DECISION MAKING PRACTICES IN GOVERNMENT PREPARATORY SCHOOLS OF HORRO GUDURU WOLLEGA ZONE, OROMIA REGION

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

BY:

RETA TILAHUN ALI

SEPTEMBER 2017

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

DECISION MAKING PRACTICES IN GOVERNMENT PREPARATORY SCHOOLS OF HORRO GUDURU WOLLEGA ZONE, OROMIA REGION

BY:

RETA TILAHUN ALI

ADVISOR:

WOSSENU YIMAM (PhD)

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

SEPTEMBER 2017

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

DECISION MAKING PRACTICES IN GOVERNMENT PREPARATORY SCHOOLS OF HORRO GUDURU WOLLEGA ZONE, OROMIA REGION

BY:

RETA TILAHUN ALI

APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS

_____ _____ _____

| **Chairman, Department** | **Signature** | **Date** |

Wossenu Yimam (PhD) _____ _____

| **Advisor** | **Signature** | **Date** |

_____ _____ _____

| **Internal Examiner** | **Signature** | **Date** |

_____ _____ _____

| **External Examiner** | **Signature** | **Date** |

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned graduate student, declare that this thesis is my original work and that all resources of materials used in this thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Place: College of Education and Behavioral Studies Department of Educational Planning and Management

Date of submission: _____

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

Advisor_____

Signature_____

Date_____

Acknowledgements

First and for most I thank my advisor Wossenu Yimam(PhD), who sacrificed his valuable time for his professional guidance and constructive comments during the write up of the thesis.

My special gratitude goes to the sample school principals for their warmly receptions, cooperation and urgent provision of information. My deepest appreciation and thanks also go to teachers, students and PTSA members of the schools for their participation during data collection activities in the area.

I am greatly indebted to Ato Diriba Abera for his encouragements with materials, economic and moral support he has been giving during my study.

All honors associated with degree to all my family, especially to my wife sr. Belainesh Moti for all hardship she faced to make me up and give me very great opportunity to learn, her kindness, moral support encouragement and taking the responsibility of care for our beloved daughters. I also give my special thanks to my daughters, Derartu Reta, Burkitu Reta and Lalise Reta for their moral support. Without their support, undoubtedly I would not have had the courage to work for my MA degree.

Finally, my special thanks go to many other people whose name I could not manage to list on this paper for the moral support they have given me. Last but not least, I am highly indebted to Addis Ababa University for all services the University provided me during my stay there.

Table of content

Contents   **Page**

List of Tables

List of Acronyms

AAU   Addis Ababa University

EDAD   Eastern District Academy of Dance

EDPM   Educational Planning and Management

ESDP   Educational Sector Development Program

FGD   Focus Group Discussion

GEQIP   General Education Quality Improvement Program

HGW   Horro Guduru Wollega

IOS   Internetwork Operating System

MoE   Ministry of Education

OECD   Organization for Economic co-operation and Development

PDM   Participative Decision Making

PTSA   Parents, Teachers, and Students Association

SBM   School-Based Management

SD   Standard Deviation

SIP   School Improvement Program

UNESCO   United Nations Educational, Scientific and cultural Organization

USA   United States of America

WEO   Woreda Education Office`

WSRC   Western Students Research Conference

Abstract

The main objective of this study was to investigate the practices and problems of decision making in preparatory schools of Horro Guduru Wollega Zone. To conduct this study, a descriptive survey design was employed. Out of the total population of 184,86 respondents (42 teachers, 12 principals and 20 students' councils and 12 PTSA members) were included in the study. School teachers were selected by systematic sampling method while principals, PTSA and students' council's members were selected by availability sampling technique. The data were gathered through questionnaire, FGD and document analysis. Data gathered through questionnaire were analyzed through quantitative approach using percentages, mean, standard deviation and an independent sample t-test whereas data obtained through FGD and document analysis were qualitatively analyzed. The major findings of the study disclosed that decision making process in preparatory schools were practiced poorly in the absence of school communities' involvement such as, in school budget preparation and disciplinary issues, whereas they were involved in decision making areas such as setting learning objectives and co-curricular activities. The study also revealed that students were mostly neglected from school decision making. Besides, the study indicated that school leaders were not effective in encouraging stakeholders and making decisions through scientific and systematic analysis. Moreover, fear of risk taking and unwillingness to share decisions with others were found to influence school decision making. It was thus concluded that the participation of teachers, PTSA and students in areas of school decision making was low. This is likely to affect the overall activities of schools in general and teaching learning process in particular. Thus, it is recommended that school leaders should make informed decisions through active involvement of stakeholders. Moreover, school leaders have to work cooperatively to reduce fear of risk taking, create strong sense of ownership, moral and recognition among stakeholders and encourage parents to show greater interest in their children's education which in turn improves the quality of schooling and students' achievement.

CHAPTER ONE

1. Introduction

This chapter deals with background of the study, statement of the problem, objective of the study, significance of the study, delimitation, limitation of the study, definition of terms and organization of the study.

1.1. Background of the study

School management can be viewed as relating both human and material resources within an integrated system for the attainment of educational goals through an organized structure that is characterized by management functions such as planning, organizing, directing, supervision and evaluation, (Hinjari, 2007) as cited in Fatima(2007-2008) states that, school management involves initiating actions, monitoring activities and demanding results on the bases of allocated resources as well as policy making, control and supervision as the major functions and responsibility of the School leaders in the attainment of educational goals. Planning on the other hand which is the most important function of management is to prepare for and predict future events.

School-based decision making is a concept based on the fundamental principle that individuals who are affected by the decision, possess expertise regarding the decision, and are responsible for implementing the decision, should be involved in making the decision. This concept often is attached to the broader school- system reform efforts of decentralization and school-based management (SBM) where decision making authority is shifted from the district to the local school (David, 1989:51). The school based decision making was designed to give schools greater autonomy to manage resources; determine the delivery, flexibility and local responsiveness, take greater control over the direction of the school, ensure the delivery of quality educational service to students, and respond to community needs (Murphy, 1997). Therefore, it has claimed, would bring with it several benefits for students, teachers, supporting staffs, educational administration and school communities.

Some educators use the terms shared decision making and school based management interchangeably while others see participative decision making as a component of school based

Management (SBM) or decentralization. In general, the goal of school-based decision-making is to "empower school staff by providing authority, flexibility, and resources to solve the educational problems particularly to their schools "(David, 1989).

In line with the above idea, participative decision-making (PDM) is generally agreed up on organizational model for delivery of education in many education systems around the world. It was still a central theme of research, policy and practice in business organizations (Chen & Tjosvold, 2006) as well as in schools (Pounder, 1997, Leithwood and duke, 1998; Walker, 2000; Somech, 2002; San Antonio & Gamage, 2007, as cited in Mokoena, 2011).

Until recently, school managements was not given due attention in education policy formulation, education practice and academic research in Ethiopia. Instead, policy documents tend to focus mainly on education access and equity. Between the introduction of the first education and training policy in 1994 and the launching of the third education sector development program (ESDPIII), education policy has emphasized on the need to increase equitable access to quality education (MOE,1998 & MOE, 2002) ESDP III has focused on improving education management at the woreda (district) and school levels and so as to expand access to education (MOE,2005), ESDP IV (MOE, 2010) has considered improvement in school management and administration as one of the tools for improving education decision making at all levels. The Government also launched the General Education quality Improvement program (GEQIP), in which school management and administration are taken as one of the key education quality intervention areas (Ayalew Shibesh, 2009).

In the past, principals throughout the world have been the main decision makers at school level. This situation has been particularly evident in a number of countries such as Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and parts of the United States of America (Imber et al, 1990; Griffin, 1995; Jonston, 1997) besides in African countries during the past 20 to 30 years there has been a major shift towards Participative decision making (PDM) in schools (Hart, 1995; Gulting & Bultler, 1999; Bush & Heystek, 2003). These authors have called for greater participation in decision making as a progressive way of making schools more democratic and more efficient as a result, the nature and extent of decision making has been changed. However, not surprisingly in reality, the nature and extent of teachers, students and parents' involvement varies across schools.

In addition, the changes have also resulted in major challenges for school leaders to move to a 'new way' of doing things that requires participation and collaboration with teachers, students and parents (Carnston, 2001).

In general, under school-based decision-making, school communities (parents, teachers and students) have the opportunity, responsibility and accountability for many more decisions that affect them than they held previously. However, research has to date indicates that this has occurred to some extent in some schools, but points to the whole area requiring further examination (Cranston, 2000,& Donohue, 1998).

Therefore, this study was to examine the actual practices and problems of decision- making process by teachers, students, parents, directors and vice directors of the existing structure in schools. In addition, it aimed to investigate the role of school leaders to operate in more participatory decision making with stakeholders and factors that affect decision making process in creating more conducive environment, mutual understanding, and mutual goal achievement in preparatory schools of Horro GuduruWollega Zone.

1.2. Statement of the problem

Educational organizations are complex institutions which require different kinds of decisions like policies, programs, school organizations, finance, training, curriculum and instruction, monitoring and evaluation, discipline and others. In supporting this idea, Ivancevich (2005) has explained that, decision is required for the purpose of planning, practicing and managing instructional process, solving problems, adjusting unfair situations, classroom management and conflict resolution. Therefore, it is very important for decision makers to look in to the objectives and goals of the organization as a whole in pursuing their decisions.

Involvement of subordinates in decision making in organizations has attracted major advocacy in the current day management. At the same time, involvement in decision making is viewed as a major component of democracy. In line with this idea, the decentralization of school management can make decision making more democratic and lead to improved efficiency and effectiveness. The expansion of good governance and democracy to schools require the involvement of stakeholders such as policy makers, teachers, students, parents and community members (Naidoo & Jordan, 2005). David (1989) has also described that the effects of

devolution of decision making authority to schools as follows: school-based management reforms that devolve decision-making authority to the schools, For example, have had important effects on teacher performance and student learning by making schools more accountable to their communities. The above and other factors related to this area have been studied by researchers such as Asefa (1995) about teachers' participation in decision making in the technical and vocational schools of Ethiopia. Mekuria (2009) has also explored the current educational decision making practice and implementation in secondary schools of Addis Ababa.

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

According to Simon (1962), delegation can reduce the difficulty of communication and helps to communicate the decision makers with the implementers. On the other hand, Melaku (2000: 178-179) has stated that, the decision made by individual is related to his/her personal goal and interest, such individual who made decision by themselves are not willing to delegate others and made all decisions based on his/her personal interests (biased and dictatorial decision maker) is not accepted in today's dynamic world. Therefore, decision makers should gather available and pertinent information in unbiased way and evaluate alternative courses of actions creatively and realistically.

Other research conducted at national level on school- based management (SBM) and decision-making in Ethiopian government schools (Workneh, 2012) found out that there was weak communications between the WEO and the schools constrained the process of devolving decision- making to school level. However, the gap between theoretical concepts and the actual practice of decision-making in preparatory schools of Horro GuduruWollega Zone remained to be unstudied leaving the gap to be filled by the current study.

In addition to this, according to Horro GuduruWollega Zone education office inspection report, the involvement of parents, teachers and students in decision-making at school level to improve the quality of education and students achievement was low. Thus, the main purpose of the study was to explore the current practice and related problems of decision making in preparatory schools of Horro Guduru Wollega Zone. More specifically, the study was attempted to answer the following basic questions:

1. What are the major decision making practices in preparatory schools of Horro Guduru Wollega Zone?
2. How effective are school leaders in playing their roles in decision making in preparatory schools of Horro Guduru Wollega Zone?
3. To what extent parents, teachers and students play their roles in decision making?
4. What major challenges affect the process of decision making in preparatory schools?

1.3. Objectives of the study

This study attempted to address the following general and specific objectives.

1.3.1. General objective

The general objective of this study was to investigate the practices and problems of decision making in preparatory schools of Horro Guduru Wollega Zone and to seek feasible solutions which may ultimately help to create favorable teaching learning environment.

