



SEEK WISDOM, ELEVATE YOUR INTELLECT AND SERVE HUMANITY!



ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND  
MANAGEMENT

PRINCIPAL'S LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS IN  
IMPLEMENTING SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM IN  
PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF WOLAITA ZONE

BY  
ABEL ODIRE

ADVISOR: JEILU OUMER (PhD)

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIOURAL STUDIES  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND  
MANAGEMENT PRESENTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF  
ARTS IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

SEPTEMBER, 2021 G.C  
ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND  
MANAGEMENT

PRINCIPAL'S LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS IN  
IMPLEMENTING SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM IN  
PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF WOLAITA ZONE

BY  
ABEL ODIRE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIOURAL STUDIES  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND  
MANAGEMENTY PRESENTED IN PARTIALFULFILLMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF  
ARTS IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

SEPTEMBER, 2021G.C  
ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

**Addis Ababa University**  
**School of Graduate Studies**  
**Approval Sheet of Thesis**

This is to confirm that the thesis prepared by Abel Odire titled: principal's leadership effectiveness in implementing school improvement programs in public secondary schools of Wolaita zone and recommended that it is be known as accomplishing the thesis prerequisite for the degree of Masters of Art in Educational Leadership and Management.

External Examiner: -----  
Name Signature Date

Internal Examiner: -----  
Name Signature Date

Advisor: -----  
Name Signature Date

---

Head of Department or graduate Program Coordinator

Addis Ababa University  
College of Education and Behavioral studies  
Department of Educational Planning and Management

**Declaration**

The researcher hereby declares that the thesis on the title “**principals leadership effectiveness in implementing school improvement program in public secondary schools of Wolaita zone**” is the researcher unique effort besides that entirely bases that have remained mentioned to then cited have remained properly shown and recognized through whole references.

Name: Abel Odire

Signature .....

Date.....

## **Acknowledgment**

First, I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to my God. He gave peace and health to me,

my advisor and our institution. Then, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Jeilu Oumer for his unreserved, critical and positive comments he gave me for the overall sustainable encouragement, the research would have not been successful. Thirdly, I have expressed my open appreciation for my wife Ms. Yetnayet Hanjalo for her moral support, encouragement, and also her efforts to overcome different challenges which affect my work as well as the life of the family. Fourthly, I have sent my heartfelt thanks to my mother Ms. Ajabe Biramo, my sister Ms. Mabirat Odire and my friends Mr. Tadele Bonja, Mr. Abara Okanto, Mr. Tefer W/Mariam, Mr. Dawit Keho, for their material as well as moral support starting from the initial to the completion of this thesis work. Fifthly, my considerate thanks also go to all of my teachers who have been supporting and helping me to come up with success and AAU, as an organization for its financial support and overall service. Lastly, I would like to express my thank for Wolaita zone education department, woreda education offices, sample secondary school teachers, principals, supervisors and Kebele Education and Training Board, PTA, and student representatives of their willingness to give necessary information, through questionnaire, interview, focus group discussion, and document analysis to make the study successfully.

## Table of Contents

<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
Acknowledgment.....	i
Table of Contents.....	ii
List of Tables.....	iv
Abbreviations and acronym.....	v
Abstract.....	vi
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.3 Basic research questions.....	6
1.4 Objectives of the Study.....	7
1.4.1 General Objective.....	7
1.4.2 Specific objectives.....	7
1.5 Significance of the Study.....	7
1.6 Delimitation of the Study.....	8
1.7 Limitation of the Study.....	9
1.8 Operational Definitions of Key Terms.....	9
1.9 Organization of the study.....	10
CHAPTER TWO.....	11
2. Review of Related Literature.....	11
2.1. The Concept of Leadership.....	11
2.2. Leadership Effectiveness and Efficiency.....	12
2.2.1. Shared vision.....	13
2.2.2. Communication.....	14
2.2.3. Creating Culture.....	15
2.2.4. Empowering Others.....	16
2.3. School Improvement Program.....	17
2.4 .The Domains of School Improvement Program.....	17
2.4.1. Teaching and Learning Domain.....	18
2.4.2. School Leadership and Management Domain.....	19
2.4.3. Safe and Healthy School Environment Domain.....	20
2.4.4. Community Involvement Domain.....	22
2.5. The role of effective leadership on school success.....	23

2.6. Challenges of Effective Leadership .....	24
2.7. Personal Characteristics and Leadership.....	24
2.8. The Role of School Principal in SIP implementation. ....	25
2.9. Principals Leadership Roles in Students Performance.....	25
CHAPTER THREE .....	27
3. Research Design and Methodology .....	27
3.1. Research Design.....	27
3.2 The research Methods .....	27
3.3. Data Source .....	28
3.4 Population, Sample and Sampling Techniques.....	28
3.4.1. Population.....	28
3.4.2. Sampling Techniques .....	29
3.4.3. Sample .....	30
3.5. Instruments of Data Collection .....	32
3.5.1 Questionnaire.....	32
3.5.2. Interview.....	33
3.5.3. Focus Group Discussion.....	33
3.5.4. Document Analysis .....	33
3.6. Data Collection Procedures.....	34
3.7. Method of Data Analysis .....	34
3.8. Ethical Consideration .....	35
CHAPTER FOUR .....	36
4. Data presentation, analysis and interpretation .....	36
CHAPTER FIVE .....	61
Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations.....	61
5.1. Summary .....	61
5.2 Conclusion .....	65
5.3. Recommendations .....	69
References.....	70
APPENDIX-A .....	75
APPENDIX-B.....	80
APPENDIX- C.....	82
APPENDIX- D .....	83

## **List of Tables**

Table 1: Populations, samples and Sampling Techniques .....	29
Table 2: List of Sample Woreda and their Respective Sample Secondary schools.....	31
Table 3: Summaries of the population, sample, sampling techniques and data gathering tools .....	31
Table 4: Returns on questionnaires:.....	36
Table 5: Demographic characteristics of respondents .....	37
Table 6: Items related to classroom observation to support teachers .....	40
Table 7: Items related to Support teachers from principals .....	42
Table 8: Items related to monitoring students for leadership effectiveness.....	45
Table 9: Test of significance of Correlation and descriptive statistics for provision of instructional materials and principal leadership effectiveness .....	47
Table 10: Test of Significance of Correlation and descriptive statistics for the curriculum monitoring, evaluation and principal effectiveness. ....	48
Table 11: Test of Significance of Correlation and descriptive statistics for school Conducive environment and principal effectiveness.....	50
Table 12: Test of Significance of Correlation and descriptive statistics for observing classroom practice and principal effectiveness to improve SIP. ....	51
Table 13: Test of Significance of Correlation and descriptive statistics for the improvement of stakeholder participation and principal effectiveness.....	52
Table 14: The school principal's challenges that face school leaders to improve SIP implementation.....	54

## **Abbreviations and acronym**

ACT:	Australian Capital Territory
EIC:	Education Improvement Commission
ETP:	Education and Training Policy
GEQIP:	General Education Quality Improvement Package
MA:	Master of Art
MoE:	Ministry of Education
PTA:	Parent Teacher Association
REB:	Regional Education Bureau
SIC:	School Improvement Committee
SIP:	School Improvement Program
UNESCO:	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
USA:	United States of America
WEO:	Woreda Education Office
ZED:	Zonal Education Department

## Abstract

*The objective of this study was to assess the principal's leadership effectiveness in implementing school improvement programs in secondary schools of the Wolaita zone. In this study descriptive survey design was used with quantitative and qualitative methods. Among the 60 public secondary schools found in the Wolaita zone 10 was taken as a sample by using random sampling techniques. The sample teachers 175 (50%) were selected by using simple random sampling techniques. Additionally, 30 public secondary schools head and vice principals, supervisors, 4 SIP directorates were selected by available sampling techniques. Finally, 10 student representatives, 10 Kebele Education and Training Board (KETB) representatives, and PTA representatives were included by using purposive sampling techniques. The instruments of data collection were questionnaires, interviews, focus group discussion, and document analysis. The data were analyzed by using mean, average mean and standard deviation. The data gathered through open-ended questions, interviews, and document analyses were analyzed qualitatively through narration. The findings of the study indicated low performance of secondary school principals in implementing school improvement programs.*

*Regarding leadership roles used by school principals implementing SIP; the class observation to support teachers and make agreement with the teachers and the department heads the result indicated the secondary school principals were not effective, as the finding of study revealed the principals monitoring students for leadership effectiveness is ineffective. Regarding the relationship between leadership roles and principals effectiveness in implementing SIP; relationship between the secondary school principals leadership effectiveness and with provision of instructional materials, curriculum monitoring, creating conducive environment, observe classroom practice, and improvement of stakeholders participation Pearson's  $r$  parametric test correlation revealed that there is a significant and positive relationship between principals effectiveness and students performance. Regarding challenges teachers are not attending lesson plans, lack of budget, lack of stakeholders participation, inadequate numbers of trained human resource, students indiscipline, limitation of textbooks, inadequate science laboratories, work load, lack of parents commitment in school were some of the challenges of secondary school principals in implementing school improvement programs. In general, as the finding of the study revealed secondary school principals leadership effectiveness in implementing SIP of the study areas were ineffective.*

*Therefore, it is recommended that, to improve instructional material problem, the principals and other stakeholders were developing projects to fill full teaching materials. To solve inadequate human resource, REO & ZED should employ available trained teachers and principals. Woreda Education Offices making cooperation with the school principals need to improve community involvement. Finally, the school principals and supervisors are advised to mobilize communities and other stakeholders to improve SIP.*

# **CHAPTER ONE**

## **1. Introduction**

This research thesis was introduced into five chapters. The first chapter consisted of the introductory part which included the background of the study, statement of the problem, basic research questions, and objective of the problem: the general and specific objectives of the research, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, and operational definitions of key terms and organization of the study were included. The second chapter presented the review of related literature relevant to the research. In these, the Concept of Leadership, Leadership Effectiveness and Efficiency, an effective instructional leadership model competencies: establishing a shared vision, communicating the vision, creating a culture and empowering others, School Improvement Program, the domains of school improvement program: teaching learning domains, leadership and management domains, learning environment domains and community participation domains, the role of effective leadership on school success, challenges of effective leadership, personal characteristics and leadership, the role of school principal in SIP implementation, principals leadership roles in students' performance are included in chapter two. The third chapter discussed research design, methods, the study size and population, sources of data, sampling and sampling techniques, instruments of data collection, methods and procedures of data collection, methods of data analysis, and ethical consideration. Furthermore chapter four provided about data interpretation, presentation and analysis. Finally; chapter five summarized the conclusions and recommendation of the study.

### **1.1 Background of the Study**

Education systems in many developed countries like the USA are being devolved to school level, and this is putting unprecedented pressure on school principals to be accountable for the quality of education provided by their school. The level of responsibility principals are expected to assume is further compounded by the amount of pressure exerted by the demands of the improved education quality that already exists. In today's educational climate of heightened expectations, principals are in the "hot seat" when it comes to improving the quality of teaching and learning in schools. School principals need to be educational visionaries, instructional and curriculum leaders, assessment experts, community builders and educational experts (Chapman, 2008).

Educational reform places a great focus on school principal and school improvement (UNESCO, 2005). The logic of this position is that an orderly school environment that is well managed provides an effective and efficient atmosphere conducive to effective improvement of student learning. Effective principal exercises an indirect, but powerful influence on the effectiveness of the school, as well as on the performance of students.

Hatcher and Hale (2006), argued that excellent school principals are very important and are vital role players in the process of lifting /supporting/ schools' performance to the desired level; also in improving the standard of students' performance achievement to the level demanded by most communities. Accordingly, school principals need to lead teachers, students, and the community with a view to creating conducive schools environments. They should create visions and develop trust collaboratively with other role players in schools; these will earn them (instructional leaders) the respect of all in their school communities.

Blasé and Blasé (2000), conducted a study into how the role of a school principal promotes teaching and learning improvement in schools. The primary aim of their study is to determine teachers' perspectives on effective instructional leadership that impacts on classroom teaching. A school principal's behavior and his or her role has a significant impact on the creation of a more effective school, and leads to higher levels of student achievement. It is therefore reasonable to expect principals of secondary schools to manage their schools by giving instructions that are sound, balanced, and fair, to their staff members.

Cotton (2003) claims that:

“The following types of principals' behavior have a significant impact on student achievement: the establishment of a clear focus on student learning by having a vision, having clear learning goals, and high expectations for all students. Interactions and cordial relationships with relevant stakeholders to ensure effective communication are essential. Provision of emotional and interpersonal support that has to accompany visibility and accessibility will promote parent -community participation”.

Generally extensive activities have been undertaken to provide quality and proper education at school and institutional levels. However, it was found impossible to achieve success merely through the above efforts. Surveys conducted at different intervals indicate that the achievement of students at various levels is low (e.visayas, 2010). It is common knowledge that school undertakes the teaching process within routine practice rather than following a properly analyzed and systematic approach that focuses on increasing the learning condition of students and improving the learning outcomes. Therefore, improving the practices of schools has no alternatives considering the basic role they play in realizing the quality of education.

The government of Ethiopia gives great attention to education with firm belief that the long term development of the country rests on the expansion and provision of education (MoE, 2005). The realization of the contribution of schools towards development, however, is strongly linked with various factors like curriculum, teaching learning process, and teaching methods, use of the technology and resource management that in turn are linked to each other and to leadership (Burdett, Strake, Lambert, 2003).

In supporting this idea, Pont, Nusche and Moorman (2008) states that school leaders play a key role in improving school outcomes by influencing the motivations and capacities of teachers, as well as the school climate and environment. Thus, individuals who lead schools are the most important role players in enabling schools to be effective and then to bring a rapid and sustainable development of a given community as well as the entire country. Availability of efficient and effective educational leaders seriously affects the improvement of school effectiveness as well as the realizations of the objectives of the entire education system of a country.

For instance, according to the 1994 Education and Training Policy the cultivation of citizens who are capable of playing conscious and active roles in the economic, social and political life is one of the major aims of the country's education system (ETP, 1994). However, the realization of this big educational aim has been somewhat challenged due to the lack of adequate and effective educational leaders as indicated in the General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP) document of the Ministry of education (MoE,2007). This document further states that educational leaders like school principals lack expected degree of leadership skills to promote transparency, accountability and participatory decision-making. This research seeks to investigate the practices of school leadership and factors affecting effectiveness of the leadership styles of school principals in Wolaita zone of secondary school in SIP implementation.

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

The School principal has the vital role of providing leadership for the school and its wider community. Review of research on the principal's role in school effectiveness concluded that "strong administrative leadership is among those factors within a school that make a difference in student learning" (Poirier, 2009). The principal's role is a complex one, which includes being accountable to the public, building community relations, dealing with crises and political issues, overseeing discipline, enhancing instruction, solving managerial problems and creating school culture.

The principal's role in the school is that they have an influence on SIP implementation (Poirier, 2009). Since head teachers play a significant role in school due to their varied tasks and roles, their tactful fulfillment of their roles together with their constant supervision of the teachers determines the level of teacher input and academic performance of the students.

