),Disagree(1.81-2.60),Undecided,(2.61 -3.40)

Agree (3.41-4.20) and Strongly Agree (4.21-5.0).

Table-9 Respondents View towards Staff development practices of the School Leadership

No	ITEMS	respondents	RESPONSE										Total	Mean	Av. mean	St. dev
			5		4		3		2		1					
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%				
1	Developing mechanisms by which competent teachers share their experiences with their colleagues	Teach	31	36%	41	49%	8	9%	5	6%	-	-	85	4.1	4.4	0.8
		Prinp.	5	42%	6	50%	1	8%	-	-	-	-	12	4.3		0.6
		Sup	3	50%	2	33%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	6	4.7		0.5
2	Helping the teacher to attend CPD/continuous professional development	Teach	40	47%	30	35%	15	18%	-	-	-	-	85	4.2	4.6	0.7
		Prinp.	10	83%	2	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.8		0.4
		Sup	3	50%	2	33%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	6	4.7		0.5
3	Helping the teachers to read different current educational publications	Teach	23	27%	25	29%	25	29%	7	9%	5	6	85	3.6	3.7	1.1
		Prinp.	6	50%	6	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	4.5		0.5
		Sup	-	-	2	33%	3	50%	1	17%	-	-	6	3.1		0.8

Mean scores =Strongly Disagree (1.00-1.80), Disagree (1.81-2.60), Undecided,(2.61 -3.40) Agree (3.41-4.20) and Strongly Agree (4.21-5.0).