



CHALLENGES OF MANAGING INFORMAL ORGANIZATION IN SECONDARY
SCHOOLS OF JIMMA ZONE

JIMMA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

NEJIB MUKTAR

ADVISOR: - MITIKU BEKELE (PhD.)

CO-ADVISOR: -ANDUALEM MOLA

MARCH,2022
JIMMA, ETHIOPIA.

CHALLENGES OF MANAGING INFORMAL ORGANIZATION IN SECONDARY

SCHOOLS OF JIMMA ZONE

NEJIB MUKTAR

ADVISOR: MITIKU BEKELE (PhD)

CO-ADVISOR: ANDUALEM MOLA

MARCH, 2022

JIMMA, ETHIOPIA

Declaration

The Researcher by declares that the thesis on the title “**Challenges, of managing Informal Organizations In secondary school of Jimma Zone**” is original work and that all sources referred to indicated and acknowledged in the complete references.

Name : Nejib Muktar

Signature :- _____

Date :- _____

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as

Advisor: MitikuBekele (PhD)

Signature:- _____

Date: - _____

Co- Advisor: Andualem Mola (MA)

Signature:- _____

Date :- _____

Place: - Jimma University College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Date of Submit ion :- _____

Acknowledgments

First of all, I would like to thank the almighty Allah for his help throughout my entire life and education. Next, I would like to extend special indebtedness to my advisor Mitiku Bekele (PhD) and Co-Advisor: Andualem Mola who gave me proper guidance starting from proposal preparation up to the end of this research. At last I also express my gratitude to my family for their greatest support and encouragement that brought my education and this research work to successful end.

Table of Contents

Contents	Page
Acknowledgments.....	i
Table of Contents.....	ii
List of Tables.....	iv
Abbreviations.....	v
ABSTRACT.....	vi
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Background of the study.....	1
1.2. Statement of the problem.....	2
1.3. Objectives of the Study.....	5
1.3.1. General Objective.....	5
1.3.2. Specific Object ivies.....	5
1.4. Significance of the Study.....	5
1.5. Delimitation of the Study.....	5
1.6. Limitations of the Study.....	6
1.7. Definition of key Terms.....	6
1.8. Organization of the Study.....	6
CHAPTER TWO.....	7
2. Review of Related Literature.....	7
2.1. The concept of informal organization.....	7
2.2. Nature and Working with group.....	8
2.3. Formal Groups.....	8
2.4 Informal Groups.....	9
2.3.1 Division of Labor and Specialization.....	10
2.3.2 Impersonal Orientation.....	11
2.3.3 Hierarchy of Authority.....	11
2.4. Development of Informal Groups in Organization.....	13
2.4.1. Group Norms and Conformity.....	16
2.4.2. Group Cohesiveness and Performance.....	17
2.4.3. Building Effective Work Group.....	17

2.4.4. Communications in Organization	18
2.5 Management of Informal groups in an organization	20
2.6 Leaders Influence Their Colleagues.....	21
2.6.1 Followers’ Perspectives	21
2.6.2 Leaders’ Perspectives	21
2.7 Teachers’ Internal States	22
2.7.1 Classroom Conditions.....	22
CHAPTER THREE	25
3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	25
3.1. The study Area	25
3.3 Research Method.....	25
3.4 Sources of Data	25
3.3.1 Primary sources of data	26
3.3.2 Secondary sources of data	26
3.4. Population, Sample and Sampling Techniques	26
3.3. Data Gathering Instruments.	27
3.3.1. Questionnaire.....	27
3.3.2 Interview.....	28
3.4 Procedure of Data Collection	28
3.5. Methods of data analysis and interpretation.....	29
3.6. Validity and Reliability of the Instruments	29
3.8. Ethical consideration	30
CHAPTER FOUR.....	31
4. Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of the Data	31
CHAPTER FIVE	41
5. SUMMERYS CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMONDATIONS	41
5. 1. SUMMERY OF MAJOR FINDINGS	41
5.2. CONCLUSIONS.....	41
5.3 RECOMMENDATION	42
Reference	44
Appendices.....	50

List of Tables

3.1: Description of the sample word's secondary schools.....	31
3:2: Reliability test results.....	34
4-1: Description of Respondent's by sex, age, qualification and service year.....	35
4 -2: Rating on Division of labor and specialization related activities of principals.....	37
4 - 3: Rating on Impersonal orientation of principals.....	38
4:4 Hierarchy of authority related activities of principals.....	40
4-5: Rule and regulation development and deployment in the school	42
4- 6: Rating on Principals' knowledge of informal groups.....	43

Abbreviations

CCSS: Common Core State Standards

Fre: Frequency

MoE: Ministry of Education

REB: Regional Education Bureau

WEO: Woreda Education Office

SD: Standard Deviation

SPSS: Statistical Package for Social Sciences

PTAs: Parents Teachers Associations

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to assess the challenges of managing informal organizations in secondary schools of Jimma Zone. To realize this purpose, descriptive survey method was employed. Accordingly, five Woreda's; six secondary schools on the basis of their year of establishment were selected using cluster and purposive sampling techniques respectively. Besides, 111 teachers, 12 principals, 12 PTA members and 6 Woreda supervisors were selected using random sampling technique and descriptive survey was employed. To collect relevant data, questionnaire and interview were employed. The questionnaire was used to collect data from teachers and principals. Interview and document analysis were also used to collect data from Parents Teacher Associations members and woreda supervisors. The quantitative data were analyzed using frequency, standard and deviation and the qualitative data was verbally analyzed. Findings of the study indicated that a reasonable amount of effort is made by the school in taking possible administrative actions to promote the bureaucratic dimension of an informal organization. Furthermore, the finding of the study demonstrated that the school had moderate/average level of performance in accomplishing the hierarchy of structure related activities. Further finding also indicated that there is a feeling of high level of dissatisfaction pertaining to some rule development and deployment dimension of managing informal groups in the Schools. The conclusion of the study revealed that, In spite of the fact that secondary school principals demonstrated low or poor performance in very few aspects of informal group management, in the majority of informal organization management dimensions, they have demonstrated adequate knowledge base and relevant management knowledge to utilize the potential of informal organizations in their respective school. The study also revealed that, with few exceptions of, the principals and the teachers believe that there is a moderate /reasonable degree of school principal's impersonal orientation. Cooperation and accepting that the very irrationality one tries to minimize can contribute to the foundation of effective informal organization. And the information gathered from interviewees support the above conclusion. Lastly, the finding of the study identified that the following were challenges usually faced by secondary school principals in harnessing the benefits of informal organizations in their respective schools includes: lack of rational knowledge of informal groups and informal networks, poor communication channels of school leaders, poor leadership skills, poor coordination, unwillingness to involve followers in decision making, political pressure, partiality lack of materials and budget and poor organizational culture are major bottlenecks that impede school principals in effectively managing informal organizations. Based on the findings of the study and conclusions made, the following recommendations are forwarded. Effectively managing an informal school organization is an important leadership responsibility for school principals. The building of such synergy and cohesion among school members requires ability to diagnose and manage the informal groups in their nascent stages before they blow out of proportion and hinder students' academic performance.

CHAPTER ONE

1.Introduction

1.1. Background of the study

Management thinking has seen organizations and group product development activities in a number of ways in the quest to improve performance. The management of multi-faceted groups has been recognized as a means of rapidly improving the way organizational development activities are managed. Moreover, Henderson's (1994) what governs organizational development success is the ability of the organization to overcome the boundaries of any organizational grouping, rather than the type of organization structure adopted (Morrison et.al, 2004).

By virtue of its nature, every organization is a group unto itself. In addition, all organizations depend on groups to achieve success. In organizations, a group refers to two or more people who interact to meet a shared goal. It is made up of people who share a common meaning and evaluation of themselves and come together to achieve common goals. In other words, a group is a collection of people who interact with one another; accept rights and obligations as members and who share a common identity (Harris, 2005).

Within these organizations, we do find a number of groups. Individuals joining group (s) is a reality – may be formal or informal groups. People work in groups quite frequently and in many different areas of their life e.g. at work, school/college, sport, hobbies. The managers need to understand group dynamics that can enable them to adopt the right approach of interacting with them. As educational institutions organizations, there exist two types of groups: formal and informal. Both influence their organization and the relationship among staff. The formal group refers to the formal relationships of authority and subordination within an organization. The primary focus of the formal group is the position the employee/manager holds, power is delegated from the top level of management down to the organization.

Each position has rules governing what can and cannot be done. There are rewards and penalties commensurate to amount of work performed (Handy, 1994; et.al).On the other hand, informal groups are not set up by an organization, but they emerge as employees begin to work together, start to share common interest or satisfy of mutual needs. The relationships established in such way have a profound influence on how members behave, how they feel, how they perform on school activities (Armstrong, 1991). According to Harris (2005), informal groups are necessitated by needs for friendship, needs for security needs to seek support.(2003) also argued that informal groups are neither established nor destroyed by the organization. As managers can

only diminish informal groups but will never eliminate them. And these groups have a strong influence on the organization.

Other definitions of informal organization (Hansen, 1991; Hoy and Miskel, 2008) closely follow those already described, namely, the interlocking social structures that govern how people work together in practice; the network of personal and social relationships that arise as people associate with others in a work environment; and aspects of organization undefined in the formal structure including human relationships, actual power versus formal power, communication and social networks.

As Lewis (1997) articulates, most informal groups operate and controlled through a leader and these groups have the capability of either supporting or opposing organizational objectives. Operation of these informal groups in organizations can also influence the implementation of school leader policy, the role of performance of individuals or groups, the degree of communication and the degree of satisfaction felt by people in the organization (Gorton, 1980).

Thus school as an organization is natural to find informal groups interacting in the system. Unless school leaders are well aware of the influences of these informal groups and systematically act towards them, it would be difficult to discharge their responsibilities for the betterment of their organization. Above all, the unique characteristics of education sector urges leaders at school level to consider the influence of informal groups as paramount to the formal ones. However, most school leaders have failed to manage the potential influence of informal groups in their respective institutions (Tolessa, 2018; Patrich, 2013). Unfortunately, the Jimma Zone secondary schools case is no exception to the abovementioned environment. Therefore, in light of the problems highlighted above, this study sought to examine the practice and challenges of managing informal organization in secondary schools of Jimma Zone.

1.2. Statement of the problem

Managing today's schools is a challenging undertaking involving two interactive organizational dimensions identified by Getzels and Guba nearly sixty years ago, namely, people and structure. While much has been written about the centrality of structure to attainment of goals and fulfillment of educational plans (Knezevich, 1984; Hoy and Miskel, 2001), less attention has been paid to the fact that schools are also peopled organizations (Lippett, 1991; Hansen, 1991; Owens, 2004), suggesting that there is more to organizational structure than tangible lines of authority, superior subordinate roles, rules and regulations, and other bureaucratic formalities.

In fact there should be a flourishing informal organization present, capable of influencing both human and organizational goal attainment. For principals attempting to maximize their schools' effectiveness, enhancing the informal organizational presence requires serious leadership consideration (Owens, 1970). Previous qualitative studies show that when the formal organization of school and patterns of informal interaction are aligned, faculty and leaders in a school are better able to coordinate instructional change (Penuel et al, 2010). Plus, as Lewis (1997) articulates, most informal groups operate and controlled through a leader and these groups have the capability of either supporting or opposing organizational objectives. As a starting point imagine that one has been tasked with examining and making recommendations for enhancing the informal organizational dimension of his/her school.

An immediate challenge is where to find evidence of the presence of this phenomenon. Such becomes less of a challenge if one recalls that potential for informal organization resides within the formal organization (Knezevich, 1984; Kimbrough and Nunnery, 1988) and in the day-to-day groups of people within the school structure--for example teachers with the same planning period meeting in the staffroom to develop professional reports; administrators whose offices are in close proximity discussing school-related matters; and students meeting in small groups to share assignment ideas and interests. Since there are many such groups in a school and it is from these roots that informal organization derives, principals should endeavor to tap their potential as a source of informal organizational presence (French and Bell, 1990; Hoy and Miskel, 2001).

A second challenge arises when one query which dimensions of formal organization contribute to this informal school dynamic. Silver (1983) posits that certain dimensions of formal structure (means) give rise to specific types of outcomes (ends) which impact not only the school organization per se but also those within. Since schools are assumed to be bureaucratic in nature, it is likely that specific bureaucracy serving as means actually contribute to defining, limiting, creating and/or modifying the invisible, often intangible informal school organization (Silver, 1983; Hoy & Miskel, 2008). In addition, effectively managing an informal school organization is an important leadership responsibility for school principals (Owens, 1970; Lipham, Rankin and Hoeh, 1985). Doing so necessitates understanding of the close association between the more tangible formal organization and the less tangible, yet critical, informal organization (Owens, 1987; Knezevich, 1984).