1.3.2. Specific objectives

The specific objectives of the study are to:

1. Assess the practices of decision making in preparatory schools.
2. Investigate how effective school leaders are in creating suitable conditions for decision making in schools.
3. Examine the extent to which teachers, PTSA and students' council play their roles in decision making.
4. Identify the major factors that affect the process of decision making in preparatory schools of the Zone.

1.4. Significances of the study

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

1. Help to improve the situation in preparatory schools to make more effective in creating a suitable decision making environment.
2. Increase awareness among the concerned stakeholders to ensure practices of decision making in preparatory schools.
3. Contribute to the practical knowledge of the duties and responsibilities of school leaders associated with decision making process.
4. Contribute for school leaders, teachers, students and parents to identify the major factors that influence decision making and to serve as reference for future studies on the area.

1.5. Delimitations of the study

The study was delimited to Oromia Region with particular reference to four preparatory schools namely; Dedu,Fincha, Wayu and Hareto in Horro Guduru Wollega Zone, so as to make it manageable. The study also focused on assessing the practices, effectiveness and challenges of decision making process. Furthermore, the study was delimited to the practices and related problems of decision making in the past three years.

1.6. Limitations of the study

This study was subjected to series of problems such as scarcity of time, inconvenience of transport during data collection from one school to another in the district and PTSA were busy and had no time to participate in FGD discussion and they were delaying plans by giving appointment for various reasons that made the researcher consume more time than expected. Furthermore, the study was limited particularly teachers and school leaders had showed less interest or carelessness in filling out the questionnaires; so that they offered

responses with less concern and. These situations might have denied full opportunities for collecting the data. In spite of these few constraints, maximum efforts have been exerted to collect enough data and make it meaningful and complete as much as possible

Operational Definitions of Terms

Decision making is a process of making a choice from a number of alternatives to achieve a desired result.

Effectiveness: the degree to which something is successful in producing a desired result; success.

Group decision making involves multiple actors (decision makers) each with different skills, experiences and knowledge relating to different aspects (criteria) of the problem.

Preparatory schools are educational institutions which consist of grade 11 and 12 and are supposed to prepare students for higher education in Ethiopia.

Stakeholders- the stakeholders of an organization are any individuals who have an interest in running of an organization or the outcomes of a specific decision. In the context of schools, stakeholders can be students, teachers, parents, administrators, other members of the community.

Students Council is an elected organ of students who participate in preparatory schools administration especially by counseling the students.

Zone: an administrative locality next to Region and consist of limited Woredas.

1.7. Organization of the study

This study is organized in five chapters. The first chapter deals with introduction which included background of the study, statement of the problem , objective of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study and definition of terms. The second chapter deals with the review of related literature. The third chapter deals with research design and methodology used. The fourth chapter contains presentation, analysis, and interpretation of the results. The fifth chapter deals with the summary, conclusion and recommendations. Finally, appendices and references are attached at the last part of the study report.

CHAPTER TWO

2. Review of the Related Literature

This chapter provides a review of related literature on different aspects of principals, teachers, parents and students involvement in decision making. It comprises concepts, nature, process and area of decision-making in school. This review also emphasizes the role of principals in participative decision making and considers the factors that affect teachers' involvement in school decision making.

2.1. The Concept of Decision Making

Decision Making is the most aspect of educational management. In fact, some authors in the field of management suggest that management is decision making. Decision-making is considered to be "the heart of management" In the process of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, reporting, and budgeting a manager makes decision (Newcombe and McCormick, 2001). Decision-making is applied in any of the organization activities. Griffith (cited in Owens, 1987) has highlighted three important concepts concerning the nature of decision-making. These are 1) the structure of the organization is determined by the nature of its decision-making process, 2)an individual's rank in an organization is directly related to the control exert over the decision process, and 3) the effectiveness of an administration is inversely proportional to the number of decisions that he/she must personally make. According to Sergiovanni (1999), schools are unique environments. Moreover, the quality of that environment- the schools climate and culture rests with the outcomes associated with the decision made by its leaders (Thomas & Bainbridge, 2002). Indeed these outcomes tangibly influence the environment which students inhabit, ultimately affecting the quality of students overall educational experience.

However, the relationship between the schools environment and organizational decision making is complex and interrelated (Senge, 1990). On the other hand, the existing environment influences the problems that emerge yet, on the other hand, problem resolution shape the environment.

2.2. Process of Decision-Making.

Decision making is the study of identifying and choosing alternatives based on the values and preferences of the decision maker. Making a decision implies that there are alternative choices to be considered, and in such a case we want not only to identify as many of these alternatives as possible but to choose the one that best fits with our goals, objectives, desires, values, and so on…(Harris (1998).

According to Baker et al. (2002), decision making should start with the identification of the decision maker(s) and stakeholder(s) in the decision, reducing the possible disagreement about problem definition, requirements, goals and criteria. Then, a general decision making process can be divided into the following steps:

Step: 1. Define the problem.

"This process must, as a minimum, identify root causes, limiting assumptions, system and organizational boundaries and interfaces, and any *problem statement* that describes both the initial conditions and the desired conditions"... Of course, the one-sentence limit is often exceeded in the practice in case of complex decision problems. The problem statement must however be a concise and unambiguous *written* material agreed by all decision makers and stakeholders. Even if it can be sometimes a long iterative process to come to such an agreement, it is a crucial and necessary point before proceeding to the next step.

Step: 2. Determine requirements

"Requirements are conditions that any acceptable solution to the problem *must* meet. Requirements spell out what the solution to the problem *must* do"... In mathematical form, these requirements are the constraints describing the set of the feasible (admissible) solutions of the decision problem. It is very important that even if subjective or judgmental evaluations may occur in the following steps the requirements must be stated in exact quantitative form, i.e. for any possible solution it has to be decided unambiguously whether it meets the requirements or not. We can prevent the ensuing debates by putting down the requirements and how to check them in a written material.

Step: 3. Establish goals

"Goals are broad statements of intent and desirable programmatic values... Goals go beyond the minimum essential *must have.*(i.e. requirements) to *wants* and *desires"*… In mathematical form,

the goals are objectives contrary to the requirements that are constraints. The goals may be conflicting but this is a natural concomitant of practical decision situations.

Step: 4. Identify alternatives

"Alternatives offer different approaches for changing the initial condition into the desired condition"... Be it an existing one or only constructed in mind, any alternative must meet the requirements. If the number of the possible alternatives is finite, we can check one by one if it meets the requirements. The infeasible ones must be deleted (screened out) from the further consideration, and we obtain the explicit list of the alternatives. If the number of the possible alternatives is infinite, the set of alternatives is considered as the set of the solutions fulfilling the constraints in the mathematical form of the requirements.

Step: 5. Define criteria

"Decision criteria, which will discriminate among alternatives, must be based on the goals". It is necessary to define discriminating criteria as objective measures of the goals to measure how well each alternative achieves the goals.. Since the goals will be represented in the form of criteria, every goal must generate at least one criterion but complex goals may be represented only by several criteria. It can be helpful to group together criteria into a series of sets that relate to separate and distinguishable components of the overall objective for the decision. This is particularly helpful if the emerging decision structure contains a relatively large number of criteria. Grouping criteria can help the process of checking whether the set of criteria selected is appropriate to the problem, can ease the process of calculating criteria weights in some methods, and can facilitate the emergence of higher level views of the issues. It is a usual way to arrange the groups of criteria, sub-criteria, and sub-criteria in a tree-structure Triantaphyllos, E. (2000).According to Baker et al. (2002), criteria should be able to discriminate among the alternatives and to support the comparison of the performance ofthe alternatives,

- complete to include all goals,
- operational and meaningful,
- non-redundant,
- few in number.

In some methods, see Keeney and Raffia, (1976), non-redundancy is required in the form of independency. We mention that some authors use the word attribute instead of criterion. Attribute is also sometimes used to refer to a measurable criterion.

Step: 6. Select a decision making tool

There are several tools for solving a decision problem. Some of them will be briefly described here, and references of further readings will also be proposed. The selection of an appropriate tool is not an easy task and depends on the concrete decision problem, as well as on the objectives of the decision makers.

Step: 7. Evaluate alternatives against criteria

Every correct method for decision making needs, as input data, the evaluation of the alternatives against the criteria. Depending on the criterion, the assessment may be objective (factual), with respect to some commonly shared and understood scale of measurement (e.g. money) or can be subjective (judgmental),reflecting the subjective assessment of the evaluator. After the evaluations the selected decision making tool can be applied to rank the alternatives or to choose a subset of the most promising alternatives.

Step: 8. Validate solutions against problem statement

The alternatives selected by the applied decision making tools have always to be validated against the requirements and goals of the decision problem. It may happen that the decision making tool was misapplied. In complex problems the selected alternatives may also call the attention of the decision makers and stakeholders that further goals or requirements should be added to the decision model.

Okumbe (1998:234) defines decision-making as the process of specifying the nature of particular problem and selecting among available alternatives in order to solve the problem. This definition of decision-making indicates that a problem precedes any decision and that there must be a number of alternative courses of action from which an optimum course will be selected. Decisions are a composite of values, facts, and assumptions. Each or all of these may be subject to change from time to time. Decision-making, therefore, is not a onetime activity, but rather a continuing enterprise every successful organization must make decision that enable the organization to achieve its goal and which meet the critical needs of members of the organization. Stoner and Freeman (1992:254) also note that "the basic process of rationale decision making involves diagnosing, defining and determining the sources of the problem, gathering and analyzing the facts of the problem, developing and evaluating alternatives and converting the alternatives in to action". As Musaazi (1982) has explained that decision- making is a process which involves identifying and selecting a course of action to deal with the specific

problem. Owens (1995:25) has identified steps involved in decision making: defining of the problem, analysis of the problem, developing alternative solution, deciding on the best alternative, convert decision in to effective action. The process of decision making can be considered to consist of steps beginning with problem identification and ending with the evaluation of its outcomes.

2.3. Types of Decision-Making

There are many types of decision-making. However, management writers such as Ivancevich et al, (2005) and Okumbe (1998:98) often distinguish between two types of decisions based on their nature as: programmed and non- programmed decision. In support of this idea, Chiffith, (1991) as cited in Assefa (1995:21) has classified decision in to ``individual and group decision, personal and organizational decision and non - programmed decision intermediary, appellate and creative decisions, rationale and non -rationale decision.''

2.4. Individual versus Group Decision Making

Decision can be made either individually or by groups based on the nature individually or by groups based on the nature of the problem and the situation. Whether decision is made by individual manager or by groups its type is determined by the decision. In support of this idea, Newstorm 1990:68) suggests that, the question of decision making by individuals or involving others should not determine by the leader's personal choice but by the nature of the problem and the situation.

In most school districts and schools, a great deal of decision making is achieved through committees, task forces, site-based councils, and other kinds of groups (Bonito, 2011). This is the increased complexity of many decisions requires knowledge in numerous areas, usually not possessed by one person. This requirement, together with the reality that the decisions made eventually accepted and implemented by many throughout the school district or school, has increased the use of collaborative approach to decision making (Zarate, 2009).

Developing a culture for group decision making, it takes time to develop a comfort level for both the school leader and followers concerning group decision making. Some scholars have proposed

phase process to involve followers in the school's decisions and offer some strategies school leaders can use to help followers participate more fully in school district and school decision making (Bulach, Lunenburg & Potter, 2008; Eisenfuhr,2011).

2.5. Major practices in School Decision Making

Principals as the school chief educational leader play a major role in shaping the nature of school organization. In supporting this idea, Ministry of education, Government of Ethiopia (2005:16) Commented that; `` principals as individual leader play a pivotal role in the success of the school. In the successful school,'' leaders; create a strong sense of vision and mission, build a strong culture of collaboration and creative problem solving situations, plan to facilitate work, set appropriate curriculum implementation mechanism, and possess an instructional leadership that take responsibility for students achievement, develop and communicate plans for effective teaching, and nurture cooperative relationship among all staff members: monitor students learning progress and close work with parents, and community members. In addition, the government of Ethiopia has also recently focused on improving school-based management through the devolution of education is decision making to school levels. To achieve this objective, it has promoted the role of various education stakeholders in decision making specifically,

- It has tried to strengthen the relationship between the WEOs and the schools through monitoring and capacity building schemes
- The recent education programs such as ESDP IV, GEQIP and SIP give more power to head teachers and administrators to coordinate the roles of communities, parents and local administration in decision- making.
- The policy emphasizes importance of the participation of communities, parents and teachers (through PTSA) for the improvement of critical decision- making at school level.
- As a key local administration unit working closely with the community, kebele administration is considered as one of the key stakeholders for enhancing school- based management.