Accordingly, Oakland (1993) states that effective leadership is an approach to improve the competitiveness, effectiveness and flexibility of the whole organization through planning, organizing and allowing participation of all members at the appropriate level. Effective school leadership is essential to improve the efficiency and equity of schooling for right implementation of SIP.

In a time when schools are being held accountable to the highest level of standards, strong leadership is critical for the schools' success. These standards are reminiscent /suggestive/ of the Reading First days, when schools were being asked to progress monitor their students and set high goals for every individual. There were several key factors noted in Reading First schools who demonstrated /verified/ success, despite having challenging student populations (Crawford & Torgesen, 2006). These factors can be applied to these similar times in order to create a school environment that is open and supportive, and where strong leadership is demonstrated not solely by the principal, but rather it is established based on a shared vision with coaches and teachers.

Therefore effective instructional leadership is required to actively improve in SIP implementation. The education system in Ethiopia has been suffering /unhappy/ from quality, relevance and efficiency. This is due to several changes including challenges in political and social institutions of the country's paradigm /forms/ shift, the complexity of the nature of the risk and other human and non-human factors (MoE, 2011).

In Ethiopia considerable educational achievements have been registered for instances, access to education and attempt made to optimize equity are some of the achievements registered

since the introduction of GEQUIP in 2007(MoE, 2010). However, beside all these achievements there are still many challenges entailed with the implementation of the school improvement program (SIP) which needs future cooperative and sustainable effort for its resolution. In line with this, MoE (2010) identified challenges such as limited capacity of management at sector and school level, limited SIP implementation capacity at both Woreda and school levels, unsustainable monitoring and evaluation system of SIP, less student achievement in relation with low quality were few of the many challenges identified.

Therefore, even though the Ethiopian government attempted to give emphasis to promote and strength school leadership capacity in ESDP – I, ESDP – II and ESDP –IV still in many secondary schools, school leaders are being assigned at the leadership position without having leadership qualification and with this capacity gap it may be difficult to have successes in the school improvement program and student achievement.

The Wolaita zone administration, as part of governmental structure, could not be free from such implementation problems. Hence, the implementation of SIP in the secondary schools in the zone faced several challenges. For instance, low community participation, lack of facilities in most schools lack of finance and limited capacity of school leaders were some of the problems in the zone. Particularly, lack of school leadership capacity had been frequently discussed as it was the most prevailing problems that the researcher experienced from different conferences, workshops and report presented at woreda, zonal and regional levels at different time in the past.

Wolaita zone educational department 2017/18 annual report indicated that the school principals were did not effectively success to implement their administrative and managerial roles. The principals in the study areas were do not play their role effectively to improve school programs like inadequate provision of instructional materials, infrequent evaluation of students and instruction, infrequent classroom observation and not giving professional support of teachers are the major problems.

Numerous studies on the topic of effective school leadership focus our attention on four key factors. Those are: organizational knowledge, use of effective leadership begins with extensive knowledge of the instructional environment; individual students need strengths and weaknesses of staff members, aspects of the instructional programs, student data, and schedules. It is the manner in which school leaders weave these data sources together that they lay /put down/ the foundation for effective school leadership. Researchers exploring the qualities of effective school leadership often begin with the leader's knowledge of the

students in his or her school. By developing a data-driven understanding and knowledge of the students, the principal and other school leaders can inform their decisions.

Effective leaders have a strong knowledge of the range of instructional tools available to address their students' needs. This entails /means/ in many cases a team-based approach to researching and vetting research-proven programs that address specific needs. Because of the sheer /complete/ volume of programs available, many school leaders rely partly on their leadership teams to continuously research and share information about new tools and methodologies.

Moreover, secondary schools are not getting adequate support from stakeholder and the relationship between parents and the schools is very weak. As a result of low relationship between parents and the schools, most students are not getting enough support from their parents and this may also contribute to the low performance of students. Most secondary schools have also scarcity of resources and educational facilities. Thus, the existence of these problems seems to show that there might be problem of leadership effectiveness in implementing of SIP in the zone. Moreover, as the researcher understands, concerning the topic area (SIP), Frew (2010), Lamessa (2012), and Jemal (2013) are some who conducted researches in different regions and zones focusing on implementation of SIP, practices and challenges of SIP but not specifically on school principal's leadership effectiveness in implementation of SIP. But, the researcher intention was to see school principal's leadership effectiveness in SIP implementation as school leaders are more responsible and accountable either for the success or failure of the school.

So this situation impressed /overcome/ the current investigator of this research study to assess school principals in school improving programs (SIP) in Wolaita zone government secondary schools. Therefore, the main purpose of the study was to assess the school principal's leadership effectiveness in implementing school improvement programs in secondary schools of study area.

### **1.3 Basic research questions**

The following basic research questions are raised:

1. What are the leadership roles used by school principals in implementing SIP?
2. What is the relationship between leadership style and principals effectiveness in implementing SIP?
3. What are the challenges that influence the effectiveness of principals in implementing SIP in secondary schools in the Wolaita Zone?

## **1.4 Objectives of the Study**

### **1.4.1 General Objective**

The general objective of this study is to assess the school principal's leadership effectiveness in implementing SIP in secondary schools of Wolaita zone.

### **1.4.2 Specific objectives**

More specifically, the specific objectives of the study are:

- To assess the leadership practices in implementing SIP in Wolaita zone secondary schools.
- To identify the relationship between leadership effectiveness and SIP implementation in selected secondary schools of Wolaita zone.
- To determine challenges that influences the effectiveness of principal's implementation of SIP in secondary schools of Wolaita Zone.

Achieving the above objectives would have a paramount importance for stakeholders since it may show the existing secondary school principals practices, effectiveness and provide valuable information for different stakeholders such as educational officers, secondary schools principals and others to enhance SIP implementation by giving information to stakeholders. In addition, it may also help the principals to be conscious of their shortcomings and the major problems they face so that they may find ways to alleviate /improve/ the problem.

## **1.5 Significance of the Study**

In spite of the fact that education has significant roles in the wellbeing of humankind, quality education is a result of various activities taking place in the education system. Effective implementation of school improvement programs is the key. This study therefore; is aimed at assessing leadership effectiveness in the implementation of school improvement programs in secondary schools of Wolaita zone.

The Significance of the study hoped that it would in point the trend in implementation of SIP. Early forms of effective principal leadership focused on the principal's ability to manage school processes and procedures related to instruction and supervision. However, when considering the recent movements in education and changes in society it is understandable why principals must retool /rebuild/ and acquire new knowledge and skills.

The school program needs to be emphasized by the government, school leaders and educational experts as a whole. As far as the SIP program is concerned, the role and contribution of school leaders are indispensable or crucial. For the effective implementation of SIP, the school principal's leadership effectiveness and active participation are decisive. So, the study aims at assessing the overall school leadership effectiveness in implementing SIP and finally to recommend possible solutions. Thus, the results of the study would have the following contributions:

- It may provide information about the status of principal's leadership effectiveness in implementing SIP in secondary schools of Wolaita zone for Regional, Zonal and Woreda Education Officials.
- The study may contribute to the future quality education improvement by initiating school leaders and other responsible parties in the zone.
- It may help to initiate other researchers to conduct further study around the topic.

## **1.6 Delimitation of the Study**

Delimitation describes the scope of the study or limits of the study. To make the study manageable for the researcher, this study was delimited as to the following. The purpose of the study was to assess the principal leadership effectiveness in implementing SIP in secondary schools of Wolaita zone. In the zone there are public and private schools, but this study is delimited to the government secondary schools only, because the management system, provision of materials, students' admission criteria, promotion criteria and teachers and principals' recruitment criteria are different.

The respondent population included supervisors, principals, teachers, Students, PTA, vice principals, Kebele Education and Training Board, Woreda SIP directorate and administrative staff were not included in the study. Because the above listed respondents are in immediate contact with the teaching learning process and with the principal than other members of the school.

Isaac and Michael (2005) defined delimitation as "arbitrarily narrowing the scope of the study and focusing only on selected aspects of the problem, certain areas of interest, a limited range of subjects and level of sophistication involved". In order to make the study more manageable, the study was delimited in geography, concepts or issues, sampling techniques, data collecting instruments and statistical tools.

Geographically, the study was delimited in the Wolaita Zone. But because of its vastness the research was not done on all government secondary schools of the Wolaita Zone.

Currently there are sixty (60) public secondary schools in the zone. To conduct a study that includes all schools in the area under study as a whole would be beyond the scope of the study due to factors of expense, time, and accessibility. Therefore; the researcher was confined to ten (10) randomly selected public secondary schools, private schools are not included in this study. In order to make the study more manageable, the study was being delimited in concepts or issues, geography and time.

Conceptually, it was delimited to the principal's leadership effectiveness in implementing SIP principals to improve student's performance. But in this study the school principals refer to school directors as they are the most responsible and accountable for the principal's leadership effectiveness in implementing school improvement programs in the targeted schools.

### **1.7 Limitation of the Study**

According to Gay and Airasian (2000:107) defined as "some aspect of the study that researcher knows May negatively impact the study, but over which they have no control". The limitations of this study included: the carelessness of some respondents, and poor record system in finding updated reports in sampled schools. Because of some respondents carelessness sometimes the findings are minimal or maximal and document analysis qualitative data is limited.

### **1.8 Operational Definitions of Key Terms**

**Challenges:** Problems that affect the school principal's leadership effectiveness.

**Effectiveness of school Leadership:** The degree to which the school principals achieving their school goals.

**Instructional Leadership:** A leadership activity carried out by the school principal with special focus on teaching learning process in the school.

**Leadership:** Leadership is defined as an influence process relationship among leaders and followers to perform in such a way to reach a defined goal or goals.

**Leadership Style:** - Leaders typical way of behaving group members or subordinates.

**Principal:** Instructional leader is appointed at the top position in a school to manage, operate, and lead all the activities of the school.

## **1.9 Organization of the study**

This research thesis was organized into five chapters. The first chapter consisted of the introductory part which included the background of the study, statement of the problem, objective of the problem, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study and operational definitions of key terms. The second chapter presented the review of related literature relevant to the research. The third chapter discussed research design, methods, the study size and population, sources of data, sampling and sampling techniques, instruments of data collection, methods and procedures of data collection, methods of data analysis, and ethical consideration. Furthermore chapter four provided about data interpretation, presentation and analysis. Finally; chapter five summarized the conclusions and recommendation of the study.

## CHAPTER TWO

### 2. Review of Related Literature

#### 2.1. The Concept of Leadership

The purpose of this chapter is to review selected literature related to the principal's leadership effectiveness in implementing school improvement programs in selected secondary schools of Wolaita zone and as well as the school improvement process, particularly the theory underlying the conception and intended implementation. This chapter reviews related literature pertinent (relevant) to the study of principals leadership, specifically the effectiveness of the building principal as he/she focuses on increasing student learning.

Research regarding behaviors and practices of the building principal as he/she implements accountability measures through the use of the school improvement process is reviewed. The leadership responsibilities were examined by identifying specific principal associated practices and teacher indicators in order to determine the degree to which the principal fulfilled each leadership responsibility. Initially the data were examined to determine the principals' and teachers' perceptions of the principals' fulfillment of each leadership responsibility. Further investigation of the data was then conducted to determine if the seven leadership responsibilities as reported by principals and teachers were significant predictors of student academic success. The purpose of this chapter would be to review relevant literature related to the study of principal effectiveness and include the general leadership theories and models, impact of school reforms, the need for effective school leadership and leadership responsibilities and core practices associated with leadership practices, teachers' perceptions of effective principal practices.

Connelly and Goldman, (1994) state, "Initially transformation leadership was viewed as a personal quality or ability to inspire employees to look beyond self-interest and focus on organizational goals" (as cited in Lash way 1995). However, as leadership theories have continued to be researched another form of transformation leadership has evolved termed "Facilitate Leadership". Facilitate leadership is defined as "the behaviors that enhance the collective ability of a school to adapt, solve problems, and improve performance" (Connelly& Goldman, 1994). In this style, the facilitator's role is to foster the involvement of employees at all levels. In other words, a leader should create a school culture that promotes collaboration, involvement, and empowerment of teachers and the school community.

In contrast, any form of leadership that focuses on manipulating teachers and school culture to reach a personal vision or agenda will only create a climate and culture that detracts (removes) from the district's vision. Stolp (1994) contends, "Healthy and sound school cultures correlate strongly with increased student achievement, motivation, and with teacher productivity and satisfaction". Although much of the current research indicates that the most effective form of leadership reflects transformation or facilitates approaches, most would caution any educational leader who attempted to focus solely on one leadership style.

Thomas Sergiovanni (1994) suggests that organizations, like people, exist at different developmental levels. A school that has traditionally operated with strong top-down decision-making may not be ready to jump into, facilitate or blend appropriate leadership theories and strategies seem to be an essential part of effective principal leadership. Leadership Constructs effective principals must not only consider appropriate leadership theories and styles to shape their intentions and actions, they must also possess essential knowledge and skills in the context of education reform in order to be effective in a school setting.

## **2.2. Leadership Effectiveness and Efficiency**

In definition, leadership effectiveness is producing the intended or expected results, while leadership efficiency is performing the best results in the least about of time and/or effort. In other words, being effective is *doing the right things* and being efficient is *doing things right* (Peter Drucker, 2019). The primary difference is efficiency is productivity concerned while effectiveness is quality concerned. In other words, efficiency refers to how much resource (time, money, materials and effort) required in accomplishing a task. Effectiveness refers to how well the job gets done.

The clear purpose of leadership is common to all organizations. This purpose is organizing and influencing every stakeholder of the organization towards the achievement of goals. However, it does not mean that there are no differences in the system of managing different organizations that differ from one another in the functions or tasks they carry out that require special skill from employees and abilities and skill required by the leader. On the other hand, leadership effectiveness is believed to be crucial for the overall success of any organization.

Effective leaders should acquire and maintain valuable and essential ingredients to score high levels of effectiveness in the process of leadership (as cited in Seyoum Ararso 2014). Early forms of effective principal leadership focused on the principal's ability to manage school processes and procedures related to instruction and supervision. However, when considering the recent movements in education and changes in society it is understandable why principals must retool and acquire new knowledge and skills. Considering recent research there appears to be general agreement between researchers and practitioners that there are several leadership styles a principal could use to effectively lead today's educational organizations. However, the most effective leadership style would require less command and control, more learning and leading, less dictating, and more orchestrating (Dufour & Eaker, 1998).

In fact, more recently effective principals have been viewed as transformational leaders that focus on establishing a vision and utilizing leadership skills such as innovation, influence and consideration for the individual in the school improvement process (Walters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2004). Effective school principals must not only consider appropriate leadership theories and styles to shape their intentions and actions, they must also possess essential knowledge and skills in the context of education reform in order to be effective in a school setting. For example, effective principals must have an extensive knowledge base in the area of school improvement and the skills to effectively implement the initiatives. Based on various models of effective leadership and without disregard to other aspects of good leadership, an effective instructional leadership model would include the following competencies: establishing a shared vision, communicating the vision, creating a culture and empowering others.