In similar vein Tolessa (2018) in his study of "influences of informal groups on leadership practices in secondary schools of West Wollega Zone" revealed that in secondary schools, informal groups were found to be formed because of poor communication channels, poor

leadership skills, lack of involving followers in decision making, personal interests, lack of conducive work environment in schools and the division that leaders make among followers were found to involve in informal groups to satisfy their interests and sometimes to defend themselves from some measures that may be taken against them. Furthermore, school leader slack transparency in decision making.

Tesfaye Tamene (2018) School Leadership practices and challenges in Oromia Regional State of Northern Shoa Zone the case of preparatory schools. The finding of his study point out that principal's leadership practices at schools, even though the execution of the practice was perceived differently by teachers and principals.

With due respect, these findings imply the existence of leadership challenges and ineffective leadership practices in managing group dynamics: human interactions and forces operating between formal and informal social groups and within the informal groups in secondary schools.

Unfortunately, the Jimma Zone secondary schools problem is no exception to the abovementioned environment. Besides, the researcher also has some observational experiences pertaining to the practice and challenges in leading different social groups in secondary schools; which manifest in the form of cliques (small groups, political groups, etc.) rebellion and resistance to cooperation and building team spirit. And clear stand-off between the school administration and these small groups that emanated from group interest, management partiality poor education service delivery, unfair employees treatment and mal-administration of public resources. Hence, the gaps identified by the local and international studies and the experiences of the researcher happened the real causes for this study was to be conducted. Therefore, in light of the problems highlighted above, motivate the researcher to conduct study” to examine challenges of managing informal organization in secondary schools of Jimma Zone”.

To attain the state of affairs in the secondary schools, the present study was guided by the following basic research questions:

1. How do Jimma Zone secondary schools manage informal organization?
2. What are the challenges encountered by these secondary schools principals in managing informal groups in their respective schools?
3. What can be done to ensure that informal groups contribute positively to the secondary schools of Jimma Zone?

1.3. Objectives of the Study

1.3.1. General Objective

The general objective of this study was to assess the challenges of managing informal organization in secondary schools of Jimma Zone.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

This study specifically attempts to:

How do Jimma Zone Secondary Schools manage informal Organizations.

Identify challenges encountered by secondary school principals in managing informal social groups

Point out strategies to ensure that informal groups contribute positively to the secondary schools of Jimma Zone.

1.4. Significance of the Study

The central theme of the study was to assess challenges of leadership in managing informal groups in secondary schools of Jimma Zone. Hence the finding of this study was used to the stakeholders including:

The finding of the research enable Jimma Zone Education Office to identify major challenges of school leadership in managing informal groups in secondary schools so that similar assessments can be conducted in other schools in providing more information in addition it enables the zone to know what kind(s) of policies, strategies, and solutions should be framed. Secondly, the finding of the study was expected to give appropriate information for leaders of the study area to use as evidence to take suitable measure against the practice and challenges in managing informal groups in their respective schools. Furthermore, it can be used as spring board for further studies to be conducted.

1.5. Delimitation of the Study

The scope of the research has been designed to cover challenges of managing Informal Organizations in Secondary school of Jimma Zone to make the study manageable. It was delimited to governmental secondary school teachers, leaders and educational expertise found in Jimma Zone. The zone was selected for the reason that the student researcher has an easy to access information about the challenges of informal groups on school leadership practices and conceptually the issue related to the challenges of informal groups on school leadership practice

teachers involve and school leaders manage informal groups in secondary schools from 2010_2014 E.C. As a sample, the study was included 6 secondary schools, 111 teachers, 12 school principal, 12 PTA and 6 educational experts.

1.6. Limitations of the Study

As the result of methodological and geographical delimitation there would be gaps or draw backs which was not be filled and covered by the researcher study the limitation where that the researcher wants to study challenges of managing Informal Organizations In Secondary school as general in Ethiopia, but because of different difficulty limited only in Jimma Zone (scope of limitation). And also the study was conceptually focused only on Challenges of managing In formal Organization, this research was not incorporating all types of informal groups that changing school leaders practice. As there was not sufficient internet connection, it was also problems to timely communicate the advisor. It took long time to get questionnaire back from the respondents and not voluntary. However, the maximum effort was exerted to make the come up the study.

1.7. Definition of key Terms

Formal Organization: is a system of structured interpersonal relations with the roles and expectation prescribed for official of various positions.(Szilagy,1981).

Management: working with and through people.

Informal Organization: refers to interpersonal relationships in the organization that affect decisions within it but either are omitted from the system or not consistent with the system.

School leadership: Involves waking with and guiding teachers towards improving educational process in elementary, secondary and post-secondary institution.(Hasan,1991:and Miskel,2008).

1.8. Organization of the Study

This Study was organized into five chapters as described below. Chapter one comprises background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions, objective of the study: general and specific, significance of the study, delimitation, limitation, and definition of key terms. Chapter two presents, the review of related literature on theoretical frame work, empirical studies and conceptual frame work. The third chapter presents, the research design and methodology, source of data, process of data collection, the instruments used for data collection and the system to analyze data. Chapter four deals with the presentation of results and discussion of the study results one after the other. Chapter five presents summary of the findings, conclusion and recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO

2. Review of Related Literature

2.1. The concept of informal organization

French and Bell (1990) view informal organization as beliefs and assumptions, perceptions, attitudes, feelings, values and group interactions deriving from the more formal dimensions of goals, technology, policy, products and resources. This definition falls in line with that proposed by Hoy and Miskel (2001) where they depict the informal organization as a system of interpersonal relations that forms spontaneously within all formal settings. It is the natural ordering and structuring that evolves from the needs of interacting participants. Owens (2004) argues that the informal organization relates to relations between people in that organization. For this reason he refers to the informal organization as the „human side“ of an organization, revealing itself when one attempts to involve people more fully in making decisions that affect them; attend to their emotional needs more adequately; and increase collegiality and collaboration through team effort.

Other definitions of informal organization (Hansen, 1991; Hoy and Miskel, 2008) closely follow those already described, namely, the interlocking social structures that govern how people work together in practice; the network of personal and social relationships that arise as people associate with others in a work environment; and aspects of organization undefined in the formal structure including human relationships, actual power versus formal power, communication and social networks. From these definitions it becomes clear that school principals wanting to understand the critical elements of informal organization should focus attention on those interpersonal relationships emerging from the formal organization itself. These human aspects include beliefs, assumptions, perceptions, attributes, feelings and values associated with people's needs.

Comprising this „human side“ of the school organization, these personal forces form the interlocking social structures governing how people work together, as well as networks of personal and social relationships, and other organizational aspects of the formal structure. Given that schools are bureaucratic in nature (Lane, Corwin and Monahan, 1967; Hoy and Miskel, 2008; Treslan, 2008), effectiveness of their informal organizations will hinge on the extent to which the ever present bureaucracy (implicit in formal organizations) is understood and

effectively managed, more specifically these four bureaucratic components: division of labor and specialization, impersonal orientation, hierarchy of authority, and rules and regulations.

2.2. Nature and Working with group

In the real world, of course, many formal groups have an informal dimension. As they work together, the members develop relationships, and modify their work role to suit themselves and other members of the group. Sometimes, the strength of their bonds can actually threaten or undermine the formal system of the organization. A group is a collection of two or more individuals who are interdependent and interact with one another for performing to achieve a common goal (Szilagyi, 1981). Thus, employees in organizations work with other to accomplish a given task. This situation force managers, in particular school Leadership to study groups in school because most activities in school are carried out in groups.

The study of groups in school is important for various reasons. First, groups provide important information for individuals to understand social values and norms of the organization. Second, by participating in groups individuals satisfy their economic status, safety and security needs. Finally, groups'' behavior and their performance facilitate ways and means for attaining organizational goals (Harris, 2005). Within any organization, there are two types of groups, the formal and informal groups.

2.3. Formal Groups

Formal groups are setup by organization to achieve a defined purpose. In other words, people with the necessary skill and knowledge brought together to carry out a given task and a system exist for directing, coordinating and controlling the groups'' activities (Armstrong, 1991). Accordingly, there are many formal designed committees in modern organizations. Among these, the most common formal groups are the command and task groups. Command groups consist of a superior and subordinates. Their membership and structure are formally prescribed and is represented organizational chart. The superior is granted formal authority over the other member of the command and the task groups. The task groups are formally established to carry a specific activity. The relationship among the members of task groups may be short or long depending on the purpose for which it is established (Luthans, 1981).

2.4 Informal Groups

(Armstrong, 1991) Informal groups are groups that satisfy the need and interest of their members than task. Which emerge naturally due to the response and common interest, and also formed by the individuals to satisfy their social needs of affiliation and they emerge on their own and hence not created by the management of the organization. People in organization who have some common interest set up informal groups. As formal groups satisfy the needs of the organization, informal groups satisfy the needs and interest of their members (Armstrong, 1991). Informal groups, if handled properly by managers, they can make a significant contribution towards organizational goal achievement. Besides supporting the goals and policy of the organization, they can offer other benefits. First, they can provide status and social satisfaction for their members; Second informal groups facilitate the communication system (Szilagyi, 1981). There are various definitions of informal groups for better understand to be given by different researchers. According to Simon (1957) who writes, that informal groups refers to those interpersonal organizational relationships that affect the decisions made therein but frequently omitted from the more formal scene.

As Knezevich (1984) puts it, the informal organization grows out of interpersonal transactions deriving from the many clusters of informal influence groups having either a positive or a negative impact on the formal organization itself. In fact, Owens (1987) believes these interactions to be prime determinants of the behavior of people in that organization, suggesting that from a school perspective both teacher and student performance significantly influenced by the ever-present informal organization.

Kimbrough and Nunnery (1988) state that within a formal organization many interactions occur that are not planned; communication networks built; ways of behaving defined; and cliques emerge/disappear. Here the informal organization portrayed in those human aspects of the enterprise not always described in organizational charts. French and Bell (1990) view informal groups as beliefs and assumptions, perceptions, attitudes, feelings, values and group interactions deriving from the more formal dimensions of goals, technology, policy, products and resources. This definition falls in line with that proposed by Hoy and Miskel (2001) where they depict the informal groups as a system of interpersonal relations that forms spontaneously within all formal settings. The natural ordering and structuring evolve from the needs of interacting participants. Owens (2004) argues that the informal groups relates to relations between people in that

organization. For this reason, he refers to the informal organization as the “human side” of an organization, revealing itself when one attempts to involve people more fully in making decisions that affect them; attend to their emotional needs more adequately; and increase collegiality and collaboration through team effort.

Generally Hansen, 1991; Hoy and Miskel, 2008 informal groups the interlocking social structures that govern how people work together in practice; the network of personal and social relationships that arise as people associate with others in a work environment; and aspects of organization undefined in the formal structure including human relationships, actual power versus formal power, communication and social networks. The schools are bureaucratic in nature (Corwin and Monahan, 1967; Hoy and Miskel, 2008), effectiveness of their informal organizations will hinge on the extent to which the present bureaucracy (implicit in formal organizations) is understood and effectively managed, more specifically these four bureaucratic components: division of labor and specialization, impersonal orientation, hierarchy of authority, and rules and regulations.

2.3.1 Division of Labor and Specialization

Schools like other organizations function by having certain “activities required for the purposes of the bureaucratically governed structure distributed in a fixed way as official duties” (Gerth and Mills, as cited in Hoy and Miskel, 2008).

Tasks such as teaching, leadership, supervision and decision making (to name but a few) are complex too complex performed unilaterally. These results in a need to divide this labor among others in the school setting teachers, vice-principals, principal and others. When observed through the specialized nature of schools this division of labor seemingly applies directly to teachers and administrators. Yet ways and means can explored to capitalize on the decisional contributions of other stakeholders, namely, students, parents and other external individuals/groups (Owens, 1987; French and Bell, 1990). In so doing, organizational specialization can be enriched through the knowledge and expertise contributed by those now engaged in these processes. Interestingly, division of labor and specialization can have a positive impact on school operation; yet, such is seldom the case simply because little time or attention is paid to this bureaucratic dimension (Hoy and Miskel, 2008). What implications might a focus on division of labor and specialization have for the informal school organization? Schools harbor a vast untapped human potential comprised of talents, abilities, feelings and interactions (French and Bell, 1990; Hoy and Miskel, 2008). These are “people” qualities, not elements of an

organizational chart. These intangibles are present in both those who administer the bureaucratic presence in schools and those who are governed by presence.

Consequently, tapping this potential can contribute to both school efficiency and effectiveness. Nevertheless, here in lurks a problem--too often we as administrators fail to recognize this talent pool at our doorstep. Therefore, it is not common to find principals unaware, not necessarily willing, of the need to build on this human potential in their schools by developing outlets for this potential to realize in daily school management.

2.3.2 Impersonal Orientation

It has long been believed that the reality of a functioning bureaucracy is provision of an impersonal orientation (Weber, Hoy and Miskel, 2008). However, when viewed in practical terms within organizations (including schools) this frequently translates into coldness, inapproachability, aloofness, and/or lack of feeling on the part of organizational constituents (French and Bell, 1990; Hoy and Miskel, 2008). Teachers, for example, are required to make decisions based on facts, not feelings, creating a “standoff” atmosphere in many classrooms (Sergiovanni, 1999; Hoy and Miskel, 2008).