- The participation of students in education management is also a way of promoting participatory decision making at school level.

2.5.1. The role of school principals in school decision-making

The literature is convincing in the evidence that the roles and responsibilities of principals changed when principals decision making approaches was introduced (Cranston, 2001).

Table 1: change in the role and responsibilities of school principals

Decrease in	Increase in
- Individual responsibility to take decisions, although the number and variety of ways to achieve significantly. - Time and opportunities to take individuals decisions. - Involvement in low-level management activities delegated to others where possible.	- The need to work with and through representative committees and groups in collaborative. - The need to delegate decisions to others to empower them. - Accountability to school community members. - School leadership through visioning, strategic planning. - Changes in attitudes, culture and a focus on people. - Operational climate change for decision making at school.

Source: Adapted from (Cranston, 2001)

In line with the above idea, Jackson (2000:44) as cited inWndesen Berihanu (2011) suggests the following for principals to consider in order achieving greater stakeholder's involvement. These include:

> *Be willing to share decision making with others, let go off traditional authority and top-down roles, providing empowerment through training, this aspect crucial, specially for illiterate parents, strive for flatter organizational structures, give support and establish on environment of trust and respect, strive to ensure that involvement becomes meaningful to all players, endeavor to engage a representative of learners in issues that affect their education and schooling, help teachers to balance their increased workload that has resulted from involvement in decision making structures (curriculum committee), minimize the perceived gap*

15

between professionals (teachers) and lay persons (parents and learners),as it affects relationship, and adopt an open participatory management approach.

In line with the role of school principals in school decision- making, Robbins (2003:146-147) lists, the following methods by which school administrators can built trust in their employees and propound each of them as follows: a) practice openness: keep people informed, make certain the criteria on how decisions are made, explain the rationale for your decision, and fully disclose relevant information; b) Be fair: be objective, important in performance appraisal and pay attention to equity perceptions in reward distributions: c) speak your feelings: if you share your feeling, other will see you as real and human. They will know who you are and their respect for you will increase; d) Tell the truth: you must be perceived as someone who tells the truth) show consistently: people want predictability. Take time to think about your values and beliefs and let them consistently guide your decision; f) fulfill your promise: keep your words and commitment, promise made must be promise kept; g) Maintain confidence: people trust those who are discreet and up on whom they can rely; h) demonstrate confidence: develop them administration and respect of others by demonstrating technical and professional ability. Thus, the school principals should strive to develop a trusting relationship among all the stakeholders in the school.

2.5.2. The role of teachers in school decision-making

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

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

2.5.3. The role of students in school decision making

Student participation in decision making refers to the work of students' representative bodies such as: School councils, student parliaments and the perceptual body. According to Novella (1998:12) has pointed out, the principals and other stakeholders should not underestimate the contributions of students especially if they are given the opportunity to develop their skills and their level of maturity. Huddleston (2007:11) has added that students should be involved in all areas of the school life. Huddleston has also added that the range of activities that make up the work of the school can be categorized in a number of different ways, but, however, it is categorized one should expect students to have opportunities for involvement in each major area in particular in schools: ethos and climate including rules, rewards and sanction, curriculum, teaching and learning, management and development planning.

Participating in the school decision- making process also enables them to become aware of the needs and problems of poor students' and their participation in the PTSA provide feedback on matters from the students' perspective. In addition, students' participation enables them to take responsibility of becoming class captains (monitors) and to manage the class effectively in the teacher's absence (MOE, 1998).

In general, a primary task of the school is to create a stimulating learning climate which develops active involvement of students in their education and develops active involvement of students in their education and develops a spirit of inquiry .This climate when students work together with school staff in such activities as planning and evaluating school programs.

2.5.4. The role of communities and parents in school decision making

One of the advantages of involving communities in school decision- making is that it creates a greater sense of ownership, moral and commitment among stakeholders. Decisions that are made of local level are arguably more responsive to specific issues related to school contexts (Dunne et al., 2007). An important achievement has been observed in South Africa in this regard, since school-based governance is often integrated with participatory decision -making (Naidoo, J. 2005).

Another advantage is that decentralization empowers communities to mobilize resources (Dunne et al. 2007). In Ghana, decentralization helps to enhance the efficiency of school management and accountability and decentralization motivates parents to show greater interest in their children's education. In some cases, the functioning of local education offices was financed by communities (Dunne et al., 2007).

Learning is no longer restricted to what goes on within the school walls. It is"now universally accepted what schools must relate well to their surrounding communities if they are to be effective. In societies that have been undergoing profound economic and social restructuring, school's role needs to be related directly to the changes that are taking place around it." (OECD, 2001b:42). Decentralization itself increases the pressure for new forms of governance partnership including shared decision-making with teachers, parents and members of the community. Principals and others in schools need to "become coalition builders as much as managers of the internal running of the schools themselves."(OECD, 2001b:26-27).

2.6. The effectiveness of decision making

All managers make decisions, while effective decision making requires defining a problem, gathering relevant information, identifying and evaluating alternative solutions, and selecting the best alternatives. Newstrom (1990: 68-80) states that effective decision making requires the combination of three aspects:

- The different kinds of managerial problem situations that he/she faces.
- The kinds of decision making styles
- The kinds of strategies that fit the various decision making situations.

Good decision requires the need of acceptance and quality. According to Newstrom (1990:323), effective decisions are the result of the level of their acceptance and their quality, that is:

> *Groups commitment for its successful implementation and the relative importance of incorporating relevant facts, objective data, or logic into a decision respectively. Thus, the ultimate effectiveness of decision is affected by both the quality of decision and the acceptance of the decision made by those who implement it. In some decisions, quality is much more important than acceptance. This may be true of the decision requiring a high degree of a high*

degree of technical expertise (that requires technical knowledge). In some decisions acceptance is more important than the quality of the decision. However, in most decisions both quality and acceptance are important. Some Problems situations demand a very high level of acceptance, especially problems that concern issues of equity and fairness.

According to Ivancevich et al, (2005:481), managers or a group decision maker becomes poor or failed when:

Failing to understand people's concern and compelling claims

Overlooking people's interest and commitments

Defining exceptions not in a clear manner

Miss using evaluations of possible alternatives.

Limiting the search for alternatives and remedies

Ignoring down claiming ethical questions

Neglecting the analysis of the result of the decision to understand what worked and did not work.

Generally, in any event a poor decision is a cause for regret and will affect the lives of many people. In support of the above, Hoy and Miskel (1991:339) has explained that:

symptoms of poor/defective decision making are incomplete survey of alternatives and objectives, failure to examine risks preferred choice, failure to reappraise initially rejected alternatives, poor information search, selective bias in processing information at hand and failure to workout contingency plans

2.7. Factors affecting school decision making process

One of the most congruent findings from studies of effective leadership in schools is that authority to lead need not located in the person of the leader but can be dispersed within the school in between and among people (Mac Beath, 1998; Day, et al, 2000). There is a growing

understanding that leadership is embedded in various organizational contexts within school communities, not centrally vested in a person or office.

The effectiveness of school principals in decision making is affected by number of factors. The skill of principals, qualification, experiences and styles are some major factors in facilitating teaching for school principals David, 1989).

2.7.1. Knowledge and skills related factors

The basic managerial skills or competencies required for a person leadership positions including school principals based on the classifications made by Katz (1996, as cited in Robbins, 2000: 4) include technical, human and conceptual skills. Lacks of those skills and other knowledge are affecting principal decision making in facilitating teaching.

In support of the above idea, the successful implementation of school-based decision- making is affected by a number of organizational factors and institutional constraints, including (1)Clarity of purpose and access to information; (2) Power and authority relationships; (3) administrative support and the changing role of central office personnel and (4) Policies at the district, state, and federal levels. These issues are taken singularly or collectively affect the long-term effectiveness of decentralizing decision- making at the school level (David, 1989).

Clarity of purpose and access to information: schools that are active in decision making have a vision statement that focuses their decision making process on the technical core of schooling-teaching and learning. Determining the school vision is a school wide effort affording the faculty the opportunity to understand the power of their commitment to decision they make. Those involved in decision making understand the necessity of using school-based and student-centered data to inform their decisions. In districts where data are limited or not disaggregated at the school level, the decision making process is limited and curtailed to issues that holed less promise of impact on the school's educational program.

Power and authority relationships: frequently, when decision-making authority is delegated, the degree of authority given to the site is often limited and ambiguous. In schools where there is confusion over decision-making authority, issues addressed at the school level tend to focus on secondary-level issues, such as school climate, scheduling, safety, and parent involvement, rather

than on primary concerns, such as instructional programs and strategies, student achievement, and school performance. In order to focus on the primary issues affecting school success, decision-making authority in the area of curriculum, staffing, and budgeting must be real and authentic.

Administrative support and the role of central office personnel:district-level support of school-based decision-making is critical to its success. Superintendents play instrumental roles in moving central offices from distractive function toward aservice orientation and resource support network. This shift in roles from a bureaucratic orientation to a service orientation is often difficult and misunderstood by those occupying various roles in the district office and in the school.

Policies at the district, state and federal levels:in a similar manner, decision-making latitude is often restricted at the school level by various state and federal policies or mandates. Under school-based decision-making, schools are encouraged to make decisions regarding the curriculum and supporting instructional strategies. These decisions should be made within a framework of district goals or the core curriculum required by the district or state. Yet schools are often limited by state mandates affecting their educational programs and are similarly restricted by compliance requirements related to federally funded programs within their school or district. Thus, these competing and often contradictory policies constrain school-based decision-making.

In another way as Aseffa (1995:39) explained factors that affect decision making process in an organization as: organizational factors (Objective, strategies and policies), environmental factors (Social, legal, technological, political and economic aspects), and personal factors (values, knowledge and capacity to take risk of the decision makers), time pressure, budget and amount to information available. Adane et al. (2002:233) identified various factors other than the above factors which influence decision making process as other factors. These are: 1) time pressure, how much time the decision maker has to make the decision; 2) higher management altitude; 3) budget; the amount of money needed to implement the decision; 4) personnel required people in number or skills effectively implement decision; and 5) the reaction of subordinates, principals' support of participative decision making seems to be another factor in determining teachers' involvement in decision making. Here are many reasons why principals may not support

participative decision making. Some principals may not perceive that they are sufficiently empowered themselves and are therefore relevant to increase the levels of teachers' participative decision making. Others may fear poorer decision quality from wider involvement (Huddlestone et al. 1991) in the words of McEwan,E.K. (2001). Many principal decisions, like many personal decisions, are made more on the basis of institution than systematic analysis. As their school organization becomes increasingly complex, and challenging, however, some school principals have began to rely on systematic approaches to decision making, many school leaders are likely to have fallen in the bad traps like failing to get all the key players involved, going for an option that is far too obvious, over reacting to pressure and stress, solving the wrong problems, relaying strictly on intuition and not learning from the past.

CHAPTER THREE

3. Research Design and Methodology

This study was designed to assess and identify the practices and problems of decision making in preparatory schools; and suggest explanation to the problems based on the findings of the study. This chapter includes a discussion of research approach, research design and sources of data, population, sampling techniques, instrument of data collection, data collection procedures and methods of data analysis.

3.1. Research Approach

Both Quantitative and qualitative research approach was employed for the study. Quantitative research is often used to validate themes and relationships in samples and populations and qualitative research is used to explore practitioners' understanding and situational use of decision making in the domain of educational administration. This provides a clear picture of how decisions are made. The method of a research emerges out from the nature of the problems and the purpose of the study. McMillan and Schumacher (1993:8) describe the research method as a systematic and purposeful way of collecting and analyzing data.