### **2.2.1. Shared vision**

Shared vision discusses associated implications for competency related to the leader's ability to create and communicate a realistic, credible, and desirable future for the organization (Bennis, 1997; Dufour & Eaker, 1998; Fullan, 2001). According to Bennis, Spritzer, and Cummings (2001), one of the most important aspects of leadership is the ability to develop a vision. Bennis (1997) also suggests the quality of effective leaders is determined by their capacity to create and in order to develop a shared vision, the leader must consider two aspects. First, to realize vision leaders must be able to envision (predict) a future with exciting and ennobling possibilities. Second, the leader must be able to enlist others in a common vision by appealing to the group's aspirations (Burns, 1978; Fullan 2001; Kouzes &

Posner, 2002). One of the keys to developing a vision that is exciting, realistic, and credible is to make sure the vision has a moral purpose. Fullan (2001) defines moral purpose as "acting with the intention of making a positive change".

For example, an educational leader may be committed to educating students but must also treat staff fairly. Treating everyone fairly can be obtained by encouraging interaction among different groups and welcoming diverse interests and goals. Therefore, in order to influence others to commit to a vision the leaders must focus on making deeper connections with people and the relationships (Bush, 1995).

More often than not, leaders fail by their inability to create a vision that is realistic and exciting and considers the values and interests of the staff. Effective leaders find creative ways to develop visions that do more than simply focus on measurable products (student achievement). Effective leaders must also recognize the importance in developing and establishing relationships so that people feel connected and part of the greater whole (Fullan,2001).

### **2.2.2. Communication**

As we know, a principals' ability to communicate is a key factor to their effectiveness. Effective principals are continuously searching for new strategies and means of communicating with their external and internal publics. Bennis (1997) maintains that a vision that is not understood remains a mere occurrence, but one that is understood can become a living experience. Therefore one determining factor of a principal's ability to effectively communicate is whether he or she can connect with the intended audience. Burns (1978) states, "one of the leader's fundamental acts is to induce people to be aware or conscious of what they feel—to feel their true need so strongly, to define their values so meaningfully, that they can be moved into purposeful action" (p.44). To do this, principals must establish a connection or rapport with their staff.

After establishing the connection, the principal may take many approaches towards communicating the organization's goals and vision to move the staff into action. One way communication can move teachers into action is by illustrating to them the disequilibrium and disorder that exists and how it has reached a point where it can no longer be ignored (Fullan, 2001; Wheatley, 1999). In addition, principals need to realize that it will take more than verbal rhetoric to effectively communicate the goals and priorities of the school.

As leaders, principals' non-verbal communications are equally important in determining the effectiveness of their leadership by positively or negatively influencing the school culture. Therefore, principals need to continuously be aware of their behaviors (Morgan, 1997). Effective principals can build trust and credibility, ensuring their behaviors and actions are consistent and align with the communicated vision and goals (Dufour & Eaker, 1998; Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Maxwell, 1998; Mann & Sims, 2001).

Unfortunately, no matter how effective a principal's communication skills are always be uncertain of the goals established by the district. Bush (1995) suggests that this ambiguity keeps the staff from fully understanding their purposes because the goals of the organization are unclear. In addition, if there are no clear goals then principals have an inadequate basis for assessing the actions and achievements of the organization. One strategy to improve communication and reduce the ambiguity associated with goals would be to focus less on comprehensive planning. Implementing school improvement activities in more subtle /indirect/ ways and considering school reform as a process rather than an event will help the principal to ensure the goals are constantly communicated to the daily task of the school. In summary, in order to improve the effectiveness, principals need to develop strategies to effectively communicate the vision and then model the way. A principal's ability to create a vision and communicate the reality of the vision to others is what separates managers from leaders (Bennis, 2000). However, it is important that principals not overlook the degree to which the goals and purpose of the school remain unclear to some of its members.

### **2.2.3. Creating Culture**

In general, culture can be defined as "the assumptions, beliefs, values, and habits that constitute the norms for that organization" (DuFour & Eaker, 1998, p.131). Based on this definition, how important is a healthy culture to the improvement efforts of a school? Sarason (1996) states: To put it as succinctly /briefly/ as possible, if you want to change and improve the outcomes of schooling for principal's, there are features of the school culture that have to be changed and if they are not changed, your well-intentioned efforts will based on effective school reforms, they must commit to developing healthy cultures in their schools.

How important is it for principals to develop a healthy culture within their school? Sergiovanni (1994) adds, "The cultural aspect is the most important dimension of leadership. In fact, the net effect of the cultural force of leadership is to bond together students, teachers and others as believers in the work of the school" (Bush, 1995), p.138).

However, even if the principal understands the importance of culture, their ability to change the culture is another matter. Although it seems reasonable to assume that all teachers and other adults have the ability to work collaboratively and innovatively together, Dufour and Eaker (1998) state, "altering beliefs, expectations, and habits that have gone largely unexamined for many years is a complex, messy, and challenging task" (p. 133).

Based on the complexity of school culture and climate, what perspectives or strategies should a principal first consider in order beginning to effectively change the school culture in a positive way? Wagner (2006) suggests that principals first find a way to accurately assess their schools' culture then begin to address the critical aspects of the school environment that impacts culture.

The Center for Improving School Culture (2002) adds, "where there is no 'one size fits all' culture for classrooms, schools, or school districts, we have been able to identify and measure three discrete 'culture markers' that, when present, strengthen the culture. These markers include: professional collaboration, affiliation and collegiality, and self-determination and efficacy." Other research-based strategies for improving school culture include developing shared values, providing opportunities for reflective dialogue, and celebrating successes as effective means to help shape the organization's culture (DuFour & Eaker, 1998; Fullan, 2001, Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Maxwell, 2001). Bolman and Deal (1997) also indicate, "Managers that understand symbolic forms and activities and encourage their use help shape an effective organization so long as the organizational culture.

#### **2.2.4. Empowering Others**

School leaders develop the skill and talents of those around them. They are also capable of leading change and helping others through the change process. Effective school leaders encourage shared decision – making with the school community including staff, students and parents. They are both the guardians and reformers of the educational system, and they ensure that all groups engage in a common goal and move in the same direction. Katz (in Wossenu, 2006) asserted that quality school leaders understand teaching and respect by their staff; and these persons are willing to hold themselves and others responsible for student learning and enhancing the capacity of teachers to meet this goal. Moreover, effective school leaders work to share leadership responsibilities throughout all levels of the educational organization.

### **2.3. School Improvement Program**

Plans support for basic education is significant and consistent. In areas where the plan works, the infrastructures of schools have improved considerably. However, in many countries, the number of girl students, rates of attendance, reading, writing and numeracy levels of children and the active participation of children and communities in school governance are far from the expectations of communities and plan. One of the most important competencies of today's principals is their ability to improve SIP in the staff. In an educational setting there are far too many areas for one person to have an expertise let alone manage. Kouzes and Pozner (cited in St John, 2006) state, "leaders strengthen and develop their constituents by sharing power and information, and by giving others visibility and credit. As coaches and teachers, they give constituents challenging tasks and support them with the tools they need to be successful."

If the leader expects all staff to develop a strong commitment to the end goal then they must provide them with the independence to be strategic and act.

In an educational setting, this independence may take the form of the staff becoming the instructional leaders or experts and the principal becoming the lead facilitator. In this sense, effective leaders are those that act as transformation leaders who empower, motivate and learn from the staff (Blanchard, Carlos Randolph 2001; Burns, 1978; Dufour&Eaker, 1998; Fullan, 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Leaders who find themselves unable to empower others often create barriers within the organization they can't overcome, which leads to people giving up or moving to another organization (Maxwell, 1998). Thus, leaders who do not understand empowerment and believe it is simply shared decision making will often find themselves in a transaction or supervising mode. Blanchard, Carlos and Randolph (2001) suggest real staff empowerment is generated by effectively utilizing the knowledge, experience and enthusiasm /interest/ that is already in people but is being underutilized.

### **2.4 .The Domains of School Improvement Program**

According to MOE (2007) school improvement programs are developed based on the result of the review of the best practices of the schools all over the country. Accordingly, the SIP has four domains in which every domain links together to each other and aims at improving students' learning outcomes.

### **2.4.1. Teaching and Learning Domain**

Quality of teaching is at the heart of successful schooling (Sammons et al., in Harris, 2005). In successful schools, teachers are well organized and lessons are planned in advance, are well structured and have clear objectives which are communicated to the students and successful teachers are sensitive to differences in the learning style of the student and adapt their teaching style accordingly.

According to Leu (2005), the characteristics of good teachers are: sufficient knowledge of subject matter to teach with confidence knowledge and skills in a range of appropriate and varied teaching methodologies, knowledge of the language of instruction, ability to reflect on teaching practice and children's responses, ability to modify teaching/learning approaches as a result of reflection, ability to create and sustain an effective learning environment, understanding of the curriculum and its purposes, particularly when reform programs and new paradigms of teaching and learning are introduced, general professionalism, good morale, and dedication to the goals of teaching ability to communicate effectively, ability to communicate enthusiasm /interest/ for learning to students, interest in students as individuals, sense of caring and responsibility for helping them learn and become good people, and a sense of compassion, good character, sense of ethics, and personal discipline, and ability to work with others and to build good relationships within the school and community .

Accordingly, the schools' domain of teaching learning process focuses on three elements, these are, teaching practice, learning assessment and the curriculum. Therefore, teachers are expected to plan, to make adequate preparation and present learning activities. In addition to this, research has found that the traditional teaching method is extremely inefficient as all students must be taught with the same materials at the same point in time. And students that do not learn quickly enough with this method can quickly fall behind, rather than being allowed to learn at their natural speeds MoE, 2007 (as cited in SeyoumArarso 2014).

Ministry of Education, (2007) states:

“Teachers need to have adequate academic and professional knowledge. Besides, they are required to apply appropriate teaching methods that help in teaching large and diversified classrooms. The preparation and utilization of teaching aids from locally available materials is another concern of teachers. Therefore, in order to get teachers in such a position, their appointment will be

made in such a way that their qualification could fit with the level they are teaching”.

Curriculum is the foundation of the education system. The Ministry of Education has published curriculum policy documents that set out expectations for student learning in each grade and subject area. The expectations... describe the knowledge and skills that students are expected to develop and to demonstrate in their class work, on tests, and in various other activities on which their achievement is assessed. To set a goal for improving the way curriculum is delivered, principals, teachers, school councils, parents, and other community members participating in the improvement planning process must understand the expectations set out by the ministry and how well the students in their school are achieving those expectations, (EIC, 2000).

Teachers should understand the curriculum and develop and use additional materials in the classroom to improve student learning. One of the key responsibilities of teachers is to study the curriculum and develop supplementary materials for use in the classroom. It is important for schools to provide the time and support that teachers need to develop these supplementary materials (MoE, 2007).

#### **2.4.2. School Leadership and Management Domain**

According to Harris and Muijs (2005), Leadership can be defined as providing vision, direction and support towards different and preferred state-suggesting changes. School leadership has become a priority in education policy because it is believed to play a key role in improving classroom practice, school policies and the relations between individual schools and the outside world. As the key intermediary between the classrooms, the individual school and the whole education system, effective school leadership is essential to improve the efficiency and equity of schooling (Pont et al., 2008).

According to Walters, et al. (2003), School leaders must lead their school through the goal setting process in which student achievement data are analyzed, improvement areas are identified and actions for change are initiated. This process involves working collaboratively with staff and school community to identify discrepancies between current and desired /planned/ outcomes, to set and prioritize goals to bridge/bond/ the gap, to develop improvement and monitoring strategies aimed at accomplishing the goals, and to communicate goals and change efforts to the entire school community. Principals must also ensure that staff development needs are identified in alignment /placement/ with school

improvement priorities and that these needs are addressed with appropriate professional learning opportunities.

The most successful school leaders are open-minded, ready to learn from others, flexible, have a system of core values and high expectations of others, and are emotionally strong and optimistic. It asserts that these traits enable successful leaders to make progress in schools facing challenging circumstances. The study in particular found out that successful school leaders share certain attributes, such as strong sense of moral responsibility and belief in equal opportunities; belief that every pupil deserves equal opportunity to succeed; respect and value for all people in and connected with the school; passion for learning and achievement; and commitment to pupils and staff. These key attributes are common to almost all effective school leaders (Day et al., 2010).

The school leadership and management domain are concerned with communicating a clear vision for a school and establishing effective management structures. The structures and processes exist to support shared leadership in which everyone has collective responsibility for student learning and School policies, regulations and procedures are effectively communicated and followed. In addition to this, the school decision-making and administrative processes (including data collection and analysis, and communicating with parents) are carried out effectively MoE (2010).

Therefore, effective leadership within the school is collegial, student-center and teacher focused, promoting collective responsibility for improvement. These elements describe how school vision is collaboratively developed to be realistic, challenging and futures oriented; leaders use reflective practices to appropriately manage people to achieve improvements to teaching and learning and the schools leadership team demonstrates effective resource management to achieve results.

#### **2.4.3. Safe and Healthy School Environment Domain**

As indicated in Estyn (2001) a healthy school environment for teaching and learning reflects confidence, trust and mutual respect for cooperation between staff, students, government, parents and the wider community is essential for purposeful effort and achievement. Best school leaders encourage good working relationships and overcome the worst effects of contrasting on developing a positive environment, high achievement and progress. Effective schools share a set of characteristics that add up to an environment that raises student achievement. By setting goals to improve a school's environment, principals, teachers, school

councils, parents, and other community members can make their schools more effective places in which to learn. Effective schools share the following characteristics.

These are: a clear and focused vision; a safe and orderly environment; a climate of high expectations for student success; a focus on high levels of student achievement that emphasizes activities related to learning; a principal who provides instructional leadership; frequent monitoring of student Progress; and strong home school relations (EIC, 2000).

School improvement is about the enrichment /upgrading/ of student progress, development and achievements, so most research evidence points towards the importance of teacher development in school development. It has been shown that schools that are successful facilitate the learning of both students and teachers. An essential component of successful school improvement interventions is the quality of professional development and learning. Collegial relations and collective learning are at the core of building the capacity for school improvement. This implies a particular form of teacher development that extends teaching repertoires and engages teachers in changing their practice (Hopkins et al, in Harris, 2002) .

Safe schools need collaborative work at the school and community levels to support inclusive education for children and teachers with special needs and also, Parents / guardians of children with special needs are actively involved in the school. So teachers are responsible to use various teaching methods in order to meet the diverse student needs in the classroom, and sufficient learning and teaching materials are available (MoE 2010).