2.3.3 Hierarchy of Authority

As with most organizations, schools are vertically structured, that is, each office/role within is arranged so that every lower office/role is under the control and supervision of a higher one (Owens, 1987; Hoy and Miskel, 2001). This gives rise to the hierarchy of authority displayed in standard organizational charts. The downside of this formal arrangement in schools is that teachers and students are located at the bottom of this “pyramid--on the receiving end of orders and rarely having occasion to input ideas to the governance process”. While it might argue that, this hierarchy ensures superior-subordinate relations, it also guarantees disciplined compliance to superior-dictated directives (Lane et al., 1967).

This in itself is detrimental to the morale and dignity of all who interact with the school organization, since the very core of informal organizational structure; individuals are denied the basic ingredients of their participation freedom, empowerment and trust (Owens, 1987; Hansen, 1991). To ensure that the hierarchy of authority in schools will enhance rather than detract from informal school organization, leader action could include: create public evaluation standards facilitating a remote control function; and they provide a sense of legitimacy for punishing people. However, teachers and administrators alike recognize the fallibility of rules and

regulation that this fallibility, while consequential to all stakeholders, is particularly detrimental to the informal school organization (Lane et al., 1967; Norton, 2005; Hoy and Miskel, 2008).

Meant to function as general guides in specific situations, rules require interpretation. Rules by their very nature encounter organized resistance because both their meaning and relevance depend on those applying them. Rules also contribute to the preservation of apathy because of their standards establishing function, usually specifying a minimal level of performance. In addition, herein lies a dilemma--while rules and regulations are design to account for the routine and the typical, the world of reality is not foreseeable. Thus, rules violation is inevitable because of their nature, their place in the school organization, and the very nature of the school organization itself (Lane et al., 1967). Principals need to realize that because of the resistance and resentment rules create, overall effectiveness of the informal school organization can be reduce by proliferation of rules and regulations, which potentially limit or constrain the informal organizational structure (Hoy and Miskel, 2008).

“In light of this information, school leaders might undertake the following actions to facilitate effective rule and regulation development and deployment in their schools “In summary, effectively managing an informal school organization is an important leadership responsibility for school principals (Owens, 1970). Doing so necessitates understanding of the close association between the more tangible formal organization and the less tangible, yet critical, informal organization (Owens, 1987; Knezevich, 1984). Armed with awareness of the role challenges identified in this paper and the bureaucratic path provided for maximizing the effectiveness of informal school organization, principals can truly embrace the Hoy and Miskel ,2001) belief that since schools are “peopled” organizations, there is undoubtedly the presence of an informal structure related to interactive with the formal school organization. This means that every effort should be to facilitate these interactive forces within the school, and tap the consequential potential of this interaction for the benefit of the school as a whole.

Suggestions advanced in this paper for doing so are aim at assisting principals in enhancing that human side to every bureaucratic action and, in so doing, to minimize any dysfunctional nature imbedded in the four bureaucratic elements focused on. These suggestions represent practical considerations for busy principals interested in enhancing the “people” dimension of their schools through awareness of the bureaucratic presence in school operation and an understanding that bureaucracy can be groom to the advantage of the informal organization. This will necessitate structural leadership on the part of principals, which, according to Lipham, et al.

(1985), includes taking immediate action on urgent decisions; exercising clear and decisive delegation; stressing outcomes; developing clear philosophy as a basis for decision making; monitoring; and maintaining positive relations with stakeholders.

Emerging from these activities should be knowledge that effective management of informal school organization equates with those essential functions of informal structure proposed by Barnard, (as cited in Hoy and Miskel, 2001), years ago—“an effective vehicle for communication; a means of developing cohesion; and a device for protecting the integrity of the individual”. I hope that this paper might assist principals in achieving this understanding. On the other hand, the disadvantages of informal groups are opposing the goals of the organization, resistant to change and transmitting incorrect information.

The spreading of rumors become more serious when employees are not informed well about what is going on in organizations (Szilagyi, 1981). School Leaderships are not only responsible for the proper functioning of the formal groups, but also responsible for the performance of informal groups because, the values and norms of informal groups may work against the goal of the organization.

2.4. Development of Informal Groups in Organization

Informal structures are sometimes created intentionally, but more often, they appear 'by default'. Since they are hidden, and often personal, they are very difficult to challenge, or even to identify and discuss. This is one of the major causes of development of informal groups in activity and volunteer groups. It often takes up a lot of time and energy at the expense of the ideals pursued and projects undertaken, and has a demoralizing effect on individual groups and on the movements they are involved in. Often these formal structures will be set out on paper in the form of organizational charts in school. However, in the course of time an informal structure develops in most organizations, which are based on the reality of day-to-day interactions among the members of the organization.

This informal structure may be different from that set on paper. Informal structures develop because people find new ways of doing things that they find easier and save time. Patterns of interaction are shaped by friendship groups and other relationships. People forget what the formal structures are. It is easier to work with informal structures. Sometimes the informal structure may conflict with the formal one. Where this is the case, the organization may become less efficient at meeting its stated objectives. However, in some cases the informal structure may prove to be more efficient at meeting organizational objectives because the formal structure was badly set

out. The informal organization refers to the network of personal and social relations that develop spontaneously between people associated with each other. The primary focus of the informal organization is the employee as an individual person. Power is derived (turn over) from membership of informal groups within the organization. The conduct of individuals within these groups governed by norms; that is, social rules of behavior. Despite the explosion of information that is accessible through the Internet and databases, people still rely heavily on their networks for help with their work.

Motivation to all individuals (not for leaders) contributes to the group. Specifically, by offering high rank as a reward for self-sacrifice, hierarchies incentivize all individuals to do more for the collective (Frank, 1985). And, as indicated earlier, some research has provided support for this function, showing that possessing higher rank motivates individuals to behave more selflessly (Willer, 2009), and that individuals higher in their organizational hierarchy are more satisfied with their job and committed to the organization (Porter & Lawler, 1965). Motivational effects on those at the top of the hierarchy might be outweighed by the damage done to those on the bottom. Some have argued that satisfaction is related to the motivation to contribute to the group and perform well – that individuals who feel satisfied with their occupational rank or compensation are more motivated to perform (Thoreson & Patton, 2001). If lower satisfaction indeed leads to lower performance, this suggests that when you take into consideration all group members, lower the motivation to contribute overall. Why would occupying a lower rank reduce individuals' motivation?

There are at least three reasons. First, individuals lower in rank might contribute less simply because they feel as though they have less to contribute. Argyris (1957) postulated that within formal organizations, placing individuals into lower-ranking positions makes them feel more passive and less effective over time, and in turn, lose their motivation to perform. The empirical research has confirmed his argument, in that individuals lower in the hierarchy tend to have lower self-perceptions of competence and ability (House, 1988; Van Vugt, 2006). When individuals randomly assigned to lower-ranking positions, they tend to perceive themselves as less efficacious (Stolte, 1978), providing causal evidence that lower rank reduces self-perceptions. Korman (1971) reviewed a range of studies showing that placing people into organizational roles with less control and autonomy decreases their level of self-efficacy and performance.

A second and related reason is that individuals occupying a lower-ranking position tend to form highly positive perceptions of their superiors' competence – leading them to believe that those individuals should contribute. Again, Argyris (1957) theorizing is relevant here. He argued that

employees in lower-ranking positions become more dependent on their superiors and defer to them more, similar to the way children become dependent on and defer to their parents. As we discussed earlier, much research has shown that individuals with higher rank are viewed as more intelligent and task-skilled, independent of their actual competence levels

(Darley & Gross, 1983; Sande, Ellard, & Ross, 1986). Thus, individuals in lower-ranking roles might begin to form overly positive perceptions of those at the top, and assume that those individuals have the capacity to take on the bulk of the group's problems. A recent study of ours (Locke & Anderson, 2010) found that when individuals placed in a lower-ranking role perceived their superior as more competent, they contributed less to the discussion and joint decision-making. Third, people in possession of lower rank might feel unfairly treated by the group, which would reduce their motivation to contribute.

According to equity theory (Adams, 1965), individuals in any social exchange relationship believe that rewards should be distributed according to the level of each individual's contributions to the relationship. Individuals judge the fairness of their exchange by comparing the ratio of their contributions (e.g., work effort) to their rewards, with others' ratio of contributions to rewards. When individuals perceive that their ratio of contributions to rewards is similar to that of others, they feel a sense of equity. When individuals perceive that their ratio of contributions to rewards is too low relative to others, they feel a sense of inequity.

They can deal with this inequity in a number of ways, such as changing their perceptions of their own contributions or rewards, or altering their actual contributions (e.g., decreasing their work effort; Cowherd & Levine, 1992; Pfeffer & Langton, 1993). Theorists have applied this social exchange framework to intra-group hierarchies, arguing that individuals gauge whether their rank in the hierarchy is commensurate with their contributions, effort, skills, and abilities (Thibault & Kelley, 1959). If individuals feel that their rank (i.e., their reward) is lower than it should be, or feel "under placed" in the hierarchy, they should feel a sense of inequity.

Moreover, research suggests that feelings of under placement are quite likely. People tend to overestimate their contributions to the group (Ross & Sicoly, 1979). Research by Tannenbaum (1962; Smith & Tannenbaum, 1963; Zupanov & Tannenbaum, 1968; also see Bowers, 1964) also found that in many organizations individuals lowest in rank believe they should have more control than they actually do and that this gap between ideal control and actual control is greater than among those at the top. In other words, those at the bottom feel they should have more control much more often than do those at the top.

When are steeper hierarchical structures more likely to de-motivate those lower in rank? Again, the program of research by Tannenbaum and colleagues is relevant (Tannenbaum, 1968; Tannenbaum et al., 1974). In their studies, they consistently found that when lower-ranking organization members felt more in control over their own work and over the organization – regardless of the number of levels in the formal hierarchy – the more motivated and committed they were to the organization. Research on voice similarly demonstrates the motivational benefits of making employees feel part of the decision-making process (Leavitt, 2005). Group members work together more efficiently by facilitating communication and increasing cooperation among members. Based on this fear, studies have consistently shown that employees stay silent instead of raising important issues to their leaders, participants temporarily assigned a low-power position tend to express their ideas and opinions less, even though the hierarchy was just constructed moments before (e.g., Anderson & Berdahl, 2002).

Moreover, Tannenbaum's research (Tannenbaum et al., 1974) suggests that these problems become exacerbated in more hierarchical organizations, if there is a broad perception among those lower in rank that they can speak freely and provide their opinions without fear of retribution.

As the existence and the influence of informal groups are inevitable, it can be considered whether the group is helpful in an organization. Therefore, it is important to note that some factors determine how informal groups perform their function. Accordingly, this section focuses on group norms and conformity, group cohesiveness and performance, school climate and leadership style of school leaders.

2.4.1. Group Norms and Conformity

Norms are defined as standards of rules of behavior that are established by informal group members to provide some order to the individual and the group activities (Szilagyi, 1981). From the definition, it is possible to deduce that these informal rules are either stated or unstated and they govern how the members of the group should or should not behave. If members of the group were free to act, interact and perform as they like, the result would be risky for the existence as well as the performance of the group. Conformity to the norms of the group can have advantages in that it can bind the group together, increase solidarity and present a united front.

It also increases commitment of the members of the group if it brings their attitudes in line with the action of the group. On the other hand, the group considers those members who do not conform as deviants. Mitchell (1982) states that conformity to group norms is what is good or bad is whether the behavior required is viewed as good or bad by the society. Conformity can both increase and decrease the effectiveness of group performance. Even though school leaders have

very little opportunity to stop the formation of negative norms, they can change unproductive and unhealthy norms of informal groups through their authority or within a participative environment (Szilagyi, 1981).

2.4.2. Group Cohesiveness and Performance

Group cohesiveness is the extent to which the members of a group find staying together to be in mutual interest or two or more people or things that stick together. Group cohesiveness is affected by several factors. Among these the most important are possibility to communicate, common goals successful, communality of backgrounds, group size, and reaction to threat (Mitchell, 1982).

The existence of cohesive informal groups in organizations have two implications for school Leadership, first it indicates the degree of influence on its members and the second is that a cohesive group has a positive attitude for its members which leads to absence of tension, conflict and disunity. High cohesive groups have a high potential to perform better than the less cohesive group (Szilagyi, 1981). Thus, school Leadership must be aware that a high cohesive informal group of teachers has a potential to influence negatively or positively the goal of schools. On the other hand, low cohesive group is not powerful to influence and perform any activity. The level of performance depends largely on how groups member are led. In relation to this Luthans (1981) has the following to say A highly cohesive group that is given positive leadership ... has the highest possible productivity... a high positive group that is given poor leadership will have the lowest possible productivity. The direction in which the highly cohesive group goes depends on how it is led. In general, performance level is very high in a highly cohesive group with positive norms. On the other hand, the output of low cohesive group with a negative norm is low and in a highly cohesive group with negative norms, the level of output is very low. Thus, school leaders should try to minimize negative norms of informal groups.