3.2. Research Design

This study employed a descriptive survey design. The rationale for the selection of this research design is that it is appropriate to describe an ongoing process and trends. Besides, this method was also helpful to obtain relevant and reliable information about the issue under the study. Supporting of the above idea, Best and Kahn (2002:107) state that survey method is used to collect data from a relatively a large sample for the purpose of describing the nature of existing situations.

3.3. Sources of Data

In this study, both primary and secondary data sources were used to investigate the issues. The primary data sources were principals, teachers, parents, and students' council members of four selected preparatory schools. These groups of respondents were selected because their day-to-day activities were related to the objectives of the study. The secondary data sources were schools'

decision making documents (guidelines related to committee works, written documents on the involvement of stakeholders in school decision-making) were used as secondary data sources.

3.4. Population, Sample and Sampling Technique of the Study

The study was conducted in government preparatory schools of Horro Guduru Wallega Zone of Oromia Region. According to Horro Guduru Wollega Zone education office of 2008 E.C statistical data, there were 12 preparatory schools in 10 Woredas; teachers (336), principals and vice principals (34), parents (PTSA) (36) and students' council members (60), a total of (466).

Four preparatory schools namely: Dedu, Fincha, Wayu and Hareto were taken as a sample by purposive sampling technique. Because those schools have relatively low administrative performance in decision making practice according to quarterly and yearly report of Horro Guduru Wollega Zone education office. Thus the researcher believed that, the sample size of preparatory schools representative helped to compose well founded generalization at the end of the study. Black, k. (2010) states that Purposive sampling is a non-probability sampling method and it occurs when "elements selected for the sample are chosen by judgment of the researcher. Researchers often believe that they can obtain a representative sample by using a sound judgment, which results in saving time and money." After identifying the sample schools, from a total of 140 teachers 42(30%) teachers were selected from sample schools by a systematic random sampling technique, with the frequency interval of every third occurring person. In addition to this, 12 school principals and vice principals, 12 PTSA members and 20 students' council were taken by available sampling method. Therefore, 42 teachers, 12 school principals, 12 PTSA members and 20 students' council, a total of 86 respondents were involved in this research. The summary of population and sample size is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Population and sample of the study

No	Schools	Participants															
		School leaders			PTSA members			Students' council			Teachers						
											population			sample		
		M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
1	Fincha	2	1	3	3	-	3	4	1	5	40	3	43	12	1	13
2	Dedu	3	-	3	3	-	3	4	1	5	30	4	34	9	1	10
3	Wayu	3		3	2	1	3	4	1	5	30	3	33	9	1	10
4	Hareto	3	-	3	2	1	3	4	1	5	30	-	30	9	-	9
	Total	11	1	12	10	2	12	16	4	20	130	10	140	39	3	42
Sampling technique	purposive	Availability sampling technique									Systematic sampling technique					

Key: No=number, F = Female, M= Male

3.5. Instruments of Data Collection

In order to collect relevant data from the field, the researcher used both qualitative and quantitative data collecting tools. These tools were questionnaires, focus group discussion and document analysis.

3.5.1. Questionnaire

Both closed and open ended questionnaires were employed to collect quantitative and qualitative data from selected teachers and school leaders. This was because questionnaire is convenient to conduct survey and to acquire necessary information from relatively large number of study subjects within short period of time. Furthermore, it makes possible an economy of time and expense and also provides a high proportion of usable responses (Best & Kahn, 2003). The questionnaire was prepared by the researcher with close guidance of the advisor. The questionnaire was also prepared in English language, because all of the sample respondents can have the necessary skills to read and understand the concepts that were incorporated.

The questionnaires have two parts. The first part of the questionnaire describes the respondents' background information, categories include; sex, level of education, area of specialization and service year. The second and the largest part were incorporated with the whole possible areas of school decision making variables of both closed and open ended questions. There were four parts of questionnaires and composed of 34 close ended and three open ended questions for the two respondents each. The closed ended items were prepared by using likert scales. The value of the scale was in between one and five but, the type of likert varied according to the type of questions.

3.5.2. Focus Group Discussion (FGD)

Focus group discussion (FGD) was designed to get information on decision making practices from selected students' council and PTSA members of preparatory schools in HGW Zone. There were 20 students' council and 12 PTSA members included in the discussion. There were also six questions for each participant's and the nature of the question was similar because it focuses on decision making practices of their schools. Because FGD has greatest potential to release more in-depth information, provide opportunity to observe non-verbal behavior of respondents, gives

opportunities for clearing up misunderstandings, as well as it can be adjusted to meet many diverse situations (MOE, 1999).

Thus, FGD was facilitated and led by the researcher with the help of school principal and it took 2hrs for each respondent's in the sample schools. The data through GFD was collected by the investigator. Therefore, this tool was used to investigate the involvement of PTSA and students' council members of each preparatory school, the extent to which the decision making was practiced and factors that affect school decision making process.

3.5.3. Document Review

In order to triangulate the information obtained through questionnaires and focus group discussion, analysis of the available documents like the participatory school decision making on budget, personnel, and curriculum and instruction, vision and mission of the school plan, the participation of community and parents in the school affaires and the school rewarding strategies related to school decision making were analyzed and interpreted.

3.6. Procedures of Data Collection

To get relevant response for the research questions, the investigator used a series of data gathering procedures. These procedures help the researcher to get authentic and essential data from the four sample schools. Checking the validity and reliability of data collecting instruments before conducting to the actual study was the core to assure the quality of the data. Accordingly, the instrument was initially prepared by the researcher and developed under close guidance of the advisor. After having letter of authorization from Woreda Education Office, the researcher went to Shambu preparatory school for pilot test which is not included in the sample. Here the pilot test was conducted with 12 respondents, i.e. three principals and 9 teachers. A reliability test was also performed to check the consistency and accuracy of the measurement scales. The results of Cronbach's alpha are summarized in Table 3. As shown in the table, the Cronbach's Coefficient alpha is between 0.77 and 0.85, indicating the questions in each construct are measuring a similar concept. As suggested by Cronbach's, the reliability coefficients between 0.70-0.90 are generally found to be internally consistent. Based on the results of the pilot study,

some vague and confusing items were modified to make the questionnaire clear and understandable.

Following this, agreement was made with the concerned participants in the four sample schools, and then, the questionnaires were distributed to sample respondents. The participants were allowed to give their own answers to each item independently and the data was collected by the assistant of data collectors. First, the questionnaire was dispatched and collected through the assigned data collectors. The data collectors were oriented about the data collection procedures by the investigator. In addition to this, close follow up was made by the investigator. Finally, the questionnaires were collected and made ready for data analysis.

The FGD was conducted after the participants' consent is obtained. During the process of FGD the researcher attempted to control and handle select communication barriers that disturb the discussion process.

Table 3: Summary of the result of Cronbach's alpha

No	Major theme	No. of items	Reliability
1	Major practices of decision making	7	0.77
2	Effectiveness of school principals in decision making	9	0.85
3	The extent of stakeholders involvement in decision making	10	0.79
4	Factors influencing decision making process	8	0.83
	overall	34	0.81

3.7. Methods of Data Analysis

The data gathered through questionnaire were organized and structured in order to make it manageable and ready for analysis. Moreover, various statistical tools such as mean scores, standard deviation, percentage and frequency were used in analyzing the quantitative responses. Besides, independent sample t-test was used to see the statistical significance of two groups' respondents' response. This is because t-test is considered as an appropriate test for judging the significance difference between the mean of two sample groups (Kothari, 1985). The qualitative data gathered through FGD and document analysis were analyzed and interpreted qualitatively.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of practices and related problems of decision making based on the data collected from sample population of Horro Guduru Wollega Zone governmental preparatory schools. It consists of two parts. The first part presents personal information of the sample respondents and the second part deals with the presentation and analysis of the collected data. In this study, 42 teachers, 12 school leaders (principals and vice principals), 12 PTSA members and 20 members of students' council a total of 86 respondents from four preparatory schools were included. Questionnaires were distributed to all sample teachers and school leaders and were duly filled in and returned. In addition, FGD and document analysis have been used to collect data. The data obtained through questionnaires, FGD and document analysis were analyzed and presented here under in relation to the basic questions of the study

4.1.   Characteristics of Respondents

Description of respondents' characteristics gives some basic information about the sample groups that helps to know the overall information of the respondents in relation to school decision making process. The following table presents the general characteristics (sex, level of education, service year and the area of subject specialization) of respondents involved in the study.

Table 4: Characteristics of respondents by sex, level of education, service year and area of specialization

No	Items		Respondents							
			Teachers		Principals		PTSA members		Student council members	
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Sex	Male	39	92.9	11	91.7	10	83.3	16	80
		Female	3	7.1	1	8.3	2	16.7	4	20
		Total	42	100	12	100	12	100	20	100
2	Level of education	Diploma	2	4.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
		BA/BED/BSC	28	66.7	9	75	-	-	-	-
		MA/MED/MSC	12	28.6	3	25	-	-	-	-
		Under grade 12	-	-	-	-	12	100	20	100
		Total	42	100	12	100	12	100	20	100
3	Service year	1-5	5	11.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
		6-10	16	38.1	4	33.3	-	-	-	-
		11-15	8	19.0	3	25.0	-	-	-	-
		16-20	6	14.3	5	41.7	-	-	-	-
		21 and above	7	16.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Total	42	100	12	100	-	-	-	-
4	Area of Specialization	language	5	11.9	2	8.3	-	-	-	-
		Mathematics	8	19.0	1	8.3				
		Natural science	12	28.6	4	33.3	-	-	-	-
		Social science	15	35.8	2	16.7	-	-	-	-
		EDPM	-	-	3	25	-	-	-	-
		Other	2	4.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Total	42	100	12	100	-	-	-	-

Key: No. stands for the number of respondents

As can be seen under item 1, Table 4, 39 (92%) teacher respondents were males whereas 3 (7.1%) were females. From this, one can understand that the numbers of females in preparatory

31

schools were much lower compared to males in the sample schools. Regarding school principals, we can also see that male respondents were 11(91.7%), whereas 1(8.3%) was female. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that, females were under represented in the teaching profession and leadership position in preparatory schools of Horro Guduru Wollega Zone. Hence, there is a need to encourage females to teaching profession and the position of leadership.

With regard to level of education, 28(66.7%) teachers were First degree holders where as 12(28.6%) teachers and 2 (4.7%) teachers were MA degree and diploma holders respectively. This indicates, preparatory school teachers and principals need to be qualified with second degree as one of the most indicators of quality education is the number of qualified teachers and principals.

In addition, 9(75%) of school principals were first degree holders whereas only 3(25%)of school principals were second degree holders.

Regarding service year, 5(11.9%) of teachers were ranged under 1-5 and 16(38.1%) of teachers and 4(33.3%) of school principals were ranged under 6-10 service, 8(19%)teachers and 3(25%) school principals were ranged under 11-15 year service, 6(14.3%) teachers and 5 (41.7%)school principals were ranged under 16- 20.Whereas 7(16.7%)teachers were ranged under 21 and above service years respectively. The data implies that the majority of teachers' respondents and all principals' respondents were above four years service. This shows that, they had relatively better understanding of the practices of school decision making and various programs carried out in the schools.

Lastly, regarding subject specialization as shown in Table 4, 5(11.9%)teachers and 2(16.7%) of school principals were specialized in languages. 8(19%)teachers, 1(8.3%)school principals were specialized in Mathematics. 12(28.6%) teachers and 4(33.3%) school principals were specialized in Natural Sciences. 15(35.8%)teachers and 2(16.7%)school principals were specialized in Social Sciences. Whereas only 3(25%) of school principals were specialized in EDPM. Correspondingly, 2(4.7%) teachers were specialized in other areas. In addition, only 3(25%) of school principals were specialized in EDPM. But the rest, 9(75%) of them were specialized or qualified in different subjects for teaching. This indicates that, the sample schools were led by most principals was specialized in other subjects in teaching but not in school administration. Therefore, they might face problems in understanding the essence of decision making.

4.2. The Major Practices of Decision Making in Preparatory Schools

Principals, as the school chief educational leaders, play major roles in shaping the nature of school organization. In supporting this idea, Ministry of Education (2005:16) has commented that; "principals as an individual leader play a fundamental role in the success of the school." The following table presents data pertaining to the major decision making practices of school principals.