Concerning school facilities, Schools should provide quality school facilities that enable all staff to work well and all children to learn. These school facilities are: a teachers room with desks and storage; a playing area for students; adequate teaching materials; reference materials; a fence /boundaries/ around the school grounds; tea rooms; one desk and chair per child; a library; a pedagogical center; sufficient number of toilets for teachers, girl students and boy students; clean safe water for drinking and hand washing; soap and water at all toilets; hygiene education for all students; daily cleaning of toilets; good management and maintenance of water and sanitation facilities; and, for high schools a laboratory and IT center (MoE, 2010). Parents can also play an important role in improving and maintaining the school, including the classrooms, the sports field, the tree plantations, the vegetable gardens, the nursery, etc. This can be particularly important if parents feel that their contributions of knowledge contribute to a building fund, to enable schools to increase their classrooms. This is usually done through a monetary contribution (MoE, 2006).

#### **2.4.4. Community Involvement Domain**

There is always interaction and interdependence wherever society exists. The major roles that the community could perform in the development of education is effective participation in school construction and encouraging parents to send their children to school and motivate children to stay in school. However, some parents are indifferent about their children's progress and failure in school work and throw away their responsibilities in school. On the other hand, schools are in no way meant to control the pupils out of school activities. It is the parents who should follow up what their children are about and what they do. In this regard, Assefa (1991) has noted that a school is not an island separated from the rest of the community that it serves. When the participation of community members in the school program is active, the objective of school will be much more facilitated. If school community interaction operates as a continuation and strengthening of the formal education program, the success of projects will be supplemented by the knowledge acquired in the formal academic program.

Communities and PTA's are playing important roles in all aspects of education from raising resources to managing schools. Resources are mobilized for building classrooms and schools. PTA's and community members are active in advising on the benefits of education and in encouraging parents to send their children to school so as to increase access and reduce dropout. Financial resources are raised and used to purchase basic equipment and materials, to hire and even to pay contract teachers. PTA involved in school management, preparing annual plans, follow-up disciplinary cases. Hence, communities are funding new school buildings, building teachers' houses, running non-formal education initiatives, and encouraging girls to go to school and be retained in school until they complete a given education level. However, PTA's and communities still need further capacity enhancement in carrying out quality support to help schools to function as desired (MoE, 2005).

According to MoE (2006) school cannot succeed without the support of the parents and community. It is therefore essential for the school principal to develop good relations with parents especially. The simplest level is to ensure that parents and communities are always informed about what is happening in the school. Parents and communities cannot provide the necessary support for learning without a good understanding of what the school actually does. Thus, the school should communicate regularly with the community, and should receive both positive and negative feedback at regular intervals. The period for such communications

should be agreed upon, and should be regular such as once a month, or once a term. It is important to consider what school responsibilities can be shared with the parents.

School improvement planning can only lead to genuine and profound /reflective/ change if schools have at least a minimum level of resources to work with. Without such resources, the school improvement program could become de-motivating. This can be improved when parents and local communities actively participate in school improvement planning and implementation (MoE, 2010). Quality improvement depends strongly on the actions which the school staff and the surrounding community undertake. School staff will therefore be given the necessary tools (such as guidelines on school improvement plans), the necessary resources (through a school grant system) and relevant training to help them prepare their own plans and take relevant action in response to whatever challenges they have identified. The combinations of these strategies are expected to lead to a significant improvement in student achievement.

## **2.5. The role of effective leadership on school success**

Nowadays, instructional leadership is being accountable and unlike the customary management function like planning, organizing, allocating, creating equilibrium, controlling etc, the present function of leadership mostly focused on developing and communicating mission and purpose motivating and inspecting of followers towards the achievement of shared goals (Metwen 2003, Carlson 1996 Locke, 1991) Leadership, as to Locke, (1991) is the power of inducing /making/ other towards some commonly perceived goals is definition encompassed /included/ three basic element, namely followers, function and influencing power first, leadership is relational action that exhibit the present of followers willing to act, second as a process there is something to be done, finally as a power, the leader has to possess either formal or informal power that the influences others, leaders at the higher post may use their legitimate power to facilitate situation, however there are many other ways that formal and informal leadership motivate followers to get thing done (Blasé and Balse 1999 p 154, Heewern,2003,p,87).

In addition, it is the leaders' responsibility to communicate a picture of what the organization should be, convince follower's leadership appears /looks/ to be a more recent perspective: define leadership as the art to transform people to the task and explain why the job is being done. They oversee the follower's activities and are responsible for improved learning outcomes; most of the responsibilities in improving instructions by developing teachers'

leaders are the province /field/ solely left for instructional leaders at whatever levels. The role of principals as instructional leadership is still in the state of transition from administrative emphasis to more instructional, democratic and participatory leadership (marks and pointy, 2003.)

## **2.6. Challenges of Effective Leadership**

The effective leadership role is affected by different barriers. Concerning this, different researchers pointed out the different barriers in different ways. For instance, Table (2013) revealed that barriers for instructional leadership are; workloads and pressure, irregular daily interruptions, training on effective, insufficient delivery of learner and teacher support materials and parental support and cooperation. Bouchard (2002) noted that among the predominant barriers expressed were management tasks, lack of respect for the office, teacher contracts, students with chaotic (disordered) lives, staff development, a lack of parent participation, and limited resources. Similarly, Sergiovanni (2001) argued that one of the primary challenges confronted by school leaders is the expanding number of duties that require a tremendous /great/ investment of time and effort.

## **2.7. Personal Characteristics and Leadership**

The older principal learned to have greater experience in education and therefore. It will offer more instructional leadership. Opposed to this, younger principals show more energy and capacity and therefore strong instructional leadership. Research finding, however, are inconsistent about the relationship between age and leadership effectiveness, (Gross and Herriot 1965; p 76) for instance , found “ negative’ relations that dictate older principals provide less leadership than do the younger, where ass (Jacob, et al .1973; 33), respond “ very little” relationship between age and successful leadership work experience as a second factor, has been commonly used as criteria in selecting principals and requires at least five years teaching experience or experience as a unit leaders department head and head of pedagogical center or school supervisor. However , research findings do not support this, for example, Gross & Herriot, (1965;p.68-73), found that the length of experience as leaders for example, Gross & Herriot, (1965;p,68-73), found that the length of experience as leaders previous administrative experience and even the number of years at the principals ship position have no significant relationship with leadership effective.

Educational attainment and qualification are other personal factors more often as criteria for selection leaders for principal ship for instance. MoE (1996;p:8) requires educational attainment of a leader at MA and more preferably qualified in educational planning and management , for instructional leadership role training in educational areas is highly considered for leader effectiveness. In this connection with, Hollinger and Murphy (1987) suggested that lack of knowledge in leadership; curriculum and instruction determine the instruction and effective leadership role.

## **2.8. The Role of School Principal in SIP implementation.**

The school principal in his/her capacity as instructional leader, his/her responsibilities would be; creating a conducive environment to facilitate supervisory activities in the school by organizing all necessary resources; giving the professional assistance and guidance to teachers to enable them to realize instructional objectives; and supervise classes when and deemed necessary; coordinating evaluation of teaching-learning process and the outcome through initiation of active participation of staff members and local community at large; coordinating the staff members and other professional educators to review and strengthen supervisory activities and cause the evaluation of the school community relations and on the basis of evaluation results strive /struggle/ to improve and strengthen such relations (MOE, 2002).

## **2.9. Principals Leadership Roles in Students Performance**

The principals as instructional leaders should at all times strive for excellence in teaching and learning with the sole (only) purpose of improving student achievement. Principals should serve foremost as instructional leaders in schools, and that their commitment to instructional improvement should not only be strongly articulated but should be reinforced with experience in the classroom (Glanz, 2006). In order to secure legitimacy in the eyes of the teachers, principals should have sufficient teaching experience and should understand with firsthand experience the instructional challenges faced by teachers. Instructional leadership demands high standards of academic excellence: setting high expectations for learner success; having knowledge and experience with effective teaching or instructional strategies. Glanz, (2006) pointed out that instructional leadership is thus about encouraging best practices in teaching. Principals should become familiar with innovative theories and practices and motivate teachers to model them in classrooms.

The concept of 'instructional leader' is a relatively new concept that emerged in the early 1980's that called for a shift of emphasis from principals being managers or administrators to instructional or academic leaders. This shift was influenced largely by research which found that effective schools usually had principals who stressed the importance of instruction (Booklover and Lezotte, 1982). Instructional leadership also made inroads to the discourse of educational leadership with the increasing importance placed on academic standards and the need for schools to be accountable. Traditionally, principals were expected to be managers of school buildings and focus on handling routines like teacher evaluation, budgeting, scheduling, and facilities maintenance. During the eighties, there was a shift in attention to educational roles with both teachers and principals receiving emphasis. A prevailing assumption of this era was that the principal should become directly involved with the teaching and learning processes. Principals were required to intervene; to ensure that teachers focused on the central mission of the School leadership is not something new or intrusive concern.

It is what it always has been; the application of reason, logic, Values to the achievement of educational objectives via the development of available resources (Holmes, 1993). Thus, School leaders are those persons, occupying various roles in the schools goals. So, school leaders are viewed as holding the key to resolve a number of problems currently facing the schools. Successful school leadership is one of the key conventional terms where the success of a school is being celebrated. In this regard, research and practice have a great deal to say about the importance of school leadership with regard to its impact on school improvement and ultimately on students' achievement.

For example, Harris and Bennett (cited in Harris, *et al*, 2003) have argued that the importance of leadership in securing sustainable school improvement has been demonstrated in both research and practice. Teddlie and Reynolds (cited in Brundrett, M. *et al*, 2003) on their part have indicated that for many, the term leadership has become centrally synonymous with school effectiveness. School leadership is a connected and crucial issue of what is meant by successful, quality school for the present and future.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **3. Research Design and Methodology**

#### **3.1. Research Design**

According to Creswell (2009) descriptive survey research design was used to meet objectives such as identify present conditions, point out present needs, to study immediate status of a phenomenon, facts and findings. Due to this the researcher believed that this design helped to an existing situation of the principal's leadership effectiveness in implementing a school improvement program in the selected public secondary school of Wolaita zone. A descriptive survey research design describes and interprets the principal's leadership effectiveness in school improvement programs in the Secondary School of study area. In supporting this idea, Abiy et al., (2009) suggested that a descriptive survey is used to gather data at a particular point in time with the intention of describing the nature of existing conditions or identifying standards against which existing conditions can be compared or determining the relationships that exist between specific events. Moreover, the descriptive survey is more effective in assessing the current practices in its natural setting. From survey design the researcher use cross-sectional survey design. According to Gay,(2012) , Educational research: cross-sectional survey is one in which data are collected from selected individuals at a single point in time. It is a single, stand-alone study. Cross-sectional designs are effective for providing a snapshot of the current behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs in a population. This design also has the advantage of providing data relatively quickly—you do not have to wait for years (as is often the case in longitudinal studies) before you have your data and can begin to analyze and draw conclusions.

#### **3.2 The research Methods**

The method employed in this research was both quantitative and qualitative methods. The purpose of using such a method was to examine the same phenomena from multiple perspectives and also to allow new order dimensions to emerge (Cohenetal, 2007). Since the research is a survey method, it more emphasizes quantitative research approach. Using multiple approaches can capitalize on the strengths of each approach and offset their different weaknesses and provide a better understanding of research problems than either approach alone.

It could also provide more comprehensive answers to research questions going beyond the limitations of a single approach (Creed, et al., 2004). It is also practical in the sense that the researcher is free to use all methods possible to address a research problem (Creswell, 2006). Furthermore, to confirm, cross-validate or corroborate /support/ findings within a study. This research was intended to apply both qualitative and quantitative approaches to identify an accurate description of the major practices and problems encountered /met/ on the principal's leadership effectiveness in implementing school improvement programs.

### **3.3. Data Source**

In this study, both primary and secondary data sources were employed to obtain reliable information about the school principal's leadership effectiveness in implementing school improvement programs in wolaita zone selected public secondary schools. The major sources of primary data were principals, teachers, students, supervisors, Kebele Education and Training Boards, woreda SIP directorate, PTA's representatives as well as observation of secondary schools. Sources of secondary data were document analysis.

### **3.4 Population, Sample and Sampling Techniques**

#### **3.4.1. Population**

A study population is the entire group of people to which a researcher intends the results of a study to apply (Aron Coups, 2008). Population is the broader group of people to whom the researcher intends to generalize the results of the study. Therefore, the population of the study is all 10 public secondary schools (9th-12th) in the Wolaita zone specifically; public secondary school principals, teachers, selected public secondary school students, supervisors, KETB's and PTA members, and Woreda SIP directorate are the populations of this study.

**Table 1: Populations, samples and Sampling Techniques**

No	Schools	Teachers			principals			students			supervisors			SIP directorates			KETB			PTA		
		population	sample	%	population	sample	%	population	sample	%	Population	Sample	%	Population	Sample	%	Population	Sample	%			
1	Hanaze	21	11	52	2	2	100	130	1	1	1	1	100	-	-	-	7	1	14	7	1	14
2	Areka	45	22	48	4	4	100	257	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	100	7	1	14	7	1	14
3	Bekilo segno	30	15	50	2	2	100	1500	1	1	1	1	100	-	-	-	7	1	14	7	1	14
4	Lasho	25	13	52	2	2	100	140	1	1	1	1	100	-	-	-	7	1	14	7	1	14
5	Gessuba	30	15	50	4	4	100	2040	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	100	7	1	14	7	1	14
6	Gununo	38	19	50	3	3	100	2381	1	1	1	1	100	-	-	-	7	1	14	7	1	14
7	Bele	46	23	50	4	4	100	2480	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	100	7	1	14	7	1	14
8	Waciga	34	17	50	2	2	100	1597	1	1	1	1	100	-	-	-	7	1	14	7	1	14
9	Sodo	46	23	50	4	4	100	2541	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	100	7	1	14	7	1	14
10	Tebela	35	17	48	3	3	100	1600	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	7	1	14	7	1	14
Sampling techniques		Simple random			Availability			purposive			Availability			Availability			purposive			purposive		

**3.4.2. Sampling Techniques**

Sampling means selecting a given number of subjects from a defined population as representative of that population or the ways of selecting the group that researcher will actually collect data from in your research. In addition to this, sampling techniques is the process of selecting a group of people and selecting the group that the researcher was actually collecting data from in the research. The sampling techniques of this study; availability

sampling techniques are used for the principals, supervisors, Woreda SIP directorates. Because they are, the selection criteria is simple based on whoever is available and they are capable of giving sufficient information or they are nearest to the research problem. Simple random sampling techniques are used for the teachers. Because the number of teachers is large, all individuals in the defined population have an equal and independent chance of selection for the sample.

Purposive sampling techniques are used for Kebele Education and Training Boards representatives, Parent Teacher Association representatives, and student's representatives. Because based on the researcher's experience and knowledge they are the representative of the above listed population and meet with the school principals on different issues of the teaching learning process.

### **3.4.3. Sample**

Sample is a subset of individuals from a large population, as well as a smaller set of data a researcher chooses or selects from a large population by using a predefined selection method. In addition to this, the sample is the specific group that the researcher was collecting data for the study. The size of the sample is always less than the total size of the population. The sample size of this study was 30 head and vice principals, 175 teachers, 10 student representatives, 05 supervisors, 10 KETB representatives, 10 PTA's representatives and 04 woreda SIP directorates are selected from public secondary schools of Wolaita zone. From woredas of city administration the researcher was taken SIP directorates as a sample. Because SIP directorates were implement supervisory roles in city administration secondary schools. Supervisors were selected from woreda secondary schools. The researcher believed that these are representative samples, manageable and sufficient to the study.