2.4.3. Building Effective Work Group

School leaders, in working with informal groups must make an effort to build effective work groups by encouraging groups with positive norms. Since highly cohesive group with negative norms hinder the proper functioning of schools Leadership should try to work with the informal leaders to influence their norms. Therefore, the characteristics of effective team building emphasize the role Leaders play to have high standards and expectations, use of the principle of supportive relationship and use of the human resources approach. In many such situations there

is little school Leadership can do to avoid these problems particularly because of bureaucratic restrictions, but they can try to make members understand why they have been included in the group and what their potential contribution and roles are. Thus, educational Leaders are often in a position to make group effectiveness a reality (Sergiovanni and Starrat, 1983). They are in unique position that they can influence both the task effectiveness and interaction effectiveness.

On top of this, the human resources approach top participative Leaders, Leaders use groups to assist in problem solving and decision-making (Mosley et.al, 1993).

There are many discussions almost everybody participates and people listen to one another (Umstot, 1988). In this approach to problem, solving results in better decision than the manager could make alone. The leaders are of course still accountable for the quality of decisions and their implementation. His/her responsibility is to build an effective team than makes good decision and carries them. In order to prevent superiors from behaving arbitrarily, the formalization of role expectations for subordinates combined with a specification of management authority within narrowly prescribed hierarchical authority relations. The organizational and management goal is to increase system rationality and predictability. This system of management based on the bureaucratic organizational control.

2.4.4. Communications in Organization

Communication is the process of exchanging ideas; meanings and understanding between and among human beings, and it harmonize the efforts and behaviors of the group, which consequently leads them toward achieving a common goal (Megginson, 1981).

Members of the school obtain information they need through job related and other information, formally and informally from their superiors and friends/ subordinate. Since communication is the basic link between school leadership and teachers, effective school Leadership should communicate and receive feedbacks from teachers. In addition, staff members understood themselves in informal ways. Thus, teachers should provided information that they need to carry out their activities in appropriate time. Effective communications facilitate a good human relationship among teachers and school leaders. In other words, effective communication brings common understanding among groups and increases a healthy relationship in school. Emphasizing this point, (Miller, 1985) says, “One of the surest paths to good human relationships is good communication”. Hence, the disagreement between school leadership and informal group can be resolved when effective communication is exercise in organization.

2.4.4.1 Types of Organizational Communication

In any organizational structures, including school, communication takes place both formally and informally.

2.4.4.1.1 Formal Communication

Much of the communication in an organization is formal. Communication flows formally established channels and is concerned with work related matters (Adler, 1985) stated that “The formal communication networks are the management’s idea of who ought to work with whom to accomplish the organizational mission”. In school, message and information flow from the superior to subordinate and vice versa. Since school size increases from time to time, the need for formal communication also increases. Therefore, it is essential for larger schools to make sure that message is introduced through the formal channel of communication to avoid misunderstanding (Hughes, 1974). These message and information is sending to subordinates in organization through downward, upward and horizontal communication.

2.4.4.1.2 Informal Communication

Informal communication is the type of communication that does not flow through the predetermined lines of communication and which enhance the effectiveness of organizational communication (Kenrick, 1987). Informal organization structure informal communication has important dynamics for the study of people behavior. It has both advantage and disadvantage in many ways. Among the function the most one: It blends with formal organization to make a workable system for getting the work done, lightens the work load of formal manager and fills in some of the gaps of his/ her ability, gives satisfaction and stability to the work groups, helps as a very use full channels of communication in the organization and encourages a manager to plan and act more carefully than he/ she would otherwise where as its disadvantages are conflicting objectives, restriction of output, conformity, backing of ambitions, inertia and resistance to change frequently mentioned as dysfunctions of informal organization (Webber, 1979).

Like other organizations, in school there is a great deal of information communication, because it is speedy than the formal communication and it takes place among the individuals who have good interpersonal relationships. Grapevines carry it out, a network of informal communication in free and open climate (Megginson, 1981). Since communications is the basic human, necessity „grapevine“ does exist in all organizations.

Thus employees who know each other talk together informally about the happening in the organization. Rumors are more functional when information that flows through normal channels becomes ambiguous, unclear and inadequate. The distortion of information throughout the informal communication process can be minimized by providing the required information to the intended group or individual at appropriate time.

To make „grapevines“ more accurate and effective (Dean, 1985) has suggested the following: . Information, which could be misinterpreted, should be given to everyone quickly, clearly and fully, so that it is difficult for the grapevines to misinterpret it. Thus, the effectiveness of school leadership measured by their effectiveness to communicate with school community, because it is through such communication that the managerial activities such as coordination, delegation, controlling and decision-making are properly implemented in school.

Regarding the vitality of communication in school (Lucio, 1979) “Communication process is central to the life and effective functioning of school. In addition, to enhance the overall activities of schools, school leadership must create a good climate for staff members through effective communication system. It is through such communication system that they influence informal group for the attainment of educational goals and maintain a healthy relationship among school community. Generally, communication in organization is crucial for purpose of management planning, organizations and controlling. It is an efficient and effective way of integrating of all organized management activities.

Specially, the functions of communications in an organization include; School leader are able to establish and disseminate goals of the organization, to achievement, aims and objectives of the organization. Organize human and other resources in the most efficient and effective ways, central in selecting, developing and appraising members of the organizations.

It also, individual and group behavior is directed and modified, change is initiated and affected and goals are achieved, an important function of leadership and controls performances of all the school workers and informal groups because, through instruction, advice and guidance, people will endeavor to be able to achieve the established standards or goals of organization.

2.5 Management of Informal groups in an organization

According to Rees (1991), informal groups are dynamics to manage so that team efforts can be directed towards organizational productivity. School leaders can only minimize informal groups but will never eliminate them. Hellriegel and Slocam (2007) argue that leaders should first know why the group exists and diagnose group process to deal with conflicts within informal groups. Donald (1960) articulates that informal groups can lead to resistance to any changes in a formal

organization and this may damage the practice of school leaders. According to Donald, (1960), in order to handle informal groups, there is need to understand employee's position in the group social structure, Hofstede (1980) suggests that organizations can absorb informal leaders into the decision making structure, in order to avert threats to the stability of the formal organization and this reduces problems related to poor performance of school leaders.

Morgan (1997) points out that leaders should make informal groups know how the organizational functions are defined and the implications of employee behavior as well as monitoring conformance to these expectations as this helps to improve the performance of school leaders.

2.6 Leaders Influence Their Colleagues

Leadership, we have argued, entails influencing one's colleagues to act in ways likely to help accomplish the short-term goals and long-term directions considered desirable for the school. Although the effects of school leadership on pupils are mostly indirect, its effects on the actions of other organizational members are both direct and indirect. In this section, we review evidence about how leaders directly influence their colleagues. Both "followers'" and "leaders'" perspectives on this question are important to understand.

2.6.1 Followers' Perspectives

Principals in China are supposed to be role models for teachers, just as teachers are seen as role models for students (Cheng and Wong, 1996).

In the Chinese context, teachers are not only expected to know more than students do, but also to act as models across in all the moral aspects (ibid.). Similarly, principals are expected to achieve the same or preferably outperform teachers in all areas.

2.6.2 Leaders' Perspectives

Chinese school principals tend to rely more on the exchange and appraising tactics. As Wong (2006) observes, teachers' incomes come from two sources: Government funds (based on teachers' qualification, experience, responsibility and actual teaching load); and the school's own funds (based on teachers' individual performance). All teachers receive a basic bonus, but those who have succeeded in raising the performance of students on public tests or examinations, or in non-academic activities, are given an additional, and sometimes generous, bonus.

2.7 Teachers' Internal States

The majority of this section builds on the results of a recent, substantially larger review of literature about teachers' internal states and the working conditions, which influence them (Leithwood, 2005). This review synthesized the results of some 91 original empirical studies and 26 systematic reviews of relevant evidence published in reputable referred journals. By far the 23 largest proportion of this evidence was collected in primary or secondary school contexts. However, a sample of comparable evidence collected in non-school contexts also was examined in order to estimate how unique to teachers they are (at least with respect to the general types of working conditions which have been found to shape their internal states and inhibit, enable or enhance their work). (Stobart & Sammons, 2006).

The direct influence of teachers' in classroom work and student learning of at least eight specific emotions: individual sense of professional efficacy, collective sense of professional efficacy, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, stress and burnout, morale, trust in leaders and mutual trust among faculty, parents and students, and engagement or disengagement from the school and/or profession. Teachers' pedagogical content knowledge is also an obviously important internal cognitive state.

The most direct implication of this body of research for the researcher review is its identification of working conditions in the classroom and school, which significantly influence teachers' internal lives. If teachers' emotions and cognitions shape their instructional practices and impact on students, then modifying and refining those conditions is clearly an important source of leaders' indirect influence on pupil learning. The researcher outline, in the remainder of this section, those conditions, which contribute positively to the internal lives of teachers.

2.7.1 Classroom Conditions

Conditions in the classroom warranting the explicit attention of school leaders include workload complexity, student grouping practices, and curriculum and instruction. Workload Complexity. Teachers' feelings of stress, morale and commitment to their school are significantly influenced by the perceived complexity of their work. These feelings, in turn, demonstrably influence teachers' classroom performance and the learning of their students (Kushman, 1992; Ostroff, 1992). From teachers' perspectives,

Complexity increases when they are required to teach in areas for which they are not qualified or otherwise not well prepared and when their students uncooperative and achieve relatively poorly.

Complexity is perceived to be increasingly manageable, however, when teachers are given a significant degree of autonomy over classroom decisions. This allows them to do the job the best way they know how. Manageability also is increased, in their view, by an atmosphere throughout the school which encourages learning, sometimes called “academic press” (Ma & Willms, 2004) and when appropriate teaching and learning resources are readily available. Student Grouping.

At any, point over at least the last fifty years, a synthesis of available empirical evidence would have suggested, quite unambiguously, that students having difficulty at school, especially those disadvantaged by their socioeconomic backgrounds, learn more when they are working in heterogeneous rather than in homogeneous ability groups (Yonezawa, Wells, & Serna, 2002).

Relatively high expectations for learning, a faster pace of instruction, peer models of effective learning, and a more challenging curriculum are among the reasons offered for this advantage. In spite of this evidence, over this same period the bulk of teachers and administrators have enacted practices that separate students by ability. Their argument is that homogeneous grouping produces greater learning by allowing for the concentration of teaching and learning resources on the same set of learning problems. Many teachers as very difficult have regarded implementing heterogeneous grouping practices in classrooms. Nevertheless, this is one of the rare examples of professional "common sense" being just plain wrong. Curriculum considerable amount evidence suggests that the best curriculum for socially, economically or culturally disadvantaged children will often be the “rich curriculum” typically experienced by relatively advantaged students.

However, this rarely happens. Rather, many struggling children experience a curriculum focused on basic skills and knowledge, one lacking much meaning for any group of students. In a comprehensive synthesis of empirical evidence, Brophy (n.d.) touches on the main features of a “rich” curriculum, one in which the teaching strategies, learning activities, and assessment practices are clearly aligned and aimed at accomplishing the full array of knowledge, skills, attitudes, and dispositions valued by society. For some students and some purposes, the most useful forms of teaching will be direct, while for other students and purposes more student directed (constructivist) approaches will be most helpful. Teachers need to be skilled in a large repertoire of teaching and learning strategies and be able to determine when each element of that repertoire is likely to be most helpful if they are to accomplish a wide array of purposes with a diverse group of students. Without neglecting attention to the “basics”, the content of such a rich curriculum is organized around a set of powerful ideas.

These ideas are “internally coherent, well connected to other meaningful learning, and accessible for application”. Skills are taught with a view to their application in particular settings and for particular purposes.

In addition, these skills include general learning and study skills, as well as skills specific to subject domains. Such meta cognitive skills are especially beneficial for less able students who might otherwise have difficulty monitoring and self-regulating their own learning. “Deep understanding” is the goal for all students (Leithwood et al., in press). Brophy synthesis of research also suggests that effective teaching is conducted in a supportive classroom environment, one embedded in a caring learning community. In this environment, most of the class time is spent on curriculum-related activities and the class is managed to maintain students’ engagement in those activities.

Effective instruction also includes questions “planned to engage students in sustained discourse structured around powerful ideas”, and teachers provide the assistance students need “to enable them to engage in learning activities productively”. Children from diverse cultures also may require “culturally responsive” teaching (Jagers&Carroll, 2002; Riehl, 2000). Such teaching is based on the premise that students’ diverse cultures pose opportunities instead of problems for teachers. Teachers adopting this perspective identify the norms, values and practices associated with the often diverse cultures of their students and adapt their teaching to acknowledge, respect and build on them.

CHAPTER THREE

3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents description of study area, the research methodology, the research site, the sources of data, the study population, the sample size and sampling technique, the procedures of data collection, the data gathering tools and the methods of data analysis.