Table 5: Major Decision Making Practices in Preparatory Schools

No	Items	Teachers N=42		School Leaders N=12		average		T-value	P-value
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
1	Creation of awareness to teachers for practical school decision making	2.95	0.89	3.25	1.21	3.01	0.96	-2.42	0.01
2	Teachers participation in school budget preparation	2.26	0.82	2.93	1.06	2.41	0.87	-6.20	0.00
3	Prior to make decisions, school leader carefully gather relevant information to the problems	3.29	1.06	3.52	0.98	3.34	1.06	-3.26	0.07
4	Develop alternative solutions by involving teachers to solve the problems	2.46	0.93	2.75	1.05	2.52	0.95	-1.23	0.00
5	School leaders put decision in to action	2.50	0.86	2.96	0.77	2.60	0.84	-4.04	0.00
6	School leaders follow-up the implementation of the decisions made in schools	2.29	0.95	2.83	1.02	2.41	0.96	-3.60	0.04
7	Teachers participation in school evaluation activities	3.24	1.00	3.33	1.01	3.26	1.00	2.39	0.56
	Grand Total	2.85	0.93	3.05	1.01	2.95	0.94		

Key: M=mean, SD=standard deviation, significance level (p-value)<0.05

Item 1 in Table 5 is related to the respondents' view on the creation of awareness to teachers for practical decision making. The mean scores were 2.95(SD=0.89) for teachers and 3.25(SD=1.21)

34

for school leaders respectively. The average mean was 3.01(SD=1.01) for the two groups. The mean score of teachers was found to be below the average mean (3.01). But the mean score for school leaders was higher than the average mean. An independent samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in the responses of the two groups concerning the first item in the table. P-value was 0.01, which is less than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was found to be-2.42. This shows that there was statistically significant difference between the responses of two groups. This indicates that there was contrary idea between the responses of two groups on the given item that school leaders might be reluctant to accept their weakness. Therefore, it needs more attention from school leaders in creating awareness for stakeholders' duties and responsibilities.

Item 2 in Table 5 is related to teachers' participation in school budget preparation. The mean scores were 2.26(SD=0.82) for teachers and 2.93(SD=1.06 for school principals respectively. The average mean scores were 2.41(SD=0.85). An independent samples t-test was computed to determine if there were differences in the responses of two groups concerning the second item in the table. The calculated t-value implies that P-value was found to be 0.00, which is less than the statistically significance level and t-value was found to be (-6.20).This result suggests that there was significant difference between the responses of two groups. Thus, one can presume that, most activities regarding teachers' participation in school budget preparation were practiced at low level in the sample preparatory schools because school leaders might feel well to hear the voice of teachers and they were important to give the direction and touch the core areas how the school finance is practiced. Therefore, it needs continuous discussion on teachers' participation in school budget preparation in order to create conducive school environment and increases transparency in relation to budget rather limiting to a few groups. Thus, the finding implies that absence of teachers' participation on the issue has an effect on school decision making.

Respondents were also asked if school leaders carefully gather relevant information to the problems before making decisions for in 3 of Table 5. The mean scores were 3.29 (SD=1.06) for teachers and 3.52(SD=0.98) for school leaders respectively. The average mean scores were 3.34 (SD=1.04). The mean scores were found to be below the average mean for teachers, but above the average mean for school leaders. An independent sampled *t*-test was computed to determine respondents' difference in their opinion on the issue. The p-value was found to be 0.079 which is

greater than the significant level 0.05 and t-value was found to bea-3.26. The result suggests that there was no significant difference between the responses of two groups. Both groups have similar attitude towards the issue under question.

In the fourth item, respondents were asked if leaders of schools develop alternative solutions by participating teachers to solve the problems. The mean scores were 2.46 (SD=0.95) for teachers and 2.75 (SD=1.05) for school leaders respectively. The average mean was 2.52 (SD=1.00). The mean scores for teachers were below the average mean. This shows that teachers' participation in developing alternative solutions to solve problems was practiced at low level. An independent-sample t-test was run to compare the two groups' responses. Regarding this, p-value was found to be 0.00, which is less than the significant level 0.05 and t-value was found to be -1.23. This implies there was statistically significant difference between the two groups' responses. These results indicate that developing alternative solutions by participating teachers in school decision making was practiced poorly in the study.

In the fifth item, respondents were also asked whether or not school leaders put decision in to action. The mean scores were 2.50 (SD=0.86) for teachers and 2.96(SD=0.77) for school leaders respectively. The average mean was 2.60(SD=0.84). An independent samples *t*-test was computed to determine if there was difference in the responses of two groups. The P- value was found to be 0.000, which is less than the significant level 0.05 and t-value found to be -4.04. Therefore, there was significant difference between the two groups' responses regarding the issue. This indicates that, decisions made in most schools were not action oriented.

Item six Table 5 shows the result on whether or not school leaders' follow-up the implementation of decisions made in schools. The mean score was 2.29 (SD=0.95) for teachers and 2.83 (SD=1.02) for school leaders respectively. The average mean scores were 2.41 (SD=0.96). The mean value of teachers was less than the mean value of school leaders which implies that, there was difference in responses of two groups. An independent samples *t*-test was computed to decide   difference in responses of two groups. P- Value was found to be 0.04, which is less than the significant level 0.05 and t- value was found to be -3.60.Therefore, there was significant difference in the mean scores of teachers and school leaders.

Concerning participation of teachers in school evaluation activities (item 7,) the mean scores were 3.24 (SD=1.00) for teachers and 3.33 (SD=1.01) for school leaders and with the average mean of 3.26 (SD=1.11) respectively. An independent samples t-test was run to come to decision related to differences between the responses of two groups. P-value was found to be 0.56, that is greater than the significance level 0.05 and the t-value was found to be 2.39 which is greater than critical table value 2.0. This implies that, teachers' participation in evaluating school activities was rated in a relatively similar level by the two groups.

Similarly, from FGD, it was found out that PTSA members' involvements were only in disciplinary issues. Besides, their involvement was still very low in the areas of instructional programs: school plans, in provision of facilities and others. Therefore, practices and problems of decision making in preparatory schools need to have teachers, parents and students involvement through meaningful way.

According to Hicks (2005:123), when implementing decision that does not produce the desired results, there are probably a number of causes: incorrect definition of problems, poor evaluation of alternatives, and/or improper implementation. Among these possible causes, the most common and serious error is an inadequate definition of problem. So, this has to be considered in the sample schools.

4.3. Effectiveness of School Principals in Decision Making Process

Table 6: Effectiveness of school principals in decision making process

No	Items	Teachers N=42		School Leaders N=12		Average		T-value	P-value
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
1	Setting learning objectives	3.47	0.80	4.08	0.99	3.60	0.87	5.11	0.53
2	The willingness in sharing his/her power and responsibilities to the stakeholders	2.26	0.85	2.83	1.02	2.38	0.88	-4.88	0.00
3	Practice in identifying the problems through collaborative activities	2.40	0.79	2.66	1.15	2.46	0.87	-4.46	0.00
4	Ability to act as a facilitator and coordinator by empowering and delegating others	2.96	0.87	3.08	0.90	2.98	0.88	-1.38	0.17
5	The consistency of his/her decision to school culture, employees and communities	2.54	0.86	2.66	1.23	2.57	0.94	-3.31	0.00
6	Transparency and openness to accept feedback from members in order to translate the decision to actions	2.30	0.71	2.83	1.14	2.41	0.83	-5.03	0.00
7	Conduct a regular meeting with community and parents to discuss on school issues	2.42	1.08	2.93	1.09	2.53	1.08	-3.20	0.01
8	Give reward for PTSA members	2.30	0.97	2.53	0.93	2.40	0.95	-4.44	0.00
9	school leaders involve teachers in co-curricular activities	3.33	1.18	3.75	1.28	3.42	1.20	2.9	0.20
	Grand Total	2.66	0.90	3.03	1.08	2.61	0.95		

Key: M=mean, SD=standard deviation, significance level (p-value) <0.05

Item 1 in Table 6 respondents were asked about leaders' ability in setting learning objectives for effectiveness of school decision making process. The mean scores were 3.47 (SD=0.8) for

teachers and 4.08(SD=0.99) for school leaders respectively. The average mean score was 3.60(SD=0.87). According to the results of independent samples t-test, P-value was found to be 0.53, which is greater than significance level 0.05 and t-value was found to be, 5.11 which is greater than the table value 2.0. The results indicate that there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups in relation to the item. This shows that school leaders were relatively effective in setting learning objectives.

Item 2 in Table 6 is about willingness of school leaders in sharing their power and responsibilities among stakeholders. The mean scores were 2.26 (SD=0.85) for teachers and 2.83(1.02) for school leaders respectively. The average mean scores were 2.38(SD=0.91). The result of an independent-sample t-test indicated that P-value was found to be 0.00, which is less than the significance level 0.05and t-value was found to be -4.88. This shows that there was significant difference in the mean scores of teachers and school leaders. Therefore, the result implies that school leaders' willingness in sharing responsibilities among stakeholders was given low attention.

Practice in identifying the problems through collaborative activities was another point in the third item. The mean scores were 2.40 (SD=0.79) for teachers and 2.66(1.15) for school leaders respectively. The average mean score was 2.46(SD=0.88). An independent samples t-test was computed to know if there were differences in the responses of the two groups. From the result, p-value was found to be 0.00, which is less than the significance level 0.05, and t-value was found to be -4.46. This implies that there was significance different in the mean scores of teachers and school leaders. The finding shows that school leaders were not effective in identifying problems through collaborative activities.

Item 4 in Table 6 was about the ability of school leaders to act as a facilitator and coordinator. The mean scores were 2.96 (SD=0.87) for teachers and 3.08(0.90) for school leaders respectively. The average mean scores were 2.98(SD=0.88). According to an independent samples t-test, p-value was found to be 0.17, which is greater than the significant level 0.05 and t-value was found to be -1.38, which is less than the table value 2.0. Therefore, the result indicates that, there was no significance difference between responses of the two groups.

Item 5 in Table 6 was about the consistency of school leaders' decisions to school culture and community. The mean scores were 2.54 (SD=0.86) for teachers and 2.66(1.23) for school leaders respectively. The average mean score was 2.57(SD=0.94). This shows that the mean scores for teachers were less than that of school leaders. An independent samples *t*-test was computed to decide if there were differences in the responses of two groups and p-value was found to be 0.00, which is less than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was found to be -3.31.Therefore, this test revealed the presence of statistically significant difference between responses of the two groups'. The result indicates that less attention was given to the consistency of school leaders decisions to school culture and school community.

In item 6 of the above table is related to respondents' views about school leaders' transparency and openness to accept feedback from members in order to translate the decision to actions. It was found that the mean scores were 2.30 (SD=0.71) for teachers and 2.83(1.14) for school leaders respectively. The average mean was 2.41(SD=0.83). An independent samples t-test was run to compare the two groups' responses. P-value was found to be 0.00, which is less than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was found to be -5.03. This shows that, there was significant difference in the mean scores of respondents with regard to openness and honesty to accept feedback from members in order to interpret decision to action. This shows that school principals were not that much transparent and open to accept feedback from stakeholders.

Respondents were also asked if leaders conduct a regular meeting with community and parents to discuss on school issues (item 7 of Table 6). The mean score was 2.42 (1.08) for teachers and 2.93(0.93) for school leaders respectively. The average mean was 2.53(SD=0.86). The result of an independent- sample t-test was disclosed that p-value was found to be 0.01, which is less than significant level 0.05, and t-value was found to be -3.32. The result shows that there was significant difference between responses of the two groups. This implies that school leaders were less effective in conducting regular meeting with community and parents to discuss on school issues in the study,

In item 8 of Table 6, the mean scores were 2.30 (0.97) for teachers and 2.53(1.09) for school leaders respectively. The average mean score was 2.40(SD=0.87). The mean scores of teachers were found to be less than that of school leaders'. An independent samples t-test was run to compare the two groups' responses. Therefore, p-value was found to be 0.00, which is less than

significant level 0.05, and t-value was found to be -4.44. This shows that there was significant difference between the two groups' responses. The result indicates that less attention was given to the provision of rewards to PTSA members.