**Table 2: List of Sample Woreda and their Respective Sample Secondary schools**

No.	Name of woreda	Name of school
1	KindoKoyssha	Hanaze Secondary School
2	Areka City Administration	Areka Secondary School
3	Bayra Koyssha	Bekilo segno Secondary School
4	Kindo didaye	Lasho Secondary School
5	Gessuba city Administration	Gessuba Secondary School
6	Damot Sore	Gununo Secondary School
7	Bele City Administration	Bele Secondary School
8	OfaWoreda	WacigaEsho Secondary School
9	Sodo city Administration	Sodo Secondary School
10	Tebela City Administration	Tebela Secondary School

**Table 3: Summaries of the population, sample, sampling techniques and data gathering tools**

No.	Types of respondents	Target population	Sample	Sample in percent (%)	Sampling techniques	Data gathering tools
1	Principals	30	30	100	Availability	Questionnaire
2	Teachers	350	175	50	Simple random	Questionnaire
3	Students representatives	10	10	100	Purposive	FGD
4	supervisors	05	05	100	Availability	Interview
5	KETB (Kebele Education and Training Boards) representatives	10	10	100	Purposive	Interview
6	PTA representatives	10	10	100	Purposive	Interview
7	Woreda SIP directorate	4	4	100	Availability	Interview

### **3.5. Instruments of Data Collection**

Data collection is a relevant instrument to collect adequate information for the further work of the study. Besides the main importance of data collecting tools such as; questionnaire, focus group discussion, and interview, document analysis was to get real information concerning the study in the area and to find the valid solution for the problem based on the responses of the questionnaire.

#### **3.5.1 Questionnaire**

The questionnaire consists of two parts. The first part deals with the general background of the participants. The second part is containing the total number of both closed ended and open-ended items that pertain to the basic questions of the study. A questionnaire is prepared by the researcher to collect information from teachers, school principals and fill the questionnaires because the researcher believes that they are rich in the information required to accomplish the research. Both open-ended and closed-ended questions are included in the questionnaire to create an opportunity for respondents to express their feeling freely (Ashebir, 2014).

Questionnaires were used as the major instrument to collect sufficient information from the data sources of the study. Questionnaires are chosen and considered appropriate because they can cover a large sample of respondents, thereby allowing a reasonable degree of generalization of the findings. They are also economical both in time and cost and ensure anonymity. Regarding this, Schermerhorn (2000) states that a questionnaire is relatively economical, has the same questions for all subjects, can ensure ambiguity and contains questions written for specific purposes.

Questionnaires are written forms that ask exact questions of all individuals in the sample group, and which respondents can answer at their own convenience (Gall et al., 2007). The data provided by questionnaires can be more easily analyzed and interpreted than the data obtained from verbal responses. Hence, 30 questionnaires are prepared in English Language and administered to 30 selected head and vice principals, 175 questionnaires are prepared and distributed to 170 teachers; they are selected from total teachers by using simple random sampling method with the supposition that they can understand the language. Both closed and open ended types of questionnaires were constructed, 05 teachers did not respond to the questionnaires. The five rank responses: 5=strongly agree (SA), 4=Agree (A), 3=Undecided (UD), 2=Disagree (D), 1=Strongly Disagree (SD) of likert scale questionnaires were constructed for data collection.

### **3.5.2. Interview**

The researcher developed 05 interview questions that were conducted especially with 05 supervisors, 04 woreda SIP directorates, 10 KETB's, 10 PTA's representatives. To Kebele Education and Training Boards /KETB/ and Parent Teacher Associations /PTA/ developed interview questions are translated to mother tongue Wolatigna, because of clearness and to get appropriate information from local communities. The responses were written for further explanation during the report of the study.

To support and cross check the findings from the questionnaire, the researcher conducted interviews with the above participants. These were done as the numbers population was manageable for interview and also to avoid effect of size during data analysis.

### **3.5.3. Focus Group Discussion**

A Focus Group Discussion (FGD) is a qualitative research method and data collection technique in which a selected group of people discusses on a given topic or issue in-depth, facilitated by professional, external moderator (Khan Manderson 1992; Barbour 2006,). Focus group discussions were held with grade 9-12 secondary school student representatives for present research in one center Sodo secondary school. According to Babbie (2008), focus group is a group of subjects discussed together prompting a disruption .This reason tallies with the opinion of care Morise, (1994) that focus group discussion could be meaningful in the case of a new topic, or when one is trying to take a new topic to a population, or if one wants to explore thoughts and feelings and not just behavior. It provides a base for interpreting quantitative findings from parallel qualitative study.

### **3.5.4. Document Analysis**

School documents that are relevant, namely lesson books, schemes of work/future plan/, registers, records of work covered, and attendance records were examined. This was done with a view to obtaining the principals' supervisory role in curriculum implementation in the selected schools. In examining the records the researcher used a document analysis performance, the school plans, different records, and documents. From document analysis the qualitative data were collected and analyzed through narration to support quantitative data.

### **3.6. Data Collection Procedures**

After the data gathering tools developed, then the respondents were identified. The teachers, principals, and vice principals in each school are invited by the respective principals for an orientation. A briefing on how to fill the questionnaire is then given by the researcher and the questionnaires are immediately distributed to the respondents in each school. After the respondents complete filling their responses to the questions, the duly (properly) completed questionnaires are collected by the researcher.

The second type of the data gathering tool is the interview. The orientation is similarly given by the researcher on how to give responses to each interview question. The respondents are supervisors, Kebele Education and Training Boards, Parent Teacher Associations and Woreda SIP directorates. Finally all the respondents are interviewed one by one by the researcher and then their response is recorded on sheets of paper.

The third data gathering tool was an observation checklist. The data gathering from documents of each school is conducted by the researcher using the checklist. Then the researcher compiled the data found from each school.

### **3.7. Method of Data Analysis**

The data gathered through primary and secondary sources were analyzed by using both quantitative and qualitative approaches. Quantitative data was analyzed in the course of questionnaires gathered from respondents by using SPSS software for windows version 20. Then based on the five point Likert rating scales from very high to very low or strongly agree to strongly disagree were used. According to Kothari, (2004) descriptive analysis is largely the study of distribution of one variable and it concerns the development of certain indices from raw data which were tabulated in terms of descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage used for personal information, whereas, mean value and standard deviation used for basic question one, and three. According to Straw, (2000), inferential statistics of Pearson product moment correlation coefficient which is used for basic question two to determine the degree of relationship between two sets of variables. Furthermore, Pearson's product moment correlation statistic was also used to establish the significance of the correlation between the schools principal's effectiveness and implemented leadership styles/roles to improve students' performance.

The mean values of each items was interpreted as the role of school principals in improving SIP with a mean value  $< 1.49$  represents as very low or strong disagreement, from 1.5 to 2.49 represents low or disagreement, from 2.5 to 3.49 represents undecided, from 3.49 to 4.49

represents high or agree and  $> 4.49$  represents very high or strongly agreement in implementation of the items are used for the sake of analysis and interpretation (Uebersax, (2006).

For the case of analysis, very high and high indicate effective implementation of each item, and moderate or undecided presents neither positive nor negative agreement and similarly very low and low indicate ineffective implementation of items of the role of school principals in implementing SIP in study areas.

As stated in Bogdan and Biklen, (1998) qualitative data, which was gathered through structured interview analysis guide, was analyzed in the form of narration and word argumentation on the feedback obtained. Finally major findings of the study have been reported with some functional recommendation.

### **3.8. Ethical Consideration**

All respondents were being asked to participate in the study voluntarily. No respondents were forced to participate in any way. Participation was voluntary. Participants were given the freedom to withdraw from the study at any time. Adequate information was also given on the aims of the research and the procedures followed to collect and analyze data. These enable the respondents to make an informed decision to participate in the study. The privacy of the respondents was also protected at all costs. Confidentiality and anonymity of the respondents were also respected when reporting the findings of the study.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### 4. Data presentation, analysis and interpretation

This chapter deals with the presentation and interpretation of data collected through four types of instruments namely; questionnaire, interview, focus group discussion, and document analysis. The first part of this chapter deals with the close-ended questionnaires that were designed for teachers and school principals, then interview, FGD, and document analysis data were interpreted.

A total of 175 questionnaires were distributed to 170 teachers. The returned questionnaires were 170 (97%). Moreover, 30 (100%) school principals properly responded to the questionnaires, and 05 supervisors, 10 KETB, 10 PTA representatives were interviewed and 10 student representatives deeply discussed the group discussion question. The data were analyzed in terms of the frequency, percentage, Mean scores and Standard Deviation. Item scores for each category were arranged under five rating scales. The five likert scales were strongly disagree = 1, disagree = 2 undecided = 3, agree = 4 and strongly agree = 5. Mean scores and standard deviation were calculated from the responses. For the purpose of easy analysis and interpretation, the mean values of each item and dimension were interpreted as follows. The extent of the school leader's role in implementing school improvement programs with a mean value of  $\leq 1.49$  as a very low level of performance, 1.50- 2.49 as low level of performance, 2.50-3.49 as a moderate level of performance, 3.50-4.49 as high performance and  $\geq 4.50$  as very high level of performance. Finally, the data obtained from the open ended items of the questionnaire, interview, document analysis and observation were presented and analyzed qualitatively to substantiate /verify/ the data collected through the questionnaires. Thus, this chapter presents the analysis and interpretation of data.

**Table 4: Returns on questionnaires:**

Respondents	Distributed	Returned	Usable returns	Percentage
Teachers	175	170	170	97 %
Principals	30	30	30	100%
Total	205	200	200	97%

From teachers five respondents did not respond to questionnaires on time in the case of different reasons. Some of the reasons were due to health problems therefore they were absent from school while other respondents were absent due to social problems during the date appointed to collect the questionnaire sheets which were distributed. From

principals all 30 respondents responded to the questionnaires, during the date assigned to collect the questionnaires they are in the school.

**Table 5: Demographic characteristics of respondents**

The two groups of respondents were asked to indicate their background information

	Items		Respondents			
			Teachers		School principals	
			N <sup>o</sup>	%	N <sup>o</sup>	%
1	Gender	Male	120	70	25	83.3
		Female	50	30	5	16.6
		Total	170	100	30	100
2	Experience	1-5	15	8.8	4	13.3
		6-10	50	29.4	5	16.6
		11-15	28	16.4	3	10
		16-20	33	19.4	8	26.6
		21-25	21	12.3	10	33.3
		26-30	23	13.3	-	-
		Above 30	-	-	-	-
		Total	170	100	30	100
3	Educational level	Diploma	12	7	-	-
		First Degree	128	75.2	20	66.6
		Second Degree	30	17.6	10	33.3
		Total	170	100	30	100
4	Age	20-25	31	18.2	-	-
		26-35	46	27	12	40
		36-45	42	24.7	14	46.6
		46-55	38	22.3	4	13.3
		Above 55	13	7.6	-	-
		Total	170	100	30	100

As shown in table 5, item one, 120(70%) of teachers and 25(83.3%) of school principals were males. On the other hand, 50 (30%) of teachers and 5 (16.6 %) school principals were females. From this, one can realize that the number of females in the teaching profession and

the position of school principals are much lower than males in the sampled schools of Wolaita zone of secondary schools. The majority of secondary school principals, vice principals and teachers were males in position. This may indicate that the participation of females as principals is almost minor in schools. Consequently, the responses of principals in this study from all secondary schools under study represent mainly male principals' ideas. Therefore, there is a need to support females in the teaching profession and the place of school leadership positions in Wolaita zone public secondary schools.

As shown in table 5, item 2 shows 15 (8.8%) of the teacher respondents had 1 to 5 years' experience. As well as, 50 (29.4%) teacher respondents had 6 to 10 years' experience. Also 28 (16.4%) teacher respondents had 11 to 15 years' service. While 33 (19.4%) teacher respondents had 16 to 20 years' experience, 21 (12.3%) teacher respondents had 21 to 25 services experience. The remaining 23 (13.3%) teacher respondents had above 26 to 30 years of experience. It could be possible to conclude that the majority of the teachers' experience was below 20 years. Similarly, 4 (13.3) school principals respondents had 1 to 5 years' experience. In addition to this 5 (16.6%) principal respondents had 6 to 10 years' experience. Whereas 3 (10%) principals' respondents had 11 to 15 years' service and 8 (26.6%) school principal respondents had 16-20 years' experience and 10 (33.3%) of principal respondents had above 20 years. It could be possible to conclude that the majority of school principals were above 20 years and the experience of principals is more than the teachers' experience. This is an implication of good practice to handle challenges encountered in the school principals; they are in a good position to critically identify the role of school principals in improving student's performance.

As shown in table 5, item three concerning the educational level of teachers and school principals, 12 (7%) of teachers were diploma holders, 128 (75.2%) of school teachers and 20 (66.6) of school principals had a first degree holders. As well as 30 (17.6) and 10 (33.3%) of school principals were second degree holders. From this fact, one may conclude that there is not too much of a gap in the level of education between the teacher and school principals. Furthermore, all principals, vice principals were selected from teachers and assigned through the direction of MoE (1996 E.C). The document says principals, vice principals and teachers in the secondary schools should be appointed on a merit basis and second degree holders. The findings show the majority of the sampled secondary school teachers and the school

principals were first degree holders. This may negatively impact the school improvement programs.

As shown in table 5, item four concerning the age level of teachers and school principals, 31 (18.2%) of teachers were 20 to 25 age level, 46 (27%) of school teachers and 12 (40%) of school principals were 26 to 35 years old. As well as 42 (24.7%) of teachers and 14 (46.6%) of school principals were 36 to 45 age level and 38 (22.3%) of teachers 4 (13.6%) of principals were 46 to 55 age level. From this fact, one may conclude that there is a gap in the level of age between the teacher and the school principals. Therefore, this influence negatively affects SIP implementation in Wolaita zone public secondary schools.

**Item1: Leadership roles used by school principals in implementing SIP.**

**Classroom observation**

The role of the principal is characterized by frequent classroom observations; supervision; effective discussion with teachers after classroom observation and checking the teachers' lesson notes and teaching methods. Principal is instrumental in successful curriculum implementation in school. The instructional supervision also takes cognized of the timely implementation of curriculum, improvement of program and monitoring of the planned objectives of the school. Below table 6, shows the views of respondents on classroom observation as follows:

**Table 6: Items related to classroom observation to support teachers**

No	Items	Respondents	X= mean	A/x=average mean	SD
1	The principal holds a classroom visit to observe a teacher to improve students and teachers.	Teachers	2.97	2.58	1.35
		Principals	2.18		.68
2	The principal holds productive discussions with the teachers after classroom visits or not.	Teachers	3.39	2.94	1.17
		Principals	2.48		1.01
3	The principal ensures that teachers have lesson notes before the classroom their teaching learning methods.	Teachers	2.22	3.44	.96
		Principals	4.66		.62
4	The principal coaches the class to mark the teachers who attend lessons and those who do not.	Teachers	2.25	2.10	1.10
		Principals	1.96		.58

KEY: RS=Respondents, X=Mean, A/x=Average Mean, SD=Standard Deviation

As depicted in item 1 of table 6, teachers and school principals with X= 2.97, SD=1.35 and X= 2.18, SD=.68) respectively. To generalize that, the average mean of both groups was 2.57 which were found to be undecided. This shows that the degree to which the principal holds a classroom visit to observe teachers was not effectively practiced in secondary schools under study areas. The findings of this study are supported by the findings of Jared (2009) who found that the majority of interviewed teachers reported that they have never seen their head teachers come to supervise them in the classroom, apart from checking their pedagogic documents.