3.1. The study Area

This study was conducted in Wayu town capital of Botor Tollay district, Jimma Zone, Oromia regional state, south western Ethiopia. It is located at 240 Km to the south west of Addis Ababa, capital city of Ethiopia and at 160km to the east Jimma city. The altitude of Botor Tollay ranging between 1100 to 1800 m above sea level and its mean annual temperature ranges from 19 °C to 30 °C where its mean annual rainfall varies from 400 to 1500 mm/year.

3.2 Research Design

In this study a descriptive survey was employed with the assumption that it was helpful to obtain sufficient information from large number of respondents and to describe the prevailing situation in secondary schools and opinions related to the management of informal groups. It also helps to draw valid general conclusions (Creswell, 2009).

3.3 Research Method

Both quantitative and qualitative methods were employed to conduct the study. Because mixed research method is convenient based on the nature of the research which is used to cover a basic deficiencies and description of the study. (Creswell, 2009). Gaey, et al. (2009) also indicated that using mixed research method neutralizes or cancels the biases of any single method, and it is used as a means for seeking convergence and integrating qualitative and quantitative data.

To this effect, the primary data were collected from various respondents through questionnaires, open ended questionnaires and interviews where qualitatively analyzed.

3.4 Sources of Data

In the study the researcher collected information from both primary and secondary sources to achieve successfully the stated objectives of the study.

3.3.1 Primary sources of data

Primary data has used to increase the actuality of the study. The primary source of data used in this study was school leaders, school PTA members and teachers selected in study area.

3.3.2 Secondary sources of data

Secondary sources of data include different available written documents; such as, leadership documents or materials and reports in MoE, and books written on the issues of managing and leading informal organizations.

3.4. Population, Sample and Sampling Techniques

In the study multi stage cluster sampling and purposive sampling techniques were employed to select schools from Jima zone, Teachers and PTA members. Accordingly, From twenty three Woreda's of Jimma Zone five woreda (21.79%) were selected using cluster and simple random sampling methods. In the zone, there are eighty-five secondary schools. Among these schools the researchers were take six (11.8%) secondary schools using cluster and simple random sampling technique (i.e. lottery method). Beside this, the sample sizes of teachers in each of the ten secondary schools were proportionally determined based on the total sample size. On the other hand, 12 (2 from each school) PTA members were selected using purposive sampling method.

Teachers' sample for each school was determined using Hogg and Tanis (2006) proportional sampling formula:

$$n_p = \frac{n}{N} \times nP$$

Where n_p denoted proportional sample, n sample size, N population and nP subsection population. Consequently, from a total of 400 teachers in the five Woreda; 111 (30%) were taken as sample using random sampling technique particularly the lottery method. Since the school principals are responsible to exercise and facilitate the task managing informal groups in each secondary school, all school principals' was included in the study using purposive sampling. Accordingly, ten school principals were selected.

Table 3.1: Description of the sample work day's secondary Schools.

No	Respective Woredas of respondents	Name of school	School principal	Teachers	PTA members	Woreda expert	Remark
1	Qarsa	Serbo	2	18	2	1	
2	Limmukossa	Limmu Genet	2	18	2	1	
		Ambuye	2	19	2	1	
3	Gommaa	Agaro	2	19	2	1	
4	Botortolay	Tolay	2	19	2	1	
5	Manna	Yebu	2	18	2	1	
	5	6	12	111	12	6	
Sampling Technique	Cluster & simple random	Cluster simple random	Purposive	Simple random	Purposive	Purposive	

3.3. Data Gathering Instruments.

The research were employed multiple instruments to gather valuable data for the study. These include questionnaire and interviews. In addition, relevant reference books, journals, internet sources, MoE manuals frame work report, document, were consulted to support the findings of the study.

3.3.1. Questionnaire

Questionnaires are used to collect data on phenomena like attitude, motivation and perception, which are not easily observed. When opinions rather than facts are desired, a questionnaire with a rating scale is usually employed (Kumar 1996). This questionnaire were first prepared by the researcher himself by taking into account the basic research questions and designed with closed and open-ended type question items originally prepared in English language and translated to Afan Oromo during data collection to reduce misunderstanding that may occur while the respondents fill the questionnaires because some of them may not understand English, and then it is translated back to English for final report. Accordingly, forty-

one, 5-point liker scale items were prepared for teacher respondents. In terms of content, the two sets of questionnaires have 30 items (23 close-ended and 7 open ended items).

3.3.2 Interview

In this study the researcher made face to face manner of personal interview since the interview permits greater depth of response which is not possible through any other means. With this in mind, interview was prepared by the researcher himself and conducted in English/Afan Oromo and Amharic to make communication easier with twelve PTA members. Semi-structured interview question items were prepared for the purpose of the interview. The reason behind the semi-structured interview items was the advantage of flexibility in which new questions could be forwarded during the interview based on the responses of the interviewee. The interview guide question set for all group of respondents had one part which targeted to obtain information related to the basic research questions.

3.4 Procedure of Data Collection

To answer the research questions which were raised the researcher gone through series of data gathering procedures. The expected relevant data was gathered by using questionnaires, and interview, And Document Analysis. First of all, the researcher were develop questionnaires based on the existing literature and duplicated it in a single copy on which the research advisor commented on. After research advisor commented, having letters of authorization from Jimma University and JimmaZone Education Office (for additional letters towards Woredasand schools) for ethical clearance. After, having letters of authorization the pilot study was made by duplicating the questionnaires in limited numbers (10) participants were involved in testing. Then the end of all aspects relating to pilot test, the researcher was a plan to contact five Woreda's education offices and the principals of respective schools for authorization.

After that the researcher introduces his objectives and purposes to each school about how and when the questionnaires should be distributed to the respondents. Then, the final questionnaires were administered to sample teachers with in selected schools at the proposed time. The participants are allowed to give their own answers to each item independently as needed by the researcher. The activities are closely assisted and supervised by the researcher himself. Finally, the questionnaires were collected back at the right time with the collaboration of school principals by going to each secondary school.

3.5. Methods of data analysis and interpretation

In this study, both qualitative and quantitative data analysis method was employed. Quantitative data obtained from respondents through closed ended questionnaire were interpreted and presented in the form of table, percentage, mean score and standard deviation where as the collected qualitative data through open ended questionnaire; interview were verbalized mainly by narration, description and analyzed normatively.

3.6. Validity and Reliability of the Instruments

To check content validity and internal constancy (reliability) of the instruments pilot test was conducted prior to the final administration of the questionnaires. This helped the researcher to make necessary modifications so as to correct and avoid confusing and ambiguous questions. For pilot testing, 12 randomly selected teachers, 5 department head teachers and 1 purposively selected school principal as well as deputy principal of one school were made to fill the questionnaire and the researcher asked the respondents about the clarity and whether or not the questionnaire fully covered all the area and measures issues related to practices and challenges of managing informal groups in the schools. Based on the comments obtained from respondents , items which were not clear have been made clear, unnecessary items were made to be omitted and other items which are assumed to be important for the objective of the research and not included have been made part of the questionnaire.

The internal consistency reliability estimate was calculated using Cronbach's Coefficient of Alpha for the questionnaires. The researcher found the coefficient of alpha (α) to be 0.901, which is regarded as excellent correlation Coefficient by (Daniel M, 2004, and Jackson, 2009).

Supporting this, George and Mallery (2003) and Cohen, L, et al. (2007) also suggest that, the Cronbach's Alpha result >0.9 excellent, $\alpha>0.8$ good, $\alpha> 0.7$ acceptable, $\alpha< 0.6$ questionable, and < 0.5 poor.

Table 3:2: **Reliability test results**

Reliability Statistics		
	Cronbach's Alpha Based	
Cronbach's Alpha	on Standardized Items	N of Items
.901	.894	39

3.8. Ethical consideration

After receiving official letter of cooperation from Jimma University, the researcher communicated all institutions and individual participants legally and smoothly. The purpose of the study was made clear and understandable for all respondents. Any communication with the concerned bodies was accomplished at their voluntarily consent without harming and threatening the personal and institutional wellbeing. In addition, all information obtained from individual respondents and the school records were kept confidential.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of the Data

This chapter deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data gathered from the sample schools teachers, principals, and PTA members. The data obtained through questionnaires, interview, and documentary analysis were analyzed and interpreted in view of the basic questions raised in chapter one. Out of the 120 questionnaires distributed to teachers and principals, were filled and returned (111) and 12 interviewers were interviewed. Based on the responses obtained from the sample respondents, the analysis and interpretation of the data is presented immediately following the table which depicts the respective quantitative data.

Table 4.1: Description of Respondent's by sex, age, qualification and service year.

Items		Respondents							
		Teachers		Principals		PTA members		Woreda Supervisors	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Sex	M	75	67.5676	11	91.6667	8	67	6	100
	F	36	32	1	8	4	33	-	-
	T	111	100	12	100	12	100	6	100
Age	above 42	12	10.8108	6	50	2	16.67	-	-
	38-42	9	8.10810	0	0	8	67	1	16.67
	33-37	30	27.0270	6	50	2	16.67	5	83.33
	28-32	37	33.3333		-	-	-	-	-
	23-27	15	13.5135		-	-	-	-	-
	T	111	100	12	100				
Qualification	Diploma	-	-	-	-	6	50	-	-
	B.A/B.Sc	79	71.1711	5	41.8182	6	50	6	100
	M.A/Msc	22	19.8198	7	58			-	-
	PhD	-	-	-	-				
	T	111	100	12	100				
Service year	1-5	-	-	-	-	3	25	3	50
	6-10	12	10.8108	6	50	4	33	3	50
	11-15	9	8.10810	0	0	5	42	-	-
	16-20	30	27.0270	6	50	-	-	-	-
	21-25	37	33.3333	-	-	-	-	-	-
	26 and above	15	13.5135	-	-	-	-	-	-
	T	111	100	12	100	12	100	6	100

As illustrated in Table 4:1 86% of the teachers, 100 % of the principals, all PTA members and Woreda supervisors are within 28-42 years age range. Even some of these respondents were above 42 years of age. From the discussion, it may be possible for one to recognize that the greatest majority of the respondents have the level of maturity to provide a lot of ideas and information about the management of informal groups.

Table 4:1 also reveals that all (100%) of the teachers, principals and supervisors in the sample and the PTA members have their and first and second degree. The implication is that they have the ability to provide adequate information pertaining to the practice and challenges of managing informal organizations in their work place.

Still further table 1 depicts that almost all (100%) of the teachers and the principals; and 75% of the school's PTA members and half (50%) of the supervisors are reported to have served for more than six years in their current position. Thus, the longer years of service in either group implies the level of maturity they have to shoulder responsibilities entrusted to them and having a good deal of experience and knowledge regarding the main theme of the research: practice and challenges of managing informal groups in their respective schools.

Groups are an important factor of organizational life in that the entire organization and its sub-units are made up of groups of people who must cooperate in order for work to be done. Formal and informal groups exist in organizations and have a particular role to play; therefore an understanding of the nature of groups is vital if managers and leaders are to influence the behavior of people in the work or organizational situation.

Table 4:2. Rating on Division of labor and specialization related activities principal.

R.N	Activities	Respond	N	Mean	Std. Dev	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
1	Review standing school committee compositions to ensure the presence of students, parents, teachers and community where necessary.	Teachers	111	2.49	.908	1.524	121	0.13
		Principals	12	2.63	.898			
2	Encourage collaborative input in critical administrative exercises such as decision making, assessment and leadership.	Teachers	111	2.66	.955	1.443	121	0.152
		Principals	12	2.71	.985			
3	Revisit the concepts of shared decision making, empowerment, and collegial management relative to stakeholder participation	Teachers	111	2.98	1.104	1.116	121	0.267
		Principals	12	3.03	1.125			
4	Redefine educational role responsibilities to include significant others in the current school community when necessary.	Teachers	111	2.97	1.046	1.599	121	0.113
		Principals	12	2.86	.941			
5	Facilitate understanding of bureaucracy and the individual's role therein,	Teachers	111	2.63	1.090	0.409	121	0.683
		Principals	12	2.74	.998			
6	Develop a structural vehicle for facilitating staff and student decisional input	Teachers	111	3.07	1.098	2.239	121	0.027
		Principals	12	3.25	1.167			

N.B. N=number of respondents t= T-statistics Std =standard deviation

df =degree of freedom ($n_1 + n_2 - 2$) P=sig $\alpha = 0.05$ 2-tailed

As one can see from the table above table 4:2, the mean score for teachers(2.49, 2.66, 2.98, 2.97, 2.63, 3.07) and the mean score for principals (2.63,2.71,3.03,2.86, 2.74, and 3.25) fall between 2.5 – 3.49 (average) mean score respectively. This similar pattern of rating of both respondents justifies a reasonable effort made by the school principals in taking possible administrator action to promote the bureaucratic dimension of an informal organization. Consequently, tapping this potential can contribute to both school efficiency and effectiveness.