Item 9 in Table 6 is regarding school leaders' action to involve teachers in co-curricular activities. The mean scores were 3.33 (SD=1.18) for teachers and 3.75(1.28) for school leaders respectively. The average mean score was 3.42(SD=1.20). An independent samples *t*-test was computed to determine if there was difference in the responses of two groups. P-value was found to be 0.20, which is greater than significance level 0.05 and t-value was found to be 2.9, which is greater than the table value 2.0. This shows that there was no significant difference between the responses of two groups.

The findings indicate that school leaders were effective in setting learning objectives and involving teachers in co-curricular activities. Whereas, majority of teachers agreed that school leaders were medium in practicing collaborative activities among stakeholders, act as facilitator and co-coordinator, and uniformity in decision making. The findings also show that, school principals were less effective at initiating PTSA members by giving rewards, willingness in sharing responsibilities and transparency and openness in accepting feedback from stakeholders.

Similarly, the results from FGD with PTSA's and students' council members and the data gathered from school documents revealed that principals were involving teachers and students in some co-curricular activities such as girls club, sports club, and anti-HIV/AIDS club and other related clubs. However, participation of students' council in school administration related to decision making were low in the sample schools. In addition, the data gathered through FGD and document analysis supported that preparatory school leaders rarely invite members for decisions related to collaborative activities and willingness in sharing responsibilities to stakeholders. According to Newstorm(1990:68-80) effective decision making requires the combination of three aspects:

> ➢ The different kinds of managerial problem situations that he/she faces.
> ➢ The kind of decision making style
> ➢ The kinds of strategies that fit the various decision making situations.

Good decisions require acceptance and quality. All managers make decisions, while effective decision making requires defining problems, gathering relevant information, identifying and evaluating alternative solutions, and selecting the best alternatives.

4.4. The extent of teachers', students' and parents' involvement in school decision making

Table 7: the extent of teachers, Students and parents involvement in school decision making

No	Items	Teachers N=42		School Leaders N=12		Average		T-value	P-value
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
1	Provide freedom for stakeholders to express their opinion	3.25	0.99	3.58	1.24	3.32	1.04	3.65	0.63
2	School leaders establish and maintain good interpersonal relationship with members in decision making	2.46	1.06	3.02	1.28	2.58	1.10	-2.00	0.02
3	School leaders accept teachers voice in decision making	2.48	1.08	2.83	1.26	2.55	1.12	-2.89	0.00
4	School leader empower stakeholders through training	2.31	1.09	2.50	1.31	2.35	1.13	-4.19	0.00
5	Create strong sense of vision and mission among members	2.38	1.12	2.75	1.21	2.46	1.14	-2.10	0.01
6	Participate students in matters affecting their learning	2.39	0.91	2.86	1.23	2.49	0.98	-2.91	0.03
7	Participate members in disciplinary issues	2.28	0.89	2.50	1.31	2.33	0.98	-4.94	0.00
8	Provision of information for stakeholders	2.97	1.08	3.00	1.34	2.98	1.13	1.13	0.07
9	School leaders' commitment in sharing responsibilities	2.41	1.11	3.00	1.27	2.54	1.14	-2.92	0.00
10	School leaders involve stakeholders in school planning	3.51	1.21	3.75	1.21	3.56	1.14	5.03	0.67
	Grand Total	2.64	1.05	2.97	1.28	2.71	1.10		

Key: M=mean, SD=standard deviation, significance level (p-value) <0.05

In the first item of Table 7, the mean scores were 3.25 (SD=0.99) for teachers and 3.58(1.24) for school leaders respectively regarding, Provision of freedom for stakeholders to express their opinion. The average mean score was found to be 3.32(SD=1.04. Furthermore, in order to determine if there was difference between the responses of two groups', an independent samples *t*-test was computed. The results indicate that, p-value was found to be 0.63, which is greater than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was found to be 3.65, which is greater than critical table value 2.0. This shows that, there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups'

The second item was about whether school leaders establish and maintain good interpersonal relationship with members in decision making. The mean scores were 2.46(SD=1.06) for teachers and 3.02(1.28) for school leaders respectively. The average mean was 2.58(SD=0.95). In order to compare the two groups' responses, an independent samples *t*-test was computed. Therefore, the results indicate that, p-value was found to be 0.02, which is less than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was found to be -2.00. This shows that, there was significant difference between the two groups' responses. The results revealed that, less attention was given to the establishment and maintenance of interpersonal relationship among stakeholders regarding school decision making

.

Concerning item 3 in Table 7, regarding the acceptance of teachers' voice in school decision making, the mean scores were, 2.48 (SD=1.08) for teachers and 2.83 (SD=1.26) for school leaders with the average mean of 2.55(SD=1.09). In order to determine the mean scores difference, an independent samples *t*-test was computed. The result indicates that, p-value was found to be 0.00, which is less than the significance level 0.05, and p-value was found to be -2.89. This shows that, there was significant difference between the responses of two groups'. The result indicates that, less concern was given to the voice of teachers in school decision making.

In the fourth item of the above table, respondents were asked if School leaders empower stakeholders through training. The mean scores were 2.31 (SD=0.09) for teachers and 2.50(1.31) for school leaders respectively. The average mean score was 2.35(SD=1.12). An independent

samples *t*-test revealed that p-value was found to be 0.00, which is less than significance level 0.05 and t-value was found to be -4.19. The results indicate that there was significant difference between teachers and school leaders' responses. This shows that, adequate training was not given to stakeholders to empower them through training.

Respondents were also asked if leaders of schools create strong sense of vision and mission among members and the result was summarized in Table 7 above. From the statistical analysis the mean scores were 2.38 (SD=1.12) for teachers and 2.75(1.21) for school leaders respectively and the average mean was 2.46(SD=1.10). An independent samples *t*-test was computed to examine if there was difference between the responses of the two groups. P-value was found to be 0.01, which is less than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was found to be -2.10. This shows that there was significant difference between teachers and school leaders' responses. This finding implies that school leaders were ineffective in creating sense of vision and mission in schools.

Item 6 in Table 7 was about participation of students in matters affecting their learning. The mean scores were 2.39 (SD=0.91) for teachers and 2.86(1.23) for school leaders respectively. The average mean for both groups was 2.49(SD=0.97). An independent samples *t*-test was computed to examine if there was differences between the responses of two groups. P-value was found to be 0.03, which is less than the significance level (0.05) and t-value was found -2.91.This implies that, there was significant difference between the responses of the two groups. This finding indicates that participation of students in school decision making was low.

Item 7 in Table 7 was about whether school leaders participate members in disciplinary issues. The mean scores were 2.28 (SD=0.89) for teachers and 2.50(1.31) for school leaders respectively and the average mean was 2.33(SD=0.99). An independent samples *t*-test was computed to determine if there was difference between the responses of the two groups. P-value was found to be 0.00, which is less than the significance level 0.05, and t-value was found to be -4.94.This indicates that there was significant difference between the responses of the two groups'. The finding shows that there was the absence concerned stakeholders' participation in school decision making process, particularly in disciplinary issues.

School leaders' provision of information to stakeholders was assessed and presented in item 8 of Table 7. The mean scores were 2.97(SD=1.08) for teachers and 3.00(1.24) for school leaders respectively. The average mean was 2.98(SD=1.14). An independent samples *t*-test result shows that p-value was found to be 0.07, which is greater than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was found to be 1.13, which is less than the table value. The result shows that, there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

Item 9 in Table 7 is regarding school leaders' commitment in sharing responsibilities. The mean scores were 2.41 (SD=1.11) for teachers and 3.00(1.27) for school leaders respectively. The average mean score was 2.54(SD=0.97). An independent samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences between the responses of the two groups'. P-value was found to be 0.00, which is less than the significance level 0.05 and t-value was found to be -2.92.Therefore, there was significant difference between the responses of the two groups. This finding indicates that school leaders' commitment in sharing responsibilities was low in the sample schools.

Item 10 in Table 7 is regarding stakeholders' involvement in school planning. The mean scores were 3.51 (SD=1.21) for teachers and 3.75(1.21) for school leaders respectively. The average mean score was 3.56(SD=0.85). According to the independent samples t-test result, p-value was found to be 0.67, which is greater than the significance level 0.05, and t-value was found to be 5.03, which is greater than table value 2.0. This shows that, there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

As can be seen from Table 7, regarding the extent of teachers', students' and parents' involvement in decision making, in items 4, 5, 6, and 7 both respondents scored the mean value at low level of practices. However, both groups agreed and scored high level in items 1, 8, and 10 of the above table.

Similarly, the data gathered from FGD and open-ended questions indicate that majority of school leaders from the sample schools motivate members to be involved in school planning. But teachers reported that sharing of responsibility and their involvement in disciplinary issues were affected by higher officials' interference. Similarly, literature revealed that students should be involved in all areas of school life and have opportunities for involvement in each major area particularly in schools climates including rules, rewards and sanctions, curriculum, teaching and learning, management and development planning (Huddleston, 2007)

4.5. Factors Influencing School Decision Making Process

Table 8: Descriptive Statistics on Factors Influencing School Decision Making Process

No	Items	Respondents	No.	M	SD	Rank	Ave. Mean	Mean Rank
1	School leaders failure to make decision based on scientific and systematic analysis	Teachers	42	2.73	1.0	5	2.86	4
		School leaders	12	3.00	1.1	1		
2	School directors fear of risk taking	Teachers	42	3.80	1.1	1	3.40	1
		School leaders	12	3.0	1.2	1		
3	School leaders' unwillingness to share decision making process with others	Teachers	42	3.61	1.2	2	3.13	2
		School leaders	12	2.66	1.1	4		
4	Lack of school leaders effective communication	Teachers	42	2.92	1.0	4	2.62	6
		School leaders	12	2.33	.9	5		
5	The undue exercise of power and control by the school leaders	Teachers	42	3.59	1.2	3	2.92	3
		School leaders	12	2.25	.9	6		
6	School leaders analyze situations effectively in selecting suitable solution to solve problems	Teachers	42	2.66	1.2	6	2.79	5
		School leaders	12	2.92	0.9	2		
7	School leaders integrate several possible alternatives in relation to social aspects of the environment	Teachers	42	2.5	1.0	7	2.62	6
		School leaders	12	2.75	1.1	3		
8	Lack of available resources (time, information, materials etc.)	Teachers	42	2.21	0.9	8	2.18	7
		School leaders	12	2.16	1.1	7		

Key: F=frequency, VL=very low, L=low, M=medium, H=high, VH=very high, M=mean, SD=standard deviation

Items in Table 8 are related to factors influencing school decision making process in sample schools.

In the above table, responses of two groups were analyzed and interpreted as follows: Based on the mean scores, and the average mean obtained, these items were ranked. As indicated above, the results show that school leaders' fear of risk taking, unwillingness to share decision making process with other stakeholders, the undue exercise of power and control, and failure make decisions based on scientific and systematic analysis were found to be the main factors that affect decision making process in preparatory schools respectively. On the other hand, lack of available resources was not considered as a major factor in affecting decision making process. Besides, lack of school leaders' effective communication and integrating several possible solutions with social aspects of the environment were not considered as major factors.

The findings indicate that, majority of respondents reported that there were problems in relation to school leaders in managing schools and reducing the problems of decision making process of schools.

In addition, comments and suggestions collected from teachers through open-ended questions indicated that stakeholders' participation in decision-making process was low due to lack of school leaders' skill of sharing duties, lack of trust, and political influence.

Similarly, from the document analysis, most of the school leaders in preparatory schools under study were not able to properly handle the delegation processes. They did not give proper delegation by giving letters with lists of activities. As a result, most activities in the schools were loaded on school leaders. This implies that there was a gap in collaborative work between school leaders and stakeholders including teachers and students in school decision making process.

CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

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

5.1. Summary

The objective of this study was to investigate decision making practices in Government preparatory schools of Horro GuduruWollega Zone, Oromia Regional State.