Furthermore, as data gathered from, focus group discussion seeks to gather information to be used to establish the role of the principal in principals' leadership and the effectiveness in implementing school improvement program (SIP) the students were asked, in your school, the principals to what extent monitor curriculum and evaluate performance of students to school improvement program (SIP). Their discussion supported the above finding, they said that "our school principals were holding a classroom visit to observe the teachers, monitor

curriculum, evaluate performance of students and were not implemented effectively.” The data gathered from questionnaires and focus group discussion there are no significant differences in assumption among the groups. In general, according to the data obtained from questionnaire and FGD the researcher concluded that the secondary school principals in Wolaita zone do not effectively visit classrooms, monitor curriculum, and evaluate performance students may negatively influence the student result.

As shown in table 6, (item 2), the respondents were asked whether the principal holds productive discussion with the teachers after classroom visit or not. Accordingly, teachers and school principals with ( $X= 3.39$ ,  $SD=1.17$  and  $X= 2.48$ ,  $SD=1.01$ ) respectively reported that, teachers undecided on the point with 3.39 mean score but school principals mean which is 2.48 indicate that the principal holds not productive discussion with the teachers after classroom visit. The average mean score of respondents is 2.94 which indicates undecided on the point. The average mean score of respondents finding indicates undecided on the point or neither positive nor negative agreement, this shows there is no effectively productive discussion with the teachers after classroom visit.

Similarly, as the information obtained from focus group discussion, “the school principals were not effectively monitoring curriculum and evaluating performance of students to improve SIP”. The data gathered from questionnaires and focus group discussion there are no significant differences in assumption among the groups. So with this reality in mind, the researcher concluded that the school principals, to improve teaching learning process productive discussion with the teacher after classroom visit was not effectively implemented in the study area.

As it can be seen from the above item 3 table 6, teachers and school principals were asked whether or not the principal ensured that teachers have lesson notes. This shows that teachers with the mean value rated as ( $X= 2.22$ ,  $SD=.96$ ) fall under the designation /description/ of disagreement and school principals with mean value rated ( $X= 4.66$ ,  $SD=.62$ ) which fall strongly in agreement on the issues. The average mean score 3.44 indicated the undecided on the point. However, the practices of secondary school principals ensure that teachers have lesson notes and samples of study areas are not effective.

Regarding document analysis, many of the sampled schools where “the school principals did not record specific activity on the principal’s leadership effectiveness in implementing school improvement programs”, this shows the principals were not serious about whether teachers

have lesson notes or not and results were supported above finding. The quantitative data gathered from questionnaires and document analysis shows there are no significant differences in assumption among the groups. Therefore, from the quantitative and qualitative data, one can conclude that Wolaita zone secondary school principals were not effectively following the teachers teaching process, this may decrease the school and the students' learning performance.

As shown in table 6, (item 4), the respondents asked whether the principal coaches the class to mark the teachers who attend lessons or not. Accordingly teachers and school principals with mean values rated as disagreement ( $X= 2.25$ ,  $SD=1.10$  and  $X= 1.96$ ,  $SD=.58$ ) respectively. The average mean score of respondents  $X= 2.10$  shows that, the disagreement of respondents with this point. This reveals that school principals did not coach the class to mark the teachers who attend lessons in secondary schools. The implication to this finding, there is no effective communication principals with students, principals with teachers; these negatively affect the SIP implementation.

#### **Supporting teachers**

In this regard, supporting teachers were the major leadership roles of the school principals. To improve the teaching learning process, the school principals and the department heads support the teachers by giving appropriate advice that supports their curriculum implementation, by checking the teacher's activities and following the textbooks coverage. Below table 7, items are supporting teachers from principals and department heads as follows:

**Table 7: Items related to Support teachers from principals**

No	Items	Respondents	X=mean	A/x=mean	SD
1	The principal advises teachers on issues related to school curriculum and teaching methods.	Teachers	2.71	2.42	1.02
		Principals	2.14		1.06
2	The principal requested the head of departments to check if teachers attend lessons.	Teachers	2.64	2.37	.98
		Principals	2.11		1.05
3	The principal asks reports from the head of departments on syllabus coverage.	Teachers	2.96	2.59	1.35
		Principals	2.22		.69

KEY: RS=Respondents, X=Mean, A/x=Average Mean, SD=Standard Deviation

As shown in table 7, item 1, teachers and school principals were asked to advise teachers on issues related to school curriculum and teaching methods. As we can observe from the data, teachers with mean value rated as “undecided”(X= 2.71, SD=1.02) and school principals with mean value also rated as disagreement on the issues (X= 2.14, SD=1.06). The total mean score of respondents is 2.42 which indicated disagreement on the point. The result indicated that school principals didn’t advise teachers on issues related to school curriculum and teaching methods in secondary schools in study areas.

Furthermore, the qualitative data gathered from, woreda SIP directorates, supervisors, Kebele Education and Training board’s /KETB/ representatives, PTA representatives indicated that “the school principals following teaching learning process implementation to improve SIP are not effective, the school principals effectively did not give advice to teachers regarding school curriculum and their teaching methods”.

The quantitative data gathered from questionnaires and qualitative data from interviews shows there are no significant differences in assumption among the groups. Therefore, from the quantitative and qualitative data, the secondary school of wolaita zone public school principals were not effectively discussing with the teachers about the curriculum and the teaching methods.

As shown in item 2 of table 7, teachers and school principals were asked; the principal requested the head of departments to check if teachers attend lessons; teachers with mean value (X= 2.64, SD=.98) fall under the designation of undecided and school principals with mean value rated as (X= 2.11, SD=1.05) which shows disagreement. To generalize that, the average of the mean of both groups was 2.37 found to be in an undecided scale. This shows the public secondary school in the study area where the school principals were not effectively requesting the department heads to check teachers' lessons.

Similarly, the qualitative data gathered from supervisors indicated that “leading schools with department heads and senior teachers make principals leadership effective, but many of the school principals are not effectively involving them to check teacher lessons”. The quantitative data gathered from questionnaires and qualitative data from the school supervisors show there are no significant differences in assumption among the groups.

Therefore, from the quantitative and qualitative data, one can conclude that the study area of the school teachers do not effectively plan lessons, make adequate preparation, and present

learning activities. This may be decreasing the student achievement and the principal's effectiveness.

As shown in table 7, (item 3), the respondents were asked whether the principal asked reports from the head of departments on syllabus coverage or not. Accordingly, teachers and school principals with ( $X= 2.96$ ,  $SD=1.35$  and  $X= 2.22$ ,  $SD=.69$ ) respectively reported that, teachers undecided on the point with 2.96 mean score but principals mean which is 2.22 indicate that school principals are the reports from head of departments on syllabus coverage. The total mean score of respondents is 2.59 which indicate undecided on the point. This shows that school principals do not do well in departments on syllabus coverage. These findings, with the ideas of Njagi, (2013) who found out that head teachers' inspection of students' progress reports had a positive relationship with performance of students in national examinations. The positive relationship meant that the extent which head teachers inspected students' progress reports predicted performance of students in national examinations. Opposing this idea, the above finding reveals the school head teachers were not effectively inspecting students' progress and syllabus coverage.

Supporting these findings, sampled secondary school students' FGD responses shows, "the school principals do not effectively motivate, encourage, create awareness to department heads on the coverage of syllabus." The quantitative data gathered from questionnaires and qualitative data from the focus group discussion shows there are no significant differences in assumption among the groups. Therefore, from the quantitative and qualitative data, one can conclude that in the study area the school principals were ineffective working with the department head and not following syllabus coverage effectively.

### **Monitoring students**

Regarding monitoring students were the main roles of the school principals. To improve SIP implementation, the school principals leadership effectiveness and the students' achievement the principals were monitoring their students by giving advice, checking classroom activities and participating in different club activities. Below table 8, items views of respondents on monitoring students as follows:

**Table 8: Items related to monitoring students for leadership effectiveness**

No	Items	Respondents	X=mean	A/X=mean	SD
1	The principal gives advice to students on different disciplinary issues.	Teachers	3.39	2.91	1.17
		Principals	2.44		.97
2	The principal frequently visits classrooms to check student's activities.	Teachers	2.23	3.42	.97
		Principals	4.62		.68
3	The principal allows students to participate in different Co-curricular activities.	Teachers	2.26	2.13	1.09
		Principals	2.00		.55

KEY: RS=Respondents, X=Mean, Av/x=Average Mean, SD=Standard Deviation

As it can be seen from the above table 8, item 1, teachers and school principals were asked whether or not the principal gave advice to students in different disciplinary issues. This means, teachers with ( $X= 3.39$ ,  $SD=1.17$ ) fall under the agreement whereas school principals mean values rated as ( $X= 2.44$ ,  $SD=0.97$ ) fall in disagreement on the issues. The overall mean value 2.91 indicated the undecided on the point. From the result obtained, it is possible to conclude that the principal giving advice to students in different disciplinary issues was not practiced as well as expected, this implies Wolaita zone secondary school principals were ineffective in making relationships with the school students; this may negatively affect principal's leadership effectiveness and SIP implementation.

As shown in table 8 (item 2), the respondents asked whether the principal frequently visited the classroom to check students' activities or not. Accordingly teachers and school principals with ( $X= 2.23$ ,  $SD=.97$  and  $X= 4.62$ ,  $SD=.68$ ) disagree and strongly agree on the point. The total mean score of respondents  $X= 3.42$  shows that, the undecided of respondents with this point. This reveals that, principal did not frequently visit classrooms to check students' activities in secondary schools.

Similarly, the qualitative information obtained from focus group discussion indicated that "the school principals to monitor curriculum frequently is not effectively implemented in school". The quantitative data gathered from questionnaires and qualitative data from the focus group discussion shows there are no significant differences in assumption among the

groups. So with this reality in mind, the researcher concluded that the principals in the study area are not appropriately visiting student learning, this may show an unsatisfactory implementation and ineffective school student performance.

As shown in table 8, item 3, teachers and school principals were asked whether or not the principal allowed students to participate in different co-curricular activities. As shown in the table from the data, teachers and school principals with ( $X= 2.26$ ,  $SD=1.09$  and  $X= 2.00$ ,  $SD=0.55$ ) respectively disagree. The average mean score of respondents is 2.13 which also indicated disagreement on the point. The result indicated that the principal was not allowing students to participate in different co-curricular activities in secondary schools or under study areas.

Furthermore, as the data gathered from FGD indicated that “the school principals did not coaching, supporting, and motivating the students to participate in different club activities in implementing SIP”. The quantitative data gathered from questionnaires and qualitative data from the focus group discussion shows there are no significant differences in assumption among the groups.

Therefore, from quantitative and qualitative data, one can conclude that Wolaita zone public secondary school principals were not effectively motivated, encouraged, supported, and empowered students to participate in different club activities. This may be negatively affecting the student’s active participation with other and their teacher that decrease their achievement and the principal effectiveness

## **Items 2: The relationship between leadership roles and principals effectiveness in implementing SIP.**

The scores for one variable are correlated with the scores for another variable; or scores for a number of variables are correlated with some particular variable of primary interest. The end result of data analysis is a number of correlation coefficients, ranging from +1.00 to – 1.00. There are a number of different methods of computing a correlation coefficient. The appropriate method depends on the type of data represented by each variable. The most common technique uses the product moment correlation coefficient, usually referred to as the Pearson  $r$ , a measure of correlation that is appropriate when both variables to be correlated are expressed as continuous data, educational research (Gay, 2012).

The relationship between the school principals’ activities to improve SIP implementation was determined by performing Pearson  $r$  correlation coefficient test. The principal’s roles mean

score and students' performance; overall mean secondary schools of Wolaita zone were correlated using the Pearson r correlation. This gave a correlation coefficient  $r$  which showed the direction of association between the variables as summarized in table 7. Pearson r Correlation Coefficient was used to establish the relationship between school principals' activities and principal's leadership effectiveness to improve SIP implementation. In order to answer our second research basic question concerning possible correlation between the school principals' activities to improve SIP and students' result, the Pearson r correlation was used.

### Instructional materials

Teaching and learning materials are determinants of quality of education, thus it is essential for quality teaching materials to be made available to teachers and students in inadequate quantities to support teaching and learning processes. The principals providing appropriate instructional materials have a positive relationship with the principal's effectiveness and the student's performance. Below table 9, shows provide instructional materials with principal's effectiveness as follows:

**Table 9: Test of significance of Correlation and descriptive statistics for provision of instructional materials and principal leadership effectiveness**

Variables	Provision of instructional materials		
Provision of instructional materials	Pearson correlation	1	.785 0.01
	Sig (2tailed)		
Principal effectiveness	Pearson correlation		.785 .000
	Sig (2tailed)		

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As shown in table 9, Correlations were statistically significant, with the exception of correlation between provision of instructional materials and principal effectiveness ( $r=.785$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). More specifically, provision of instructional materials was significantly and strongly positively related to principal effectiveness and to dependent variable provision of instructional materials. A significant and positive relationship was found between provision of instructional materials and principals effectiveness to improve SIP implementation ( $r=0.785$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). This shows that there is a significant relationship between provision of instructional materials and improvement of students' performance.

Furthermore, as the qualitative data gathered from Woreda SIP directorates, indicated that “leading schools with stakeholders make the school principals effective, school stakeholders like Kebele Education and Training Boards /KETB/ and Parent Teacher Associations /PTA/; they providing the necessary instructional materials such as textbooks, laboratory materials, financial resources and another important materials for teaching learning process”. The quantitative data gathered from questionnaires and qualitative data through interviews shows there are no significant differences in opinion among the groups.

Therefore, from the quantitative and qualitative data, the researcher can concluded that the school principals in the study area the school principals were not effective by providing textbooks and other teaching/learning materials to improve school; selecting and organize teaching materials and make them available for use by teachers for effective implementation of SIP; allocating resources to improve instructional activities; ensuring teaching learning resources like laboratories...well equipped to promote school achievement. These listed roles/activities are not effectively available in school; these may negatively affect the principal effectiveness as well as the school improvement implementation.