As indicated in table 4: 2, As can be seen in the P-value column of the table under treatment, the result for items 1,2,3,4,5, and 6, (P = 0.013, P= 0.152, P= 0.267, P = 0.113, and P= 0.68, respectively) shows that there are no significant differences in the mean rating of the two groups of respondents with regard to the above mentioned points (P>0.05).

However, it seems , we have observed perceptual difference as regards developing a structural vehicle for facilitating staff and student decisional input (item 7). It is said because the P-value for this particular item was 0.027 (which is less than P-value: $\alpha = 0.05$). But, if we critically look at the mean scores of both groups (3.07 and 3.25), the values fall within the same mean range category (between 2.5 and 3.49) which indicates moderate performance of principals pertaining to developing a structural vehicle for facilitating staff and student decisional input.

In fact we can guess the source of difference simply by looking the mean scores 3.07 and 3.25 that, the t-test identified difference in magnitude. All in all, one can conclude that secondary school principals are good at discharging their managerial responsibility in relation to the bureaucratic aspect of informal group management.

Table 4: 3. Rating on Impersonal orientation of principals

R.N	Activities	Respond	N	Mean	Std. Dev	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
1	Recognize teacher and student accomplishments via home-school communication,	Teachers	111	2.88	1.011	3.639	121	0.00
		Principals	12	3.08	.983			
2	Emphasize fairness and objectivity based on relationships rather than Selective decision making and rankings,	Teachers	111	2.94	1.022	2.076	121	0.04
		Principals	12	2.40	.953			
3	Emphasize equality when dealing with all school stakeholders.	Teachers	111	2.62	.913	1.016	121	0.312
		Principals	12	2.88	1.066			
4	Encourage activities designed to warm the classroom/school climate.	Teachers	111	2.98	1.078	1.561	121	0.121
		Principals	12	2.49	.908			
5	View seemingly idle conversation as potential for valuable informal cooperation.	Teachers	111	2.63	.898	2.914	121	0.004
		Principals	12	2.66	.955			
6	Accept that the very irrationality one tries to minimize can contribute to the foundation of effective informal organization.	Teachers	111	2.71	.985	6.57	121	0.00
		Principals	12	2.98	1.104			

N.B. N=number of respondents

t= T-statistics Std =standard deviation

df =degree of freedom ($n_1 + n_2 - 2$)

P=sig $\alpha = 0.05$ 2-tailed

This is to mean that ,a glance at Table 4: 3 indicates that, with the exception of item 2 and 4, the principals and the teachers believe that there is a moderate /reasonable degree of school principals impersonal orientation , for example , in taking possible administrator action such as : recognizing teacher and student accomplishments via home-school communication, emphasizing equality when dealing with all school stakeholders, viewing seemingly idle conversation as potential for valuable informal cooperation, and accepting that the very irrationality one tries to minimize can contribute to the foundation of effective informal organization.

Contrast to the above ratings, the principals rating of themselves pertaining to school principals' impersonal orientation in taking administrative action such as emphasizing fairness and objectivity based on relationships rather than selective decision making and rankings, and encouraging activities designed to warm the classroom/school climate was low.

In fact, as depicted in table 4:3 in four of the six cases it has been observed that there was significant difference of opinion between the respondents ($P < 0.05$: 0.00, 0.04, 0.004, and 0.00).Although we did not deny such a difference of views, the difference still was clear manifestation of both groups doubt about impersonal orientation of principals in taking administrative action. This include the practice of viewing seemingly idle conversation as potential for valuable informal cooperation, and accepting that the very irrationality one tries to minimize can contribute to the foundation of effective informal organization.

By implication, respondents' opinion difference justifies some sort of sluggishness of school leaders as far as the execution of the case in point. In support of this argument, in responding to an interview question, PTA members expressed that this kind of very democratic and civilized managerial practice seems to have been completely absent in the secondary schools. They stated that the school principals don't have such kind of personality. Likewise, woreda supervisors, in responding to a similar interview question responded that:" Almost in all secondary schools, there was no such kind of managerial and customary practice. There is no doubt there are different levels of leadership, but within our secondary schools there are individuals/principals who have characteristics of a traditional leader.

Table 4:4 Hierarchy of authority related activities of principals

R.N	Activities	Respond	N	Mean	Std. Dev	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
1	Minimize coordination through order-giving,	Teachers	111	2.97	1.046	4.51	121	0.01
		Principals	12	2.86	.941			
2	Minimize position in the decision making process,	Teachers	111	2.63	1.090	2.493	121	0.014
		Principals	12	2.74	.998			
3	Assist all school members in overcoming their reluctance to communicate with perceived superiors,	Teachers	111	3.07	1.098	1.265	121	0.208
		Principals	12	3.25	1.167			
4	Provide information sessions for all organizational members on how their school is really managed,	Teachers	111	2.95	1.036	1.875	121	0.063
		Principals	12	2.88	1.011			
5	Make existing school structure more user-friendly, and	Teachers	111	3.08	.983	1.769	121	0.079
		Principals	12	2.94	1.022			
6	Help stakeholders understand the meaning of individual-institutional interaction.	Teachers	111	2.50	.953	1.287	121	0.2
		Principals	12	2.62	.913			

N.B. N=number of respondents

t= T-statistics Std =standard deviation

df =degree of freedom

$(n_1 + n_2 - 2)$ P=sig $\alpha = 0.05$ 2-tailed

The evidences presented in table 4: 4, above attempts to throw light on the practice of school principals as regards ensuring that the hierarchies of authority in schools were enhance rather than detract from informal school organization. As it stands to reason, the two groups of respondents unanimously demonstrated that the school principals had moderate/ average level of performance in accomplishing the above hierarchy of structure related activities (the mean scores of both respondents are greater than 2.5: 2.97, 2.63, 3.07, 2.95, 3.08, and 2.50 for teachers and 2.86, 2, 74, 3.25, 2.88, 2.94, and 2.62 for principals respectively). On the whole, the evidences

gathered illustrated that school principals are in a good position in accomplishing tasks related with hierarchy structure to tap the informal groups in and out of the school.

The t-test result for items 3,4,5,and 6 (where $P > 0.05$: 0.208, 0.063,0.079, and 0.2 respectively) also shows that there is no significant differences in the mean ratings of the two groups of respondents with regard to ensuring that the hierarchy of authority in schools enhances rather than detract from informal school organization. Although, the t-test result for items 1 and 2($P < 0.05$: 0.01 and 0.014 respectively) displays opinion disagreement , it doesn't justify reliable disagreement. Because, the mean rating of both groups fluctuates within the moderate mean range category (2.97, 2.63, 2.86, 2, 74).

The interview response with the PTA members and Woreda supervisors indicated that: As it is clearly known, principals often try to engage parents and some community through encouraging their involvement in school management, student related affairs regardless of their position in the decision making process, providing information sessions for all organizational Members on how their School is “really managed“, and helping community members and parents Understand The meaning of individual- institutional / school community interaction. Thewhole evidences gathered illustrated that school principals are in a good position in accomplishing tasks related with hierarchy structure to tap the informal groups in and out of the school.

Table 4: 5: Rule and regulation development and deployment in the school

R.N	Activities	Respond	N	Mean	Std. Dev	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
1	Create a multi-stakeholder committee to draft new rules and regulations when needed	Teachers	111	3.03	1.125	1.232	121	0.22
		Principals	12	3.0	1.2			
2	Create a multi-stakeholder committee to review new rules and regulations when needed	Teachers	111	2.95	1.036	0.807	121	0.421
		Principals	12	3.1	1.0			
3	Allow school committee to vet all rules and regulations prior to implementation	Teachers	111	2.10	.600	0.668	121	0.505
		Principals	12	2.19	.649			
4	Understand reasons for the existence of informal groups in the school compliance with due process	Teachers	111	2.35	.731	0.911	121	0.364
		Principals	12	2.03	.609			
5	Examine the impact of specific rules and regulations on the Informal groups in the school	Teachers	111	1.96	.742	1.041	121	0.3
		Principals	12	2.03	.758			
6	Ascertain the “goodness of fit“ between specific rules and regulations and school goals	Teachers	111	2.37	.825	0.417	121	0.678
		Principals	12	2.36	.824			

N.B. N=number of respondents t= T-statistics Std =standard deviation
df =degree of freedom $(n_1 + n_2 - 2)$ P=sig $\alpha = 0.05$ 2-tailed

As illustrated in table 4:5, principals performance was found to be moderate / reasonable in the eyes of teachers and themselves in creating a multi-stakeholder committee to draft new rules and regulations when needed, to review new rules and regulations when needed (the mean scores fell between 2.95 and 3.03 inclusive) .

As far as items 2,3,4,5 and 6 are concerned the pattern of the respondents' reaction seemed almost similar demonstrating a feeling of high level of dissatisfaction. The mean scores are within 1.96 – 2.37 range for both groups of respondents; implying deficiency- low (very low) status of principals informal group managing practice.

So also the t-test result evidenced no significant opinion difference between the two groups of respondents. As can be seen in the P-Value column of the table under treatment, the t- test result for items 1,2,3,4,5, and 6 (0 .22, 0.421,0.505, 0.364,0.3 and 0.678 respectively) shows that there are no significant perceptual differences in the mean ratings of the two groups of respondents with regard to principals regular endeavor in rule and regulation development and deployment in the school.

Furthermore, to better digest the arguments above over the issue under treatment, it was paramount importance to look at the interview data given by PTA members and worded as supervisor: They stated it very clearly: Everything we describe by or link to the word “formal” is always following certain procedures, forms or principles and there exists a common understanding about it. However, when we talk about informal aspects, the preconceived impression is something casual and without prescribed rules. Consequently, every school rule and regulation enacted is meant to work and implemented against the informal social groups in the same school. It seems well-nigh and unethical at the present time to allow.

Table4 : 6: Rating on Principals' knowledge of informal groups

R.N	Activities	Respond	N	Mean	Std. Dev	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
1	Take immediate action on urgent decisions;	Teachers	111	2.88	.844	0.712	121	0.478
		Principals	12	2.68	.912			
2	Exercise clear and decisive delegation;	Teachers	111	2.91	.900	0.736	121	0.463
		Principals	12	3.03	.870			
3	Stress outcomes;	Teachers	111	3.06	.788	0.918	121	0.36
		Principals	12	3.15	.744			
4	Develop clear philosophy as a basis for decision making;	Teachers	111	2.74	.751	2.426	121	0.017
		Principals	12	3.03	.870			
5	Monitor positive relations with students	Teachers	111	2.88	.913	2.05	121	0.043
		Principals	12	2.70	.810			
6	Monitor positive relations with teachers	Teachers	111	2.71	.799	2.279	121	0.024
		Principals	12	2.79	.914			
7	Monitor positive relations with administrative employees	Teachers	111	2.79	1.008	1.914	121	0.058
		Principals	12	2.97	.810			
8	Maintain positive relations with students.	Teachers	111	2.82	.968	2.073	121	0.04
		Principals	12	2.76	.819			
9	Maintain positive relations with teachers	Teachers	111	3.00	.921	2.419	121	0.017
		Principals	12	2.94	.814			
10	Maintain positive relations with administrative employees	Teachers	111	2.94	.919	0.091	121	0.928
		Principals	12	3.62	1.101			
11	Use informal structure/groups as an effective vehicle for communication;	Teachers	111	3.53	.992	0.355	121	0.723
		Principals	12	3.47	1.051			
12	Use informal structure/groups as a means of developing cohesion;	Teachers	111	3.06	.983	0.233	121	0.816
		Principals	12	3.32	1.007			
13	Use informal structure/groups as a device for protecting the integrity of individuals in the school	Teachers	111	3.38	.888	2.25	121	0.026
		Principals	12	3.00	.825			
14	Understand that informal school organization is an important leadership responsibility for them	Teachers	111	2.1	.824	2.426	121	0.017
		Principals	12	2.45	.758			

N.B. N=number of respondents

t= T-statistics Std =standard deviation

df =degree of freedom

($n_1 + n_2 - 2$)P=sig $\alpha = 0.05$ 2-tailed

As depicted in table 4;6above, Accordingly, items 1, 2,3,4,5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 were rated as reasonable or average by all of the respondents (mean scores fell between 2.1 and 3.1 range).The scores revealed that principals demonstrate there was lack of adequate knowledge base and relevant management knowledge to utilize the potential of informal organizations in their

respective school. There is also a strong substantiation that, items 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 were rated by the two groups of respondents “low “(mean scores fell between 2.1 and 3.1 ranges). This is to mean that low school principals make evident that they do have adequate knowledge and relevant management knowledge to utilize the potential of informal organizations by maintaining positive relations with administrative employees, using informal structure/groups as an effective vehicle for communication; utilizing informal structure/groups as a means of developing cohesion; and using informal structure/groups as a device for protecting the integrity of individuals in the school, because the researcher also believe that the above challenges were solved if there were relevant management knowledge and unity among the all school stake holders. As indicated in table 6, the Independent sample t-test was used to determine the significance of differences in average rating of the two groups of respondents for all items. As can be seen in the P-Value column of the table under treatment, the t-test result for items 1,2,3,7,10,11, and 12 (0.478,0.463,0.36,0.058,0.928,0.723 and 0.816 respectively , where $P > 0.05$) displays perceptual agreement in between the respondents. The agreement solidifies the above conclusion as far as the issue under consideration is concerned.