In order to achieve the objectives of this study, the following basic questions were raised:

1. What are the major decision making practices in preparatory schools?
2. How effective are school leaders in playing their roles of decision making?
3. To what extent parents, teachers and students play their roles in decision making?
4. What major challenges affect the process of decision making in preparatory schools?

The study was conducted in four preparatory schools. The schools were taken as a sample by purposive sampling method. The subjects of the study were school leaders, teachers, parents and students. As a source of data, 42 teachers, 12 school principals, 12 PTSA members and 20 students' council (a total of 86 respondents) were involved in this study.

The data collecting tools were questionnaire, FGD, and document analysis.

The data obtained were analyzed using statistical tools such as percentage, frequency, mean, standard deviation and t-test. Based on the results of the analysis, the following major findings were obtained:

1. Concerning school decision-making practices in preparatory schools the data analysis revealed that, teachers' participation in school budget preparation, follow-up of the implementation of decision by school leaders and developing alternative solutions in participating teachers were found to be low. Creation of awareness to teachers for practical decision making and school leaders' effort to put decision in to action were on the medium

range. The study also revealed that decisions made are not usually implemented because of non-participation and involvement of teachers in the process of decision making and that alternative choice of decisions reached sometimes bridge conflicts in the management of preparatory schools with regards to their implementation. However, teachers' participation in school evaluation activities and gathering relevant information were relatively high. This indicates that, practices of decisions made in schools were below the expected level.

2. Regarding effectiveness of school leaders in decision making process, the study indicates that setting learning objectives and teachers' involvement in co-curricular activities were the area in which school leaders were effective. In contrast, school leaders' willingness in sharing responsibilities, initiating PTSA members in providing rewards and transparency and openness in accepting feedback were found to be ineffective. Conducting regular meeting with the school community, school leaders' consistency indecisions to school culture was considered as medium. The study indicated that, most schools under study were less effective in the process of decision making.

3. The findings of this study   also disclosed that, the extent of teachers', parents', and students' participation in school decision making process: participation of members in disciplinary issues, provision of empowerment through training, participating students in matters affecting their learning, and creation of strong sense of vision and mission of the school in having information about decision making process were found relatively low. Similarly, the acceptance of teachers' voice in decision making, school leader's commitment in sharing ideas, and the establishment of relationship was considered to be medium. However, teachers' involvement in school planning and provision of freedom and information was relatively found to be high. The findings of the study revealed that parents as members of the PTSA are not involved in decision making process in school. This indicates that teachers, parents and students' participation in school decision making process were unsatisfactory.

4. Concerning factors affecting school decision making process, the analysis of the study revealed that there were major challenges in school decision making process; school leaders fear of risk taking, unwillingness to share decision making process with other stakeholders, undue exercise of power and control and school leaders failure to make decision based on scientific and systematic analysis were considered to be the major once.

Moreover, the analysis of open-ended questions indicated that, lack of financial incentives, low concern of teachers to solve school problems, lack of proper supervision, unwillingness of giving recognition towards motivating stakeholders, higher political leaders interference, and low social respect given to teachers, and school leaders personal commitment were some of the factors affecting school decision making process.

5.2. Conclusions

Based on the findings, the following conclusions are drawn:

A great deal of decision making in school organization is achieved through the participation of teachers, parents, students, school leaders, and other concerned groups. From the findings of this study, the practices, effectiveness of school leaders and the extent of stakeholder's participation were found to be minimal in the sample schools. This was because of some factors affecting school decision making process. This implies that less attention was given to the contribution of good decision making practice by involving concerned bodies. And this has an effect on schools to be effectiveness. Moreover, this affects the overall activities of schools in general and the teaching learning process in particular.

The study disclosed that most of the factors that hamper stakeholders' involvement in school decision making were related to poor management capacity of school leaders. This is because a few of school principals were qualified in school management. As a result, they failed in involving stakeholders in school decision making process through various administration functions such as planning delegation, motivation, and others. It was thus concluded that school leaders might lack the necessary leadership skills, commitment and attitude to attract stakeholders through collaborative activities.

5.3. Recommendations

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

❖ The finding of the study revealed that, preparatory school leaders practice decision making process poorly. Therefore, it is advisable for school leaders to make decisions systematic and scientific and hence practice their role properly in:

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

- Creating a collaborative relationship among teachers through in-service training in which they can share their experience and learn from each other concerning their profession and the teaching learning process.

- Conducting panel discussion on school issues and particularly on school decision making process and work closely with higher officials in increasing stakeholders' participation level.

❖ It is also advisable for school leaders to be committed in leading schools as a leader. Thus, the woreda education office and higher political leaders should let school leaders manage their school without unnecessary interferences.

❖ Students are one of the key stakeholders in education system. All kinds of decisions and governance practices at school level directly affect students. Therefore, it is suggested that school leaders involve students in decision making process which affects their learning. This requires a discussion with students/ their representatives as decisions made in schools without active involvement of students cannot be successful.

❖ As the result revealed, school leaders were not effective in most activities that directly affect their leadership role. Therefore, it is useful

for school leaders to share responsibilities among teachers by showing their commitments through discussion, and conducting regular meetings.

❖ It is also recommended that school leaders should organize series of discussion with the community about the importance of their involvement in school management in order to improve the education of their children which in turn creates the feeling of ownership.

❖ At the end, the researcher recommends the need to conduct more detailed and comprehensive study on the current practices and problems of decision making processes in preparatory schools.

References

Adane Tessera et al.(2002). *School Organization and Management:* Distance Education Material for   In-service Trainees: Addis Ababa University: Unpublished Continuing and Distance Education Division.

Armstrong, M. A. (1984). *Hand book of personal management practice.* London: Kogan pare Ltd.

Asefa Abahumna (1995).*Teachers' Participation in Decision Making in Technical and Vocational schools of Ethiopia*. Addis Ababa University: Unpublished Master's Thesis.

Ayalew Shibesh (2010). *Foundation of educational readership*: Addis Ababa University: Unpublished teaching material: Alpha Printing enterprise.

Baker, et al.(2000). *Guide book to Decision Making Methods,* WSRC-IM-2002-00002, Department of Energy, and USA.

Best, J. & Kahn, J. V.(2003). *Research in education:* (7th Ed.). New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.

Black, K. (2010) "*Business statistics: Contemporary Decision Making*" (6th Ed), Johan Wiley and Sons.

Bonito,J. (2011). *International influence in small group decision making:* New York, NY: Routldge.

Bulach. C. Lunenburg, F. C. & Potter, (2008). *Creating a culture for high performing schools: A comparative approach to school reform:* Lanham, MD: Roman & Littlefield.

Bush, et al.(1980).*Approaches to School Management.* London: Harper & Row Publisher.

Chanman et al. (1997).Teachers participation in decision making: The case of SMI School in Hong Kong. *Educational Journal: 25*(2), 17-42.

Cranston, N. (2000c). *The impact of school based management on primary principals in Queensland:* Unpublished doctoral thesis, central Queensland University.

Cranston, N. (2001). Collaborative decision making and school based management: challenges, rhetoric and reality. *Journal of educational enquiry*, *2* (2): 1-22.

Cronbach, L. J. (1971). Test validation: In R.L. Thorndike (Ed.). *Educational measurement* (2nd ed.) Washington, DC: American council on education.

David, Jane L. (1989). *"Synthesis of research on school-based management": Educational leadership, 46* (8), 45-53.

Day et al. (2000).*Leading schools in times of change.* Buckingham: Open Press.

Dunne, et al. (2007). School process, Education, Kenya, Uganda, and Lesotho*,* Paris: *International Institute for educational planning and UNESCO.*

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

Fatima Isah, (2007-2008). *Assessment of Decision Making Process in Secondary Schools in* Kaduna State, Unpublished: Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria-Nigeria.

Griffin, G.A. (1995). Influence of shared decision making on school and classroom activity: *The elementary school journal*, 96, 29-45.

Gulting J., Buter D. (1999).*Creating people-centered: school organization and change in South Africa.* London: Oxford University press.

Harris, R.(1998).*Introduction to Decision Making,* Virtual salt.
http:www.virtualsalt.com/crebook5.htm.

Hart, AW. (1995). Re-conceiving school leadership: *Elementary school journal,96*(1): 9-28.

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

Hoy, W. K. & Miskel, C. G. (1991). *Educational administration: Theory, Research and Practice* (4th Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Huddleston, J. (2007). *For Student voice to shared responsibility: Effective practice in democratic:* School Governance in European schools.

Huddleston, J. et al. (1991). Participative Decision Making can capitalize on Teacher Expertise. *NASSP Bulletin, 75*(534), 80-89.

Imber M. et al.(1990). Factors that contribute to teachers' satisfaction with participative decision making: *Journal of research and development in education, 23*(4), 216-225:International Academy of Education.

Ivancevich, J., Konopaske, & R.Matteson, M.(2005).*Organizational Behavior and Management (7thEd).* New Yor*k*: McGraw Hill Companies. Inc

Jonston C. (1997). *Leadership and the learning organization in self-managing school:* Doctoral thesis, unpublished Melbourne: University of Melbourne.

Keeney, R.L. and Raiffa, H.(1976).*Decisions with Multiple Objectives: Performance and Value Trade-offs,* Willey, New York.

Kothari, K. (1985). *Research Methodology, Method and Techniques:* Jaipur ,University of Rajasthan.

Mac Beath, J. (1998).*Effective school leadership: Responding to change.* London: Paul Chapman.

McEwan, E.K. (1997).*Leading your Team to Excellence: How to make Quality Decision:* London Crown Press.

McMillan, J. H. Schmacher, S. (1993). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction.* New York: Harper Collins College Publisher.

Mekuria, (2009).*The current educational decision-Making practice and implementation in secondary schools of Addis Ababa University*: unpublished master's Thesis.

Melaku, et al.(2000: 178-179). *School Organization and Management (EDAD, 302): Distance education materials for in-service trainees. Continuing Education:* Addis Ababa University: Unpublished.

MoE.(1994).*Ethiopia Education and Training Policy*: Ministry of Education. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

MoE.(1998). *Educational sector development program I (ESDP-I): Action plan,* Addis Ababa*:* Ministry of Education.

MoE.(1999). *Educational Administration, Community participation, and finance:* Addis Ababa.

MoE.(2002). *Education sector development program II (ESDP-II).* Addis Ababa: Ministry of education.

MoE.(2005). *Education sector development program (ESDP III) program action plan:* Addis Ababa: Ministry of education.

MoE.(2010). *Education sector development program IV (ESDP-IV).* Addis Ababa: Ministry of education.

Mokoena, S.(2011). Participative decision making: Perceptions of school stakeholders in South Africa: University of South Africa.

Mualuko, N. J. Mukasa, S. A. & Judy, A. S.(2009).Improving decision making in schools through teachers participation: *Educational research and review*, *4*(8), 391-397.

Murphy J.(1997).*Restructuring Through School-Based Management:* In Townsend.

Musaazi, J.C.S, (1982). *The Theory and practice of educational Administration*: Oxford, Macmillan.

Naidoo, Jordan P. (2005). *Educational decentralization and school Governance in South Africa: from policy to practice*. Paris: international institute for educational planning, UNESCO.

Newstorm, John, w & pierce, John L. (1990). *Windows in to organization*: New York America Management Association.

OECD,(2001). Report on Hungary/OECD Seminar on *Managing Education for Lifelong Learning,* 6-7 December 2001, Budapest.

Okumbe J.A. (1998). *Educational management*: Theory and practice: Nairobi, Nairobi University Press.

Owens, R.G.(1987).*Organizational Behavior in Education(3rd ed.).* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Owens, R.G. (1995). *Organizational Behavior in Education*: Englewood cliffs, prentice Hall: Pathways to access: research management no. Brighten: Consortium for education.

Owens, R.G.(1998).*Organizational Behavior in Education.* Boston: Ally and Bacon, Inc.

Rallis, S.F., & Mac Mullen, M.M.(2000). *Inquiry-minded schools opening doors for accountability.* Phi Delta Kappan*, 81*(10), 766-776.