### **Curriculum monitoring**

Curriculum monitoring and evaluation are the main roles of the school principals. The school principals leadership effectiveness and curriculum monitoring, evaluation are positive relationships to improve the learner's achievement. The following table 10 shows the relationship:

**Table 10: Test of Significance of Correlation and descriptive statistics for the curriculum monitoring, evaluation and principal effectiveness.**

Variables	curriculum monitoring	
Curriculum monitoring	Pearson correlation	1 .746 .000
	Sig(2tailed)	
principal effectiveness	Pearson correlation	.746
	Sig(2tailed)	.000

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As shown in table 10 the relationships between curriculum monitoring, evaluation and principals effectiveness to improve students’ performance. The results showed that the

curriculum monitoring and evaluation had a statistically significant and positive relationship with rational ( $r= 0.746$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), the null hypothesis was rejected. Strong relationship was found between curriculum monitoring and evaluation to improve SIP implementation.

Similarly, as the qualitative information gathered from focus group discussion the student representatives indicated that “the principals were not effectively evaluate instruction, coordinates the curriculum and monitors students and their focus attention on improving the curriculum is ineffective.” The quantitative data gathered from questionnaires and qualitative data FGD there are no significant differences in opinion among the respondents.

Therefore, from the quantitative and qualitative data, one can concluded that the school principals not effectively focus on curriculum monitoring and evaluation by properly monitoring the curriculum and student learning outcomes to improve school improvement programs; providing teachers with opportunities to learn the methodology of teaching well within their academic areas; evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum and monitoring student progress to improve SIP; using appropriate data from curriculum monitoring and evaluation to improving SIP. These roles are not effectively implemented in study areas; these may be negatively affecting the school principal effectiveness and the student achievement.

#### **Conducive environment**

A healthy school environment for teaching and learning reflects confidence, trust and mutual respect for cooperation between staff, students, government, parents and wider community is essential for purposeful effort and achievement. Best school leaders encourage good working relationships and overcome the worst /bad/ effects of contrasting on developing a positive environment, high achievement and progress. Creating conducive environment to the learner is the main role of the school principals. Safe and healthy learning environment has a significant relationship with the school principal's effectiveness and the students' result. Below table 11, shows creating conducive environment to learners and principal effectiveness as follows:

**Table 11: Test of Significance of Correlation and descriptive statistics for school Conducive environment and principal effectiveness.**

variables	Conducive environment	
Creating conducive environment	Pearson correlation	1 .718
	Sig(2tailed)	.000
principal effectiveness	Pearson correlation	.718
	Sig(2tailed)	.000

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Pearson’s parametric test of correlation revealed that there is a significant and positive relationship between the conducive environment and principal effectiveness above table shown ( $r = .718$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). Moreover related to conducive environment was significantly and positively related principals effectiveness to improve students result ( $r = 0.718$ ,  $p = .000$ ). This finding show, the principal creating conducive environment to the learners increase the principal effectiveness and the student result.

Furthermore, as the qualitative data gathered from focus group discussion and supervisors indicated that “the school principals are not effective in making school environments conducive to learners; making safe and healthy schools, making cooperation with parents to gather necessary support, inviting other stakeholders to improve SIP”. The quantitative data gathered from questionnaires and data from FGD shows there are no significant differences in view among the respondents.

Therefore, from the quantitative and qualitative data, one can concluded that the principals were not effective making conducive learning environment to improve principal effectiveness: by creating conducive environment facilitate collaboration with others and the sharing of best practice to implement SIP; creating conducive environment to facilitate supervisory activities in the school by organizing all necessary resources to implement SIP; motivating students by making school safe and healthy learning environment; using shared decision-making, and developing a culture of mutual respect in the school; organizing favorable learning environments for students learning to improve SIP. These above listed roles/activities were not effectively implemented in the study area; these may be decreasing the student achievement and the principal effectiveness.

### Classroom supervision

Classroom supervision is one of the school principal's roles. To the school principal's effectiveness and the school student's achievement improvement, observing classroom practice is a positive relationship with principal effectiveness. Below 12, reveals significant relationship as follows:

**Table 12: Test of Significance of Correlation and descriptive statistics for observing classroom practice and principal effectiveness to improve SIP.**

Variables	Observe classroom practice	
classroom supervision	Pearson correlation	1 .676 .000
	Sig (2tailed)	
principal effectiveness	Pearson correlation	.676
	Sig (2tailed)	.000

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As shown in table 12, Pearson's r parametric test of correlation revealed that there is a significant and positive relationship between classroom supervision and improving students' performance and characteristics ( $r=0.676$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). Moreover, supervising classroom practice was significantly and positively related to improving students' performance in secondary schools of study areas. These shows, the principal observed that teaching learning methods in the classroom practice is improving the learner result and their effectiveness, but Wolaita zone public secondary school principals were not effectively supervising classroom teaching learning process.

Therefore, from the quantitative data the researcher can concluded that the principal effectiveness the school principal should observe classroom practice by encouraging teachers to use different teaching methods to provide for specific needs of students; supporting and guiding teachers in data-based decision making regarding effective practices to maximize student success; making frequent and formal class visits to check students' notebooks and assignments to improve SIP; providing feedback to students and teachers on instructional methods and techniques. In the study, Wolaita zone public secondary school principals were not effectively and efficiently implementing their above listed roles/activities, these may negatively affect the principal effectiveness as well as the learner result.

### Improving stakeholder participation

Improving stakeholder participation is the key role of the school principals. Improvement of stakeholder participation and the principal effectiveness are positive relationship; the school principal should participating the school stakeholders by taking parents as members of school committees and boards to make school decision; promoting relationships between teachers, parents and students and other school stakeholders to improve students' achievement; participating stakeholders in the formulation of school rules and procedures and involving stakeholders in making decisions regarding implementing SIP domains to improve school results. Below table 13, indicates improvement of stakeholder's participation and principal's effectiveness as follows:

**Table 13: Test of Significance of Correlation and descriptive statistics for the improvement of stakeholder participation and principal effectiveness**

variables	Improvement of stakeholder participation	
Improvement of stakeholder participation	Pearson correlation	1 .804 .000
	Sig (2tailed)	
Principal effectiveness	Pearson correlation	.804 .000
	Sig (2tailed)	

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As shown in table 13, Pearson's r parametric test of correlation revealed that there is a significant and positive relationship between the improvement of stakeholder participation and improved principal effectiveness ( $r = 0.804$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Moreover, the improvement of stakeholder participation was significantly and positively related to improving students' performance in secondary schools of study areas.

Furthermore, as the qualitative data gathered from Parent Teacher Association (PTA) indicated that “ for school improvement leading schools with various school stakeholders make school principals leadership effective as well the learner achievement also effective, but the school principals not effectively involving different bodies like parent teacher association, kebele education and training boards, student parents and other communities”.

Similarly, focus group discussion held with students revealed that “principals do not motivate students to work hard by rewarding top performers, and do not recognize

stakeholders and teachers to impart instruction by using local available materials to improve SIP". The quantitative data obtained from questionnaires and qualitative data from interviews show there are no significant differences in view among the respondents.

Therefore, from the quantitative and qualitative data, one can concluded that improvement of stakeholder participation and the principal effectiveness are positive relationship; the school principal should participating the school stakeholders by taking parents as members of school committees and boards to make school decision; promoting relationships between teachers, parents and students and other school stakeholders to improve students' achievement; participating stakeholders in the formulation of school rules and procedures and involving stakeholders in making decisions regarding implementing SIP domains to improve school results, but the secondary school principals were not effectively involve stakeholders. These principal roles are significantly and positively related to their effectiveness. But in the study area the stakeholder participation was not effectively implemented, this may be decreasing the principal effectiveness and the school performance.

**Item 3: challenges that influence the school principal's leadership effectiveness in implementing school improvement programs (SIP).**

#### **Challenges of principals**

The major challenges faced by principals in managing schools for improved performance were; inadequate teaching staff, lack of parental cooperation in fees collection, inadequate teaching and learning facilities and teacher lateness in reporting to school for duty. Challenges that negatively influence the school principal's leadership effectiveness in implementing school improvement programs; like: lack of stakeholder's involvement, the school principals and teacher's workload, and students' indiscipline. Below table 14, reveals the school principals challenges that affect their leadership effectiveness as follows:

**Table 14: The school principal's challenges that face school leaders to improve SIP implementation**

No	Items	Respondents	X=mean	A/X=mean	SD
1	The school teachers are not attending lesson plans.	Teachers	3.82	3.53	1.04
		Principals	3.25		.44
2	There is a lack of budget/income at school level.	Teachers	3.77	3.94	.93
		Principals	4.11		.32
3	Involvement of respective stakeholders in school affairs.	Teachers	3.57	3.87	1.09
		Principals	4.18		.48
4	Inadequate number of trained teachers in school.	Teachers	3.87	3.82	.89
		Principals	3.77		.97
5	Teachers not cover textbooks timely	Teachers	3.84	3.44	.92
		Principals	3.03		1.05
6	In school the admission of students with low marks.	Teachers	3.89	4.07	.90
		Principals	4.25		.81
7	There is Strikes or high students' indiscipline at school level.	Teachers	3.81	3.73	1.06
		Principals	3.66		1.27
8	In school there are limitations, like inadequate textbooks and revision books.	Teachers	3.87	3.63	.83
		Principals	3.40		.50
9	To improve the teaching learning process there are inadequate science laboratories.	Teachers	3.58	4.12	1.15
		Principals	4.66		.62
10	Lack of time to check teachers' schemes of work, lesson plans, records of work and lesson attendance.	Teachers	3.41	3.16	1.34
		Principals	2.92		.26
11	In school, teachers lack time to check students' notes, assignments.	Teachers	3.77	3.49	.93
		Principals	3.22		.69
12	Lack of parents' commitment to their children's education and SIP implementation in school.	Teachers	3.67	3.52	.89
		Principals	3.37		.49

KEY: RS=Respondents, X=Mean, Av/x=Average Mean, SD=Standard Deviation

As shown in table 14, item 1, teachers and school principals were asked; the school teachers are not attending lesson plans; the teachers had a mean of ( $X=3.82$ ,  $SD=1.04$ ), this shows agreement on the issues and principal's with mean values rated as undecided ( $X=3.25$ ,  $SD=0.44$ ). The average mean score of respondents is 3.53 which indicate agreement on the point. This result indicates that school teachers did not attend lessons.

The data obtained from document analysis, indicated that “the document shows the school principals not effectively following the teachers lesson plans and other specific activities to improve their effectiveness and SIP implementation”. The quantitative data obtained from questionnaires and qualitative data from document analysis there are no significant differences in view among the respondents.

So, with this reality in mind, the researcher concluded that the school principals of Wolaita zone public secondary school were not effectively coaching teachers to prepare their lesson and use appropriate teaching methods, this may negatively influence the principal effectiveness and the school learner performance.

As shown in table 14, item 2, teachers and school principals were asked; the lack of budget/income at school level in teachers had a mean of  $X=3.77$ ,  $SD=.93$  which shows agreement on the issues that means teachers agree that there is a lack of budget in their school. While the principals had a mean of ( $X=4.11$ ,  $SD=.32$ ) in the above table. The average mean value 3.94 respondents indicate agreement of the points. The above finding shows the secondary school in Wolaita zone there is a lack of budget/income that influences the school principal's leadership effectiveness in implementing school improvement program (SIP).

The data obtained from document analysis, indicated that the one of the secondary school document shows “there is only one hundred thirty eight thousand annual budgets, the school principals allocate sufficient budget to teaching learning activities the annual budget not enough to various school activities”. The quantitative data obtained from questionnaires and qualitative data from document analysis there are no significant differences in view among the respondents.

In general, according to the obtained data from quantitative and qualitative, the researcher concluded that to improve school improvement programs there is limitation of financial resources in the study area; this limitation may affect the school principals and the learner achievement.

As presented in the above table item 3, teachers and school principals were asked; the involvement of respective stakeholders in school affairs. The teachers had a mean of  $X=3.57$ ,  $SD=1.09$  while the principals had a mean of  $X=4.18$ ,  $SD=.48$ . The average mean value is 3.87. It is possible to realize that there was agreement on the necessity of respective stakeholder's involvement in school affairs.

Similarly, as the information obtained from supervisors, indicated that "limitation of awareness creation to stakeholders, ownerless of different bodies, school principals busy on routine activities, lack of stakeholder's commitment are challenging the schools". The quantitative data obtained from questionnaires and qualitative data from the supervisors show there are no significant differences in outlook among the respondents.

Therefore, based on the data gathered through questionnaires and interviews, it can be concluded that Wolaita zone public secondary school principals were not effectively participating with different stakeholders: like kebele education and training boards, parent teacher associations in school issues, this may affect SIP implementation and student achievement.

As shown in table 14, item 4, the respondent were asked the inadequate number of trained teacher in school teachers had a mean of teachers  $X=3.87$ ,  $SD= .89$  while the school principals had a mean of  $X= 3.77$ ,  $SD=.97$  which shows agreement on the point respectively. The average mean score of respondents is 3.82 which indicated agreement on the point. This shows that an inadequate number of trained specialized teachers in secondary schools in the study area.

The information collected from woreda SIP directorates indicated that "the major challenges that influence principals to implement SIP are limitations of trained teachers". The quantitative data obtained from questionnaires and the information from the woreda SIP directorates show there are no significant differences in viewpoint among the respondents.

Therefore, as the data gathered from questionnaires and interviews, one can conclude that there is scarcity of trained human resources in the study area. Without available professionally trained teachers and the school principals, achieving quality education is very difficult; this may negatively affect the school principal to improve SIP.

As shown in table 14, item 5, the respondents were asked whether teachers were not completing syllabus in time or not. As we can observe from the data, teachers and principals with ( $X= 3.84$ ,  $SD=0.92$  and  $X= 3.03$ ,  $SD=1.05$ ) agree on the part of teachers and undecided on the part of principals. The average mean score of respondents is 3.44 which indicated undecided on the point.

This means that the mean rating of teachers and schools principals, in the role of principals to improve students' performance was completion syllabus in time secondary schools in Wolaita zone was ineffective.

Similarly, the information obtained from supervisors indicated that "some secondary school teachers were not covering the textbooks at the time, like Mathematics, Physics, and English teachers". The quantitative data obtained from questionnaires and the information from the school supervisors show there are no significant differences in viewpoint among the respondents.

Therefore, from the quantitative and qualitative data, the researcher can conclude that the school principals were not making effective channels with the department heads, the school teachers and the principals were not effectively following the syllabus coverage, and this may be affecting the principal and the student result.

As shown in table 14, item 6, the respondents were asked in school the admission of students with low marks teachers and principals with mean ( $X=3.89$ ,  $SD=.90$ ) and principals ( $X=4.25$ ,  $SD=.81$ ) agree respectively. The averages mean score fall agreement to the point 4.07. This shows respondents agree there was no effective admission of students with low marks in secondary schools of study areas. Therefore, based on the data gathered through questionnaires the researcher can conclude that the role of principal in improving students' learning performance, helping the lower achieving students by providing different support were not properly implemented, this may negatively affect the student performance and the principal's effectiveness.