While on the other hand, the t-test result of items 4,5,6,8,9,13 and 14 (0.017, 0.049, 0.024, 0.04, 0.017, 0.026 and 0.0.17 respectively) shows that there are significant differences in the mean rating of the two groups of respondents with regard to the above mentioned points ($P < 0.05$). Well, the opinion difference is a fact ; but, such a difference doesn't contradict with the conclusion made above: the existence of a good knowledge foundation of principals as regards the importance and natural existence of informal organizations/groups in their respective secondary schools. In this connection it will be beneficial to look at similar interview evidences. The interview response with the supervisors and PTA members indicated that: Our secondary school principals do have adequate knowledge of the existence of informally organized groups in their respective schools. Besides they know the kind of effect or influence they have. For example, they are well aware of their social, social and political powerful influence. Furthermore, they know that these groups of people / employee have the right to be organized. But, what matters most importantly is utilizing / tapping the talents, capabilities and gifts of members of the different groups for the good of the secondary schools.

Taking all the information inputs together, one can conclude that there were encouraging sets of good practice and appropriate aspiration of school principals in managing informal organizations in the schools.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. SUMMERY'S CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMONDATIONS

In this chapter conclusion and recommendation which depends on the result of the findings were presented.

5. 1. SUMMERY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

The summary of the study is presented below. The finding of the study justified that a reasonable amount of effort was made by the school principals in taking possible administrative actions to promote the bureaucratic dimension of an informal organization. Consequently, tapping this potential can contribute to both school efficiency and effectiveness. The mean score for teachers (2.49, 2.66, 2.98, 2.97, 2.63, 3.07) and the mean score for principals (2.63,2.71,3.03,2.86, 2.74, and 3.25) fall between 2.5 – 3.49 (average) mean score respectively.

The study also revealed that, with few exceptions of , the principals and the teachers believe that there is a moderate /reasonable degree of school principals impersonal orientation , for example , in taking possible administrator action such as : recognizing teacher and student accomplishments via home-school communication, emphasizing equality when dealing with all school stakeholders, viewing seemingly idle conversation as potential for valuable informal cooperation, and accepting that the very irrationality one tries to minimize can contribute to the foundation of effective informal organization. (the mean for principals rating ranges from 2.40 – 3.08 . on the other hand ; the mean score for teachers' rating ranges from 2.62 - 2.98).

As it stands to reason, the finding of the study demonstrated that the school principals had moderate/ average level of performance in accomplishing the hierarchy of structure related activities (the mean scores of both respondents are greater than 2.5 : 2.97, 2.63, 3.07, 2.95, 3.08, and 2.50 for teachers and 2.86, 2,74, 3.25, 2.88, 2.94, and 2.62 for principals respectively).

5.2. CONCLUSIONS

The study has been carried out in Oromia Regional state, Jimma zone, to examine existing challenges of managing informal organization in secondary schools. In dealing with the research questions, related literature was reviewed. As information sources questionnaire, interview and document review were used. The total number of respondents responding to the study were 136, comprising of teachers, principals, school PTA members and Woreda Supervisor. The finding of the study revealed that a reasonable amount of effort was made by the school principals in taking possible administrative actions to promote the bureaucratic dimension of an informal

organization. Consequently, tapping this potential can contribute to both school efficiency and effectiveness.

In spite of the fact that secondary school principals demonstrated low or poor performance in very few aspects of informal group management, in the majority of informal organization management dimensions, they have demonstrated adequate knowledge base and relevant management knowledge to utilize the potential of informal organizations in their respective school. The study also revealed that, with few exceptions of , the principals and the teachers believe that there is a moderate /reasonable degree of school principals impersonal orientation , for example , in taking possible administrator action such as recognizing teacher and student accomplishments via home-school communication, emphasizing equality when dealing with all school stakeholders, viewing seemingly idle conversation as potential for valuable informal Cooperation and accepting that the very irrationality one tries to minimize can contribute to the foundation of effective informal organization. As it stands to reason, the finding of the study demonstrated that the school principals had moderate/ average level of performance in accomplishing the hierarchy of structure related activities.

And the information gathered from interviewers support the above conclusion. The finding also indicated that there is a feeling of high level of dissatisfaction pertaining to some rule development and deployment dimension of managing informal groups in schools. Lastly, the finding of the study identified that the following were challenges usually faced by secondary school principals in harnessing the benefits of informal organizations in their respective schools includes: lack of rational knowledge of informal groups and informal networks, poor communication channels of school leaders, poor leadership skills, poor coordination, unwillingness to involve followers in decision making, political pressure, partiality lack of materials and budget and poor organizational culture are major bottlenecks that impede school principals in effectively managing informal organizations.

5.3 RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings of the study and conclusions made, the following recommendations and policy implications are forwarded to different level of decision makers in the area.

Effectively managing an informal school organization is an important leadership responsibility for school principals. The building of such synergy and cohesion among school members requires ability to diagnose and manage the informal groups in their nascent stages before they blow out of proportion and hinder students' academic performance.

While policies or programs are going to be launched informal and formal Organizations shall first consult all the stakeholders to inform concerning their demands and how it is feasible to the concerned body for the purpose of creating awareness and to enhance its implementation and efficiency.

For Coordination and cooperation to be prevalence in Schools it needs the school leaders to give rational and enough answers for complains of the teachers and students. To develop and promote low or poor performance the Organizations must provide different workshops and training on the issue for the all concerned body to build their capacity.

Rule of law according the FDRE constitution is one of the highest laws in the country and it is expected that all members of the country should be under the law. Especially formal and informal Organizations need to be abiding by the laws of the country. Thus, some form of corrections in this matter is relevant for school stakeholders.

Follow up mechanisms and school rules to avoid bureaucracy and respect hierarchy in school have great role if they are established by Schools. School heads ought to be encouraged to be alert and sensitive to informal group formation and be well prepared to work together with the informal leader in order to achieve positive results. To this effect, appropriate awareness creation forums and short term training should be prepared at the school level by the school principals and the school management board. School Principals must utilizing informal communication networks as a way of gathering useful information for identifying problems in the organization before they grow out of hand . Hence, in addition to any sort of short term training, principals should develop the habit of self-learning and referring relevant books and materials in this regard.

Reference

- AyalewShibeshi (1991) Approaches to educational organization and management. Unpublished teaching materials.A.A.U Department of Educational Administration, Faculty of Education.Hall.
- Armstrong,M.(2005).Managing Performance: Performance Management in action. London: CIPD.
- Armstrong, M. (2003). Team rewards; London chartered institute of personnel and development.
- Armstrong, M. and Baron, A. (1998).Performance management.London, Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Bass, B.M.,&Avolio, B. J. (1994).Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York: The Free Press.
- Bennett, N., Harvey, J. A., Wise, C., & Woods, P. A. (2003).Distributed leadership: A desk Study. Retrieved: March 18, 2015.From [www.ncsl.org.uk/literature reviews](http://www.ncsl.org.uk/literature%20reviews).
- Bennett (1991), Cultural Differences in Motivation to Learn- Internet TESL Journal
- Bennis, W. G. (2004). The seven ages of the leader. Harvard Business Review, 82(1), 46-53,112.
- Benjamin, J. B. (1999). Creating a climate for change students ,teachers ,Administrators working together. Chicago: NASSP.
- Best, J. (2003).ReaserchIn Education. NewDelhi: Prentice Hall of IndiaPvt.Ltd. Best, J. K. (2003).ReaserchIn Education. NewDelhi: Prentice Hall of IndiaPvt.Ltd.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Cresswell.J (2009).Research Design. London: International and professional publisher.
- Creswell, J. a. (2003). Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, andmixed Methods approaches. London : Sage publications.
- Conway (2002) Psychological Contracts Cover- LSE Research Online: London
- Campbell-Evans, G. (1988). The nature and influence of values in principal decision-making.Unpublished doctoral thesis.University of Toronto, Toronto, ON
- Fullan, M. (2001).Leading in a culture of change. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fullan, M. (2003).The moral imperative of school leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press

- French, W.L and Bell, C.H(1999) organization Development :Behavioural Science interventions for organization Improvement.
- Goldman, D. (2000). Leadership that gets results. Harvard Business Review.78-90
- Goldman, E. (2002).The significance of leadership style. Educational Leadership, 55(7), 20-22
- Greeberg and Robert A Baron (2007), Behavior in organizations: Prentice Hall
- Griffin (2000), The persistence of structural priming: Transient Activation or Implicit Learning: Stanford University.
- Hallinger, P. (2003) „School leadership development“, in J.P. Keeves and R. Watanabe (eds.), International Handbook of Educational Research in the Asia-Pacific Region. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishes.
- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. Cambridge Journal of Education, 33(3), 329-351.
- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. Cambridge Journal of Education, 33(3), 329-351
- Handy, (1996).Job performance. Wall Street, Journal, May 12, 1984 pp B1, B2
- Handy (1993), Understanding Organizations.Wall Street.
- Harris, A and Bennett, N. 2001.in Alma.H and Nigel. B. School effectiveness and school alternative perspectives. (Pp 1 -4).London: Continuum
- Harris, A. (2005). Improving School Through Teachers'Leadership. New York: Open University.
- Harris, A. (2003). Teachers Leadership and School Improvement .London : Rout ledge falmer.
- Harris, A.,& Chapman, C. (2002). Effective leadership in schools facing challenging circumstances. Nottingham, UK: National College for School Leadership (NCSL).
- Harris A. (2004a). Distributed leadership and school improvement: Leading or misleading Educational Management and Administration, 32(1), 11 -24.
- Harris, A. (2004b). Teacher leadership and distributed leadership: An exploration of the literature. Leading and Managing, 10(2), 1 -10.
- Harris, A. (2005). Crossing boundaries and breaking barriers: Distributing leadership in schools: Specialist Schools Trust. <http://www.sst-inet.net>
- Harris, A., & Chapman, C. (2002).Effective leadership in schools facing challenging circumstances. Nottingham, UK: National College for School Leadership (NCSL).
- Harris, A., &Muijs, D. (2004).Improving schools through teacher leadership. London: Oxford University Press.

- Henderson, John. 1994. *Eastern and Central Arrernte to English Dictionary*, Alice Springs: IAD press.
- Hersey, P. A. (1996). *Management of Organizational Behaviour Utilizing Human Resources* 7th Ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hoy NK, Miskel, C.G. (1992). *Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice*. 2nd Edition. Random House, New York. pp. 22-24.
- Hoy, W.K. & Miskel, C.G. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice*, 8th edition. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Hoy, W.K. & Miskel, C.G. (2001). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice*, 6th edition. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Johansson, C. (2003). *Visionary och verklighet (Visions and reality, in Swedish)*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsalensis. Jacobson, S. L.,
- Johnson, L., Ylimaki, R. and Giles, C. (2005). Successful leadership in challenging US schools: enabling principles, enabling schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43 (6), pp. 607-618.
- John, C.M. (2002). *Million leaders Mandate. Notebook one*. Equip Publishers, America.
- Johnson & Scholes (2004) *Exploring Corporate Strategy (text & cases)*, 6th Edition, Pearson Education Limited.
- Johnson and Scholes (1999) *Exploring Corporate Strategy*: Prentice Hall.
- Kimbrough, R.B. & Nunnery, M.Y. (1988). *Educational administration: An introduction*. New York: MacMillan.
- Knezevich, S. (1984). *Administration of public education*. London: Harper and Row.
- Kotter, J P (1991) Power, dependence and effective management, in *Managing People and Organizations*, ed J Gabarro, pp 33–49, Harvard Business School Publications, Boston, MA.
- Kumar, R. (2005). *Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners*. (2nd ed.). England: Sage publication Ltd.
- Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2005). What we know about successful school leadership. In W. Firestone & C. Riehl (Eds.), *A new agenda: Directions for research on educational leadership* (pp. 22-47). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- Leithwood, K., Riedlinger, B., Bauer, S., & Jantzi, D. (2003). Leadership program effects on student learning: The case of the Greater New Orleans School Leadership Center. *Journal of School Leadership and Management*, 13(6), 707-738.
- Leithwood, K., & Hallinger, P. (Eds.). (2003). *International Handbook of Educational Leadership* (2nd Ed.). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Leithwood, K., Seashore-Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influence student learning: A review of research for the Learning from Leadership Project*. New York: The Wallace Foundation.
- Leithwood, K., & Steinbach, R. (1995). *Expert problem solving processes: Evidence from principals and super intedents*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Lewis M.D (1997) *Personality self Organization: cascading Constructions on Cognition – emotion interaction*.
- M. Armstrong. (1991). *Ahand book of Personnel Management Practice* 4th edition. London: Kogan. Norton,
- M. (2005). *Executive Leadership for Effective Administration* . Boston: Pearson.
- Miller, P. W. (1998). *Nonverbal communication: what a researcher says to the teachers* (3 rded.). USA: Nea. (pp. 6-7, 11 -14, 18, 22).
- Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structure of organizations*: Englewood Chiff: Prentice Hall.
- MoE.(2010). *General Education Quality Assurance package*. Addis Ababa
- MOE. (2010). *Educational Sector Development Program Document* . Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- MOE. (2008). *Review of the Ethiopia Education and Training Police and its Implimentation* . Addis Ababa : EMPDA.
- MoE. (1994). *The education and training policy of Ethiopia*. Addis Ababa: EMPDA.
- MoE. (2006). *Decentralized management of education in Ethiopia: A reference manual*.
- Morrison AJ, et al (2010) *A Guide to Teaching practice* New York: Routledge.
- Mullins, L.J. (2005). *Management and Organizational Behaviour*. Seventh edition prentice Hall.
- Mullins L.J (2010), *Management and Organizational Behaviour*: Financial Times, Prentice Hall.
- Owens, R. (1970). *Organizational behavior in schools*. Engle wood cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall.
- Owens, R. (1987). *Organizational behavior in education*. EngleWoodCliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall.
- Owens, R. (2004). *Organizational behavior in education*. New york: Pearson. Principals, N. P.
- MOE,(2013). *Standard for School Principals*. Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.