Robbins, R.P. (2003). *Organizational behavior:* (10th end.). Upper Saddle River: Prentice-Hall.

Senge, P. M. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization (rev. Ed).* New York, NY: currency/double day.

Sergiovanni, T. & Starrat, R.(1999).*Supervision*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Simon, Herbert, A. (1962). *Public Administration:* London: Altered A. Knopf. Inc

Stoner, J. A. D. & Freeman, R. G.(1992). *Management* (6th Ed): Eaglewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall.

Thomas, B.(2002).*School Discipline.* htt:www.helium.com/items/1245730.Changing-Probl.

Triantaphyllos, E.(2000).*Multi-Criteria of Decision Making Methods: A comparative study,*
Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Wondewosen Berihanu, (2011).An Assessment of the practice and problems of decision making
in secondary Schools of Nekemte Town, unpublished master's thesis, AAU.

Workneh Abebe, (2012). *School management and decision making in Ethiopian Government
schools:* evidence from the young lives qualitative school survey. Addis Ababa.

Zarate, P. (2009). *Collaborative decision making: Perspectives and challenges.* Amsterdam, the

Netherlands: IOS Press.

Addis Ababa University

College of Education and Behavioral Studies

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Questionnaire to be filled by preparatory school teachers

Dear Respondent,

First of all I would like to express my heartfelt appreciation and regard for your time, energy, in advance to fill this questionnaire. This questionnaire is designed to collect data for the thesis entitled"**practices and problems of decision making in preparatory schools of Horro Guduru Wollega Zone**". Your genuine and frank response to the questionnaire is highly valuable for the achievement of the objectives of this research. Your response will be kept confidential and will be utilized only for academic purposes. Please provide your response as per the instruction of each section.

General Instruction

- No need of writing your name
- Please put "X" mark in the box provided where alternatives are given.
- If you have additional or different option from the given alternatives, please write it on the space provided for the option "if other please specify"
- You are kindly requested to give short and precise answers in the space provided for those open-ended items.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation!

Part1. Personal back ground information

1.1.Woreda_____

1.2.School_____

1.3.Sex:- Male ☐ Female ☐

1.4.Qualification

Certificate ☐ First degree ☐

Diploma ☐ second Degree ☐

Please specify if any_____

1.5.Area of specialization

Major_____ Minor_____ if others_____

1.6.Service year

1- 5	☐	16-20	☐
6-10	☐		
11-15	☐	21and above	☐

Part II Items related to major practices of decision making in preparatory schools

Direction: below in the table, there are response patterns which are represented by numbers "1-5" where, 5= very high; 4=high; 3= medium; 2 =low; 1=very low.
Depending on your judgment, please show your response by selecting the possible options and putting the symbol (X) under the number you want to select:

No	Items	Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Creation of awareness to teachers for practical school decision making					
2	Teachers participation in school budget preparation					
3	Prior to make a decision, school leader carefully gather relevant information to the problems					
4	Develop alternative solutions in participating teachers to solve the problems					
5	School leaders put the decision in to action					
6	School leaders follow- up the implementation of the decision					
7	Teachers participation in school evaluation activities					

Part III: Effectiveness of school principals in decision making

Direction: below in the table, there are response patterns which are represented by numbers "1-5" where, 5=very high; 4=high; 3= medium; 2= low; 1=very low. Depending on your judgment, please show your response by selecting the possible options and putting the symbol (X) under the number you want to select.

No	Items	Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Setting learning objectives					
2	willingness in sharing his/her power and responsibilities to the stakeholders					
3	Practice in identifying problems through collaborative activities					
4	Abilities to act as a facilitator and coordinator by empowering and delegating others					
5	The consistency of his/her decision to school culture, employees and communities					
6	Transparency and openness to accept feedback from members in order to translate the decision to actions					
7	Conduct a regular meeting with community and parents to discuss on school issues					
8	Give reward for PTSA members having good participation					
9	School leaders involve teachers in co-curricular activities					

Part IV. The extent of teachers, students and parents involvement in school decision making

Direction: below in the table, there are response patterns which are represented by numbers "1-5" where, 5 =strongly agree; 4= agree; 3= neither agree nor disagree; 2= disagree; 1= strongly disagree. Depending on your judgment, please show your response by selecting the possible options and putting the symbol (X) under the number you want to select.

No	Items	Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Provision of freedom to express your opinion					
2	School leaders establish and maintain good interpersonal relationship with members in decision making					
3	School leaders accept teachers' voice in decision making					
4	School leaders empower stakeholders through training					
5	School leaders create strong sense of vision and mission among stakeholders					
6	School leaders involve students in matters affecting their learning					
7	School leaders involve members in disciplinary issues as decision makers					
8	School leaders provision of information to stakeholders					
9	School leaders commitment in sharing responsibilities among stakeholders					
10	School leaders involve stakeholders in school planning					

Part V: Items related to factors influencing decision making process.

Direction: below in the table, there are response patterns represented by numbers from 1-5, where 5=Very high; 4= high; 3= medium; 2= low; 1= very low. Please, put the symbol (X) under the number you are going to select.

No	Items	Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	School leaders failure to make decision based on scientific and systematic analysis					
2	School directors fear of risk taking					
3	School leaders unwillingness to share decision making with others					
4	Lack of school leaders effective communication					
5	The undue exercise of power and control by the school leaders					
6	School directors analyze situations effectively to select suitable solution to solve problems					
7	School directors integrate several possible alternatives with social aspects of the environment					
8	Lack of available resources (time, information, materials etc.)					

If you have any idea/suggestions you can write in the space provided below.

9. What do you think about the problems/challenges of decision making in your school?

_____

_____

_____

10. Please suggest the possible solutions for the problems

_____

_____

_____

11. If you have any other idea you can write in the space provided below

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____.

Addis Ababa University

College of Education and Behavioral Studies

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Questionnaire to be filled by preparatory school leaders (Principals and Vice Principals)

Dear Respondents,

The major purpose of this questionnaire is to gather relevant information on the practice and related problems of decision making in preparatory schools of HGW Zone. The information collected through this questionnaire will be used only for academic purpose and the results of the study are believed to be used as an input to improve the practices of decision making for the schools. Therefore, your genuine and timely response is very important for the success of this study. So, I kindly request your cooperation in completing the questionnaire honestly and responsibly.

General Information:

- It is not necessary to write your name
- For questions with alternative, put (X) mark inside the box
- Write your opinion briefly for open ended items on the space provided

Thank you in advance for your cooperation!

Part I. Personal Background Information

1.1.Name of the school_____

1.2.Woreda _____

1.3.Sex: Male ☐ Female ☐

1.4.Level of education:

Diploma ☐ MA/MED/MSC ☐ BA/BED/BSC ☐ Any other ☐

1.5.Service year as principal/Vice principal

1-5 ☐ 11-15 ☐ 21 and above ☐

6-10 ☐ 16-20 ☐

1.6. Areas of specialization

Language ☐   Social science ☐

Mathematics ☐   Business ☐

Natural science ☐   Educational management area ☐   others ☐

Part II: Items related to the major practices of decision making in preparatory schools.

Direction: below in the table, there are response patterns which are represented by numbers "1-5" where, 5 =very high; 4=high; 3=medium; 2=low; 1=very low. Depending on your judgment, please show your response by selecting the possible options and putting the symbol (X) under the number you want to select.

No	Items	Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Your creation of awareness to teachers for practical school decision making					
2	Provision of school leaders for teachers participation in school budget preparation					
3	Prior to make a decision school leaders carefully gather relevant information to the problems					
4	Develop alternative solutions in participating teachers to solve the problems					
5	You are putting the decision in to action					
6	Your effective follow up and make corrective action in school decision making					
7	Making teachers to participate in school evaluation activities					

Part III. Effectiveness of school principals playing roles related to decision making in schools.

Direction: Below in the table, the effectiveness of school principals playing roles in school decision making and response patterns represented by numbers '1-5'where, 5=very high; 4=high; 3=medium; 2=low;1=very low. Please, indicate your answer by putting 'X' mark under the number you are going to select.

No	Item	Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Setting learning objectives					
2	The willingness in sharing your power and responsibilities to the stakeholders					
3	Practice in identifying the problems through collaborative activities					
4	Abilities to act as a facilitator and coordinator by empowering and delegating others					
5	The consistency of your decision to school culture, employees and communities					
6	Transparency and openness to accept feedback from members in order to translate the decision to actions					
7	Conduct a regular meeting with community and parents to discuss on school issues					
8	Give reward for PTSA members having good participation					
9	School leaders involve teachers in co-curricular activities					

Part IV: The extent of teachers, students and parents involvement in school decision making

Direction: below in the table, there are response patterns which are represented by numbers "1-5" where, 5=strongly agree; 4=agree; 3= neither agree nor disagree; 2=disagree; 1= strongly disagree. Depending on your judgment, please show your response by selecting the possible options and putting the symbol (X) under the number you want to select.

No	Items	Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Providing freedom for stakeholders to express their opinion					
2	Establishing and maintaining good interpersonal relationship with members in decision making					
3	Accept teachers voice in decision making					
4	Providing empowerment through training about school disciplinary issues					
5	Create strong sense of vision and mission among stakeholders					
6	Participate students in matters affecting their learning					
7	Participate members in disciplinary issues as decision makers					
8	School directors provision of information to stakeholders					
9	School leaders commitment in sharing responsibilities among stakeholders					
10	School directors involve members in school planning					

Part V. Items related to factors affecting schools decision making

Direction: Below in the table, there are responses patterns represented by numbers from '1-5', where, =very high; 4=high; 3=medium; 2=low; 1=very low. Please. Put the symbol (x) under the number you are going to select.

No	Items	Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	School leaders make decision on scientific and systematic analysis					
2	School directors fear of risk taking					
3	Unwillingness to share decision making with others					
4	Lack of school leaders effective communication					
5	The exercise of power and control by the school leaders					
6	School directors analyze situations effectively to select suitable solution to solve problems					
7	School directors integrate several possible alternatives with social aspects of the environment					
8	Lack of available resources (time, information, materials etc.)					

If there are any factors affecting school decision making, please list them on the space provided below.

9. What do you think about major problems/challenges of decision making in your school?

_____

_____

_____

10. Please suggest the possible solutions for the problems

_____

_____

_____

11. If you have any other idea you can write in the space provided below

_____

_____

_____

Appendix B

FGD Questions for preparatory students' council members

The purpose of this study is to collect relevant data / information on the practices and related problems of decision making in preparatory schools of HGW Zone. The information that you will provide determines the quality of the study. The information will be used only for academic purpose. You are kindly asked to provide your own response.

Part 1: Background information

1.1.Name of Woreda_____

1.2.Name of school_____

1.3.Number of FGD participants Male [_____] Female [_____] Total [_____]

1. How are decisions made in your school? Who are involved in decision making?

2. How do you evaluate your level of participation in school decision making?

3. On what major issues you are involved in decision making?

4. To what extent do school leaders facilitate conditions for the effectiveness of decisions to be made?

5. What factors affect parents' participation in school decision making?

6. What are the possible solutions for the practice and related problems of decision making in preparatory schools?

<div align="center">

Appendix C

</div>

FGD Questions for PTSA members of parents in preparatory schools

The purpose of this study is to collect relevant information on the practices and problems of decision making in preparatory schools of HGW Zone. The information that you will provide determines the quality of the study. The information will be used only for the academic purpose. You are kindly asked to provide your own response.

Part I. Back ground information

1.1. Name of the school_____

1.2. Woreda _____

1.3. Number of FGD participants: Male ⬜   Female ⬜   Total ⬜

1.4. Educational back ground

      Diploma ⬜   First Degree ⬜   Second Degree ⬜   other ⬜

1. How are decisions made in your school? Who are involved in decision making?

2. How do you evaluate your level of participation in school decision making?

3. On what major issues you are involved in decision making?

4. To what extent do school leaders facilitate conditions for the effectiveness of decisions to be made?

5. What factors affect PTSA participation in school decision making?

6. What are the possible solutions for the practice and related problems of decision making in preparatory schools?

Appendix D

Document Review Checklist

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

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