- Schein (1950), Organization and Management- Google Books
- Schein, E. (1990). Organizational Culture .Newyork :Campusverlag .
- Scholes, J. a. (1999).ExploringCorporateStratege(text and cases). London: PrenticeHall. Scocam,
- H. a. (2007). Fundamentals of Organizations:.. India: PrenticeHall.
- Sergiovanni, T.S &Starratt, R.J. (1987)..Supervision; Human perspective.New York; McGraw hill.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1999).Rethinking Leadership for Administration.AringtonHeights,II.: Sky light professional Development.
- Seyoum&Ayalew.(1989).Fundamental In Educational Research for students and Beginning researchers. Addis Ababa: AAU printing press.
- Shcoles, J. a. (2004).Exploring Corporate Strategy Sixth edition. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Silver, P. (1983).Educational Administration. New York: Harper and Row.
- Simon, H. (1947). Administrative Behaviour .Astudy of decision making processes in Administrative organizations .Chicago : Macmillan .
- Simon, H. (1993). Decision-making: Rational, non-rational and irrational. Educational Administration Quarterly, 29, 392-411.
- Simon, H. (1957). Administrative behavior,2nd edition. New York: MacMillan.
- Spataro, S. (2015, March 18). Informal Status in Formal Organizations. Retrieved March 18, 2015,from Difference in Respects and Prestige among CoWorkers<http://www.mba.yale.edu/faculty/pdf>.
- Spataro, S, E (2004).Informal status in Formal Organizations: Differences in Respects and Prestige among Co -workers. Yale School of Management.
- Stevens, J (2005) High Performance Wales: Real experiences, real success, Wales Management Council, Cardiff.
- Stewart, R (1967) Managers and Their Jobs, Macmillan, London.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. Journal of Psychology, 25, 35-71.
- Thompson, M and Heron, P (2005) Management capability and high-performance work organization, The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 16 (6), pp
- Treslan, D.L. (2008). Tips for principals: Facilitating the bureaucracy learning Organization interface. The Bulletin, 5, 26-27.
- Way, C. (2002). Psychological Contracts. London: Cover-LSE Research online.

- Waters, T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2004). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on pupil achievement*. A working paper.
- Waters, T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on pupil achievement*. A working paper. Aurora, CO: Mid-contine Research for Education and Learning.

Appendices
JIMMA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
DEPARTEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Questionnaire to be filled by Teachers

Dear respondents,

The purpose of these questionnaires is to collect relevant data to the study entitled “Practice and challenges of managing informal groups in secondary schools of JimmaZone”. Your responses are vital for the success of the study. So you are kindly requested to read all the questions and fill the questionnaires with genuine responses. Your response will be used only for academic purpose

1. You do not need to write your name on the questionnaires.
2. Read all the instruction before attempting to answer the questions.
3. There is no need to consult others to fill the questionnaires.
4. Please provide appropriate response by using tick “√” or X to choose one of the suggested Likert scale items .
5. Please write your opinion briefly for the short answer questions on the space provided.

Thank you, in advance.

SECTION ONE :General information and personal data

1.1. Name of the School _____

1.2. Sex : male female

1.3. Age: 18-22 23-27 28-32 33-37 38-42 above 42 .

1.4. Work experience: . 1 -5 years 6-10years 11 -15 years 16-20 years
21 – 25 years 26 years and above

1.5 Educational backgrounds. Diploma First degree Second degree

1.6 Current work position: Teacher Department head Unit Leader

other specify _____

SECTION TWO : The practice of managing informal groups / informal relationships .

- Please use one of the following Likert scales to indicate your response.
- Key : 5=Strongly Agree , 4=Agree , 3=Undecided , 2= Disagree or 1=Strongly Disagree
- Use “√” or “X” mark to indicate the scale you choose in the table corresponding to each item.

R.N.	Items	Scales				
		1	2	3	4	5
	Division of labor and specialization related activities of principals					
1	review standing school committee compositions to ensure the presence of students, parents, teachers and community where necessary					
2	encourage collaborative input in critical administrative exercises such as decision making, assessment and leadership,					
3	revisit the concepts of shared decision making, empowerment, and collegial management relative to stakeholder participation					
5	redefine educational role responsibilities to include significant others in the current school community when necessary,					
6	facilitate understanding of bureaucracy and the individual’s role therein,					
7	develop a structural vehicle for facilitating staff and student decisional input					
	Impersonal orientation of principals					
8	recognize teacher and student accomplishments via home-school communication,					
9	emphasize fairness and objectivity based on relationships rather than selective decision making and rankings,					
10	emphasize equality when dealing with all school stakeholders,					
11	encourage activities designed to warm the classroom/school climate,					
12	view seemingly idle conversation as potential for valuable informal cooperation					
13	accept that the very irrationality one tries to minimize can contribute to the foundation of effective informal organization					
	Hierarchy of authority related activities of principals					
14	minimize coordination through order-giving,					

15	Minimize position in the decision making process,					
16	assist all school members in overcoming their reluctance to communicate with perceived superiors,					
17	provide information sessions for all organizational members on how their school is really managed,					
18	make existing school structure more user-friendly, and					
19	help stakeholders understand the meaning of individual-institutional interaction.					
D.	Rule and regulation development and deployment in the school					
20	create a multi-stakeholder committee to draft new rules and regulations when needed					
21	create a multi-stakeholder committee to review new rules and regulations when needed					
22	Allow school committee to vet all rules and regulations prior to implementation					
23	Understand reasons for the existence of informal groups in the school compliance with due process					
24	examine the impact of specific rules and regulations on the informal groups in the school					
25	ascertain the “goodness of fit” between specific rules and regulations and school goals					
E.	Principals’ knowledge of informal groups					
	Principals :					
26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> take immediate action on urgent decisions; 					
27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> exercise clear and decisive delegation; 					
28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> stress outcomes; 					
29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop clear philosophy as a basis for decision making; 					
30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> monitor positive relations with students 					
31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> monitor positive relations with teachers 					
32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> monitor positive relations with administrative employees 					
33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> maintain positive relations with students. 					
34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> maintain positive relations with teachers 					

35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> maintain positive relations with administrative employees 					
36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> use informal structure/groups as an effective vehicle for communication; 					
37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> use informal structure/groups as a means of developing cohesion; 					
38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> use informal structure/groups as a device for protecting the integrity of individuals in the school 					
39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> understand that informal school organization is an important leadership responsibility for them 					

- What challenges do you think; principals often face in harnessing their academic and administrative staff's informal networks?

- What measures do you recommend to overcome challenges faced by principals in harnessing their staff's informal networks ?

JIMMA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
DEPARTEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Questionnaire to be filled by principals/vice principals

Dear respondents,

The purpose of these questionnaires is to collect relevant data to the study entitled “Practice and challenges of managing informal groups in secondary schools of JimmaZone”. Your responses are vital for the success of the study. So you are kindly requested to read all the questions and fill the questionnaires with genuine responses. Your response will be used only for academic purpose

1. You do not need to write your name on the questionnaires.
2. Read all the instruction before attempting to answer the questions.
3. There is no need to consult others to fill the questionnaires.
4. Please provide appropriate response by using tick “√” or X to choose one of the suggested Likert scale items .
5. Please write your opinion briefly for the short answer questions on the space provided.

Thank you, in advance.

SECTION ONE :General information and personal data

1.1. Name of the School _____

1.2. Sex : male female

1.3. Age: 18-22 23-27 28-32 33-37 38-42 above 42 .

1.4. Work experience as a principal:

1 -5 years 6-10years 11 -15 years 16-20 years

21 – 25 years 26 years and above

1.5 Educational backgrounds. Diploma First degree Second degree

SECTION TWO : The practice of managing informal groups / informal relationships .

- Please use one of the following Likert scales to indicate your response.
- Key : 5=Strongly Agree , 4=Agree , 3=Undecided , 2= Disagree or 1=Strongly Disagree
- Use “√” or “X” mark to indicate the scale you choose in the table corresponding to each item.

R.N.	Items	Scales				
		1	2	3	4	5
	Division of labor and specialization related activities of principals					
1	review standing school committee compositions to ensure the presence of students, parents, teachers and community where necessary					
2	encourage collaborative input in critical administrative exercises such as decision making, assessment and leadership,					
3	revisit the concepts of shared decision making, empowerment, and collegial management relative to stakeholder participation					
5	redefine educational role responsibilities to include significant others in the current school community when necessary,					
6	facilitate understanding of bureaucracy and the individual’s role therein,					
7	develop a structural vehicle for facilitating staff and student decisional input					
	Impersonal orientation of principals					
8	recognize teacher and student accomplishments via home-school communication,					
9	emphasize fairness and objectivity based on relationships rather than selective decision making and rankings,					
10	emphasize equality when dealing with all school stakeholders,					
11	encourage activities designed to warm the classroom/school climate,					
12	view seemingly idle conversation as potential for valuable informal cooperation					
13	accept that the very irrationality one tries to minimize can contribute to the foundation of effective informal organization					
	Hierarchy of authority related activities of principals					
14	minimize coordination through order-giving,					
15	Minimize position in the decision making process,					

16	assist all school members in overcoming their reluctance to communicate with perceived superiors,					
17	provide information sessions for all organizational members on how their school is really managed,					
18	make existing school structure more user-friendly, and					
19	help stakeholders understand the meaning of individual-institutional interaction.					
	Rule and regulation development and deployment in the school					
20	create a multi-stakeholder committee to draft new rules and regulations when needed					
21	create a multi-stakeholder committee to review new rules and regulations when needed					
22	Allow school committee to vet all rules and regulations prior to implementation					
23	Understand reasons for the existence of informal groups in the school compliance with due process					
24	examine the impact of specific rules and regulations on the informal groups in the school					
25	ascertain the “goodness of fit” between specific rules and regulations and school goals					
	Knowledge of informal groups					
	Principals :					
26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> take immediate action on urgent decisions; 					
27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> exercise clear and decisive delegation; 					
28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> stress outcomes; 					
29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop clear philosophy as a basis for decision making; 					
30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> monitor positive relations with students 					
31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> monitor positive relations with teachers 					
32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> monitor positive relations with administrative employees 					
33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> maintain positive relations with students. 					
34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> maintain positive relations with teachers 					
35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> maintain positive relations with administrative employees 					

36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use informal structure/groups as an effective vehicle for communication; 					
37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use informal structure/groups as a means of developing cohesion; 					
38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use informal structure/groups as a device for protecting the integrity of individuals in the school 					
39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • understand that informal school organization is an important leadership responsibility for them 					

- What challenges do you think; principals often face in harnessing their academic and administrative staff's informal networks?

- What measures do you recommend to overcome challenges faced by principals in harnessing their staff's informal networks ?

JIMMA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
DEPARTEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Interview guide for PTA members, supervisors and Woreda Office heads

Dear interviewees,

The purpose of this interview is to collect relevant data to the study entitled “Practice and challenges of managing informal groups in secondary schools of Jimma Zone”. Your responses are vital for the success of the study. So you are kindly requested to provide your genuine responses. Your response will be used only for academic purpose

Interview Guide

- Do you think that there exist informal relationships/informal groups within the school? [If yes, can you give some examples?]
- What kind of influence do they have on the school/s? [Positive / negative / non]
- Do you think informal relationships/ informal groups are well managed by secondary school principals?
- Would you explain some of the managerial activities performed by these secondary school principals in this regard?
- Do you think there are observable challenges faced by the school principals in managing informal groups and their social relationship?
 - If yes, can you mention some of these challenges?
- What do recommend for the school principals to do in order to cope with these management challenges?