Item 7 of table 14, teachers and school principals were asked; that there are strikes or high students' indiscipline in the school or not, this means, teachers and school principals with ( $X= 3.81$ ,  $SD=1.06$  and  $X= 3.66$ ,  $SD=1.27$ ) agree respectively. The average mean score of respondents is 3.73 which indicate agreement on the point.

Similarly, the information obtained from the parent teacher association revealed that “challenges that influence principals to improve SIP are some of a student's characteristics or behaviors are indiscipline”. The quantitative data obtained from questionnaires and the information from the school PTA representative there is no important difference in viewpoint between the respondents.

In general, according to the obtained data from questionnaires and interviews the researcher can conclude that the secondary school of Wolaita zone there is student misbehavior, this shows the school principal with their students were not effective communication, common agreement, this may negatively influence the principal and the student achievement.

As shown in table 14, (item 8), the respondents were asked if there were inadequate textbooks and revision books or not. As we can observe the data from the table, teachers and principals with ( $X= 3.87$ ,  $SD=.83$  and  $X= 3.40$ ,  $SD=0.50$ ) show agreement on the part of teachers and undecided on the part of principals. The average mean score of respondents is 3.63 which indicated agreement on the point. This shows that inadequate textbooks in school are the major challenge to improve SIP implementation, it needs great attention.

Furthermore, as the data gathered from focus group discussion and interview respondents revealed that “to improve teaching learning process one of the major challenges that affect the school principal is limitation of textbook and revision books”. The quantitative data obtained from questionnaires and the information from the FGD and interviews respondents’ viewpoint, there is no important difference in viewpoint between the respondents.

Therefore, based on the data gathered through questionnaires and interviews it can be concluded that in study areas there is limitation of textbooks and other supporting revision books to improve school improvement programs that may affect the SIP implementation.

As shown in table 14, (item 9), the respondents were asked to improve teaching learning process, there are inadequate science laboratories..., observe from the table data, teachers and principals with ( $X= 3.58$ ,  $SD=1.15$  and  $X= 4.66$ ,  $SD=0.62$ ) agreed on the issues respectively. The total mean score of respondents is 4.12 which indicated agreement on the point. As the school supervisors informed that, “to modernize the teaching learning process and improve the student’s achievement, the principal’s effectiveness in some of the secondary schools was a lack of science laboratories materials”. The quantitative data obtained from questionnaires

and the information from the supervisor's respondents' viewpoint, there is no importance differences in viewpoint between the respondents

Therefore, based on the data gathered through quantitative and qualitative, it can be concluded that Wolaita zone secondary school principals do not effectively fill full science materials; this may be affecting the school performance and the principal's effectiveness.

As shown in table 14, (item 10), the respondents were asked about the lack of time to check teachers' schemes of works, lesson plans, records of work and lesson attendance or not. As observed from the data, teachers and school principals with ( $X= 3.41$ ,  $SD=1.34$  and  $X= 2.92$ ,  $SD=0.26$ ) respectively. The average mean score of respondents is 3.16 which indicated undecided on the point. This reveals that there is a lack of time to check teachers' schemes of works, lesson plans, and records of work and lesson attendance.

The information collected from SIP directorates, supervisors, kebele education and training boards and parent teacher associations indicated that "the school principals had workloads and lack of time to check teacher's lesson plans and other specific activities". The quantitative data gathered from questionnaires and the information from the interviews respondents' viewpoint, there is no importance differences in viewpoint between the respondents

Thus, with these realities in mind, the researcher concluded that the school principals were not given enough time to follow the teaching learning process of teachers and the principals were also busy in routine activities, which affected their effectiveness and the students' performance.

As shown in table 14, (item 11), the respondents were asked, in school to teachers, if there is a lack of time to check students notes, assignments or not. Observe from the data, teachers and principals with ( $X= 3.77$ ,  $SD=.93$  and  $X= 3.22$ ,  $SD=0.69$ ) respectively. The average mean score of respondents is 3.49 which indicated undecided on the point.

Therefore, from quantitative data gathered through questionnaires, the researcher can conclude that in the secondary school of the Wolaita zone, the teachers were busy, there was a lack of time to check student's notes and assignments, and this may negatively influence principal's effectiveness and the learner's achievement.

As indicated in table 14, (item 12), the respondents were asked whether or not there is a lack of parents' commitment to their children's education or not. As we can observe from the data, teachers and school principals with ( $X= 3.67$ ,  $SD=.89$  and  $X= 3.37$ ,  $SD=0.49$ ) respectively. The average mean score of respondents is 3.52 which indicated that agreement on the point.

In literature review, according to MoE, (2006) school cannot succeed without the support of the parents and community. It is therefore essential for the school principal to develop good relations with parents especially.

Similarly, as the information obtained from focus group discussion indicated that lack of student parent participation is the major challenges which influence student's performance and principal effectiveness in the study area.

Interview question related challenges that influence principals to implement SIP, many of interviewers, such as supervisors, Woreda SIP directorates, Kebele Education and Training Boards, and Parent Teacher Associations are responded interview similarly, they responded that limitation of parent involvement and ownerless of their students learning. The quantitative data gathered from questionnaires and the information from the interviews respondents' viewpoint, there is no significance differences in viewpoint between the respondents

Therefore, based on the data gathered through questionnaires, focus group discussion and interviews, it can be concluded that in the study area the school student parents are not effectively involving their students in teaching learning process, providing financial resources, making learning environment conducive, this may be negatively affecting principals and the SIP implementation.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

#### 5.1. Summary

The major purpose of this study was to assess principals' leadership effectiveness in implementing SIP in public secondary schools of Wolaita Zone. With this regard, this part deals with the summary of findings, the conclusions reached at and the recommendations forwarded on the basis of findings. In order to meet this purpose the following basic questions were raised:

1. What are the leadership roles used by school principals in implementing SIP?
2. What is the relationship between leadership style and principals effectiveness in implementing SIP?
3. What are the challenges that influence the effectiveness of principals in implementing SIP in secondary schools in the Wolaita Zone?

This effect, the study was conducted in 10 public secondary schools of wolaita. Consequently, 175 (50%) teachers were selected as a sample by using simple random sampling techniques and 30 (100%) of school principals were selected as a sample by using availability sampling techniques. From selected secondary schools 10 student representatives, 10 KETB representatives, 10 PTA representatives were taken as a sample through purposive sampling technique. In addition to this, 4 Woreda SIP directorates are included in the sample by using availability sampling techniques. For the study, primary and secondary data sources were employed. The data was gathered through both quantitative and qualitative tools. Accordingly, 175 copies of a questionnaire were prepared and 170 copies were distributed for teachers and 30 copies of questionnaires for school principals. From the prepared questionnaires, 05 teachers did not return the questionnaires. On the other hand, to obtain qualitative data, focus group sessions were conducted with students from the sample secondary schools and interviews were conducted with supervisors, KETB, PTA and Woreda SIP directorates. Moreover, document analyses were used to obtain qualitative data. The quantitative data gathered through questionnaires were analyzed in descriptive statistics (frequency, mean value and standard deviation) and whereas, the qualitative data gathered through the open-ended questionnaire, focus group discussion and document were analyzed by narration.

According to the result of data analysis, the following major findings are identified. Therefore, based the analysis of data, the findings of study were summarized as follows:

### **1. Findings related to the leadership roles used by school principals in implementing SIP**

Regarding the classroom observation, the secondary school principals in Wolaita zone not effectively visit classroom, monitor curriculum, and evaluate performance students, did not holds productive discussions with the teachers after classroom visits, not effectively follow the teachers teaching process, did not coaches the class to mark the teachers who attend lessons and those who do not.

Regarding supporting the teachers, the secondary school principals in Wolaita zone did not give advice to teachers regarding school curriculum and their teaching methods, not effectively requesting the department heads to check teachers' lessons, ineffective working with the department head and following syllabus coverage effectively.

Regarding monitoring the students, the secondary school principals did not give advice to students in different disciplinary issues; did not frequently visit classrooms to check students' activities in secondary schools; did not effectively motivate, encourage, support, and empower students to participate in different club activities.

### **2. Findings related to the relationship between leadership roles and principals effectiveness in implementing SIP.**

#### **❖ Views of respondents related to provides instructional materials**

A significant and positive relationship was found between provision of instructional materials and principals effectiveness to improve SIP implementation ( $r=0.785$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). This shows that there is a significant relationship between provision of instructional materials and improvement of students' performance. This reveals that there is low provision of textbooks and other teaching/learning materials according to mission and goals of the school, allocation of resources to the instructional activities in the study area.

The school principals were not effective by providing textbooks and other teaching/learning materials to improve school; selecting and organizing teaching materials and making them available for use by teachers for effective implementation of SIP; allocating resources to improve instructional activities; ensuring teaching learning resources like laboratories...well equipped to promote school achievement.

#### ❖ **Views of respondents related to curriculum monitoring**

Based on the findings related to curriculum monitoring and improving SIP implementation, the results showed that curriculum monitoring had a statistically significant and positive relationship with principal effectiveness performance ( $r= 0.746$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). This reveals that there was a strong relationship between curriculum monitoring to improve students' performance by implementing SIP.

The school principals were not effectively focuses on curriculum monitoring; did not properly monitoring the curriculum and student learning outcomes to improve school improvement programs; did not providing teachers with opportunities to learn the methodology of teaching well within their academic areas and ineffective valuating instruction, coordinating the curriculum and monitoring student progress to improve SIP; using appropriate data from curriculum monitoring to improving SIP.

#### ❖ **Views of respondents related to creates conducive environment**

Regarding creating conducive environments Pearson's parametric test of correlation revealed that there is a significant and positive relationship between related to conducive environment and principal effectiveness above table shown ( $r= .718$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). This shows that school principals' activity positively relates to students' performance and the relationship is significant. That is to say that any unit increase or decrease in the level of principals' activity also increases or decreases students' performance.

The principals were not effective making conducive learning environment to improve principal effectiveness: did not creating conducive environment facilitate collaboration with others and the sharing of best practice to implement SIP; ineffective creating conducive environment to facilitate supervisory activities in the school by organizing all necessary resources to implement SIP; not effectively motivating students by making school safe and healthy learning environment; did not using shared decision-making, and ineffective developing a culture of mutual respect in the school; ineffective organizing favorable learning environments for students learning to improve SIP.

#### ❖ **Views of respondents related to observe classroom practice/supervision/**

Pearson's parametric test of correlation revealed that there is a significant and positive relationship between observing classroom practice and improving students' performance and characteristics ( $r=0.676$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). Moreover, observing classroom practice was significantly and positively related to improving students' performance in secondary schools of study areas.

The principals were not effective in observing classroom practice by encouraging teachers to use different teaching methods to provide for specific needs of students; ineffective supporting and guiding teachers in data-based decision making regarding effective practices to maximize student success; did not making frequent and formal class visits to check students' notebooks and assignments to improve SIP; ineffective providing feedback to students and teachers on instructional methods and techniques.

❖ **Views of respondents related to improvement of stakeholder participation**

Pearson's parametric test of correlation revealed that there is a significant and positive relationship between the improvement of stakeholder participation and improved principal effectiveness ( $r= 0.804$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). Moreover, the improvement of stakeholder participation was significantly and positively related to improving students' performance in secondary schools of study areas. This is an indication that a positive relationship exists between improvements of stakeholder participation and improves students' performance

The school principals were did not taking parents as members of school committees and boards to make school decision; ineffective promoting relationships between teachers, parents, students and other school stakeholders to improve students' achievement; not effectively participating stakeholders in the formulation of school rules and procedures and involving stakeholders in making decisions regarding implementing SIP domains to improve school results.

**3. Findings related to the challenges that influence the school principal's leadership effectiveness in implementing school improvement programs (SIP).**

Regarding challenges that influence the school principals leadership effectiveness: the school teachers did not attend lessons; lack of budget/income that influences the school principal's leadership effectiveness in implementing school improvement program (SIP); ineffective respective stakeholder's involvement in school affairs between teachers and principals; scarcity of trained human resources; teachers were not completing syllabus in time; the admission of students with low marks or high member of lower achiever students; student misbehavior ; limitation of textbooks and other supporting revision books to improve school improvement programs; lack of science laboratories materials; the school principals were not given enough time to follow teaching learning process of teachers or the principal workloads; the teachers were workload, there is lack time to check student's notes and assignment; the school student parents not effectively involving their students teaching learning process, did not providing financial resources and making learning environment conducive to the learner.

## 5.2 Conclusion

### **Based on the major findings the following conclusions were drawn:**

Regarding the leadership roles used by school principals in implementing SIP; the public secondary schools of the study areas related to before and after classroom observation to support teachers, the degree to which the principal holds a classroom visit to observe teachers was not practiced well as expected, the principal holds productive discussion with the teachers after classroom visit was not practiced well as expected, the practices of secondary school principals ensure that teachers have lesson notes and samples of study area is not effective, school principals do not coaches teachers effectively to prepare lesson plans. Therefore, from the finding, it is possible to conclude that the secondary school principals of Wolaita zone were not effective in collaboration with the senior teachers and the department heads to improve the classroom observation; ineffective by allocating of time to visit classroom then make productive discussion with the teachers to improve teaching learning process.

Related support teachers from supervisors and department heads; school principals didn't advise teachers on issues related to school curriculum and teaching methods. This shows the school principals were not effectively collaborating with the teachers about curriculum and teaching methods. The principal did not coach the class to mark the teachers who attend lessons and those who do not. The school teachers do not effectively plan lessons, make adequate preparation, and present learning activities, the principals do not follow the syllabus coverage effectively. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that, secondary school principals were not making effective communication with the teachers about their teaching learning process; did not encourage the teachers who prepared effective lesson plans; did not effectively follow teachers; they covered their textbooks in time.

Related to monitoring students for leadership effectiveness; the principal giving advice to students in different disciplinary issues was not practiced as well as expected, the principal did not frequently visit classrooms to check students' activities in secondary schools. The principal was not allowing students to participate in different co-curricular activities in secondary schools or under study areas. These shows the school principals were ineffective in implementation in club activities. Therefore, it is possible to conclude, Wolaita zone secondary school principals did not make common understanding with their students about

the misbehavior of the learners; ineffective classroom observation allowing; not effectively encouraging students to improve their participation.

Regarding the relationship between leadership roles and principals effectiveness in implementing SIP; the public secondary school of Wolaita zone, there was a significant relationship between the school principals' leadership effectiveness and practice to improve SIP implementation. The correlation coefficient indicated a strong SIP implementation positive relationship between the school principals' activities to improve students' performance.

The school principals were not effective by providing textbooks and other teaching/learning materials to improve school; selecting and organizing teaching materials and making them available for use by teachers for effective implementation of SIP; allocating resources to improve instructional activities; ensuring teaching learning resources like laboratories...well equipped to promote school achievement. Therefore, it is possible to conclude, the school principals were not effective by involving the school stakeholders to provide textbooks, select, organize, allocate appropriate resources to improve instructional activities and promote learner achievement.

The school principals were not effectively focus on curriculum monitoring and evaluation; did not properly monitoring the curriculum and student learning outcomes to improve school improvement programs; did not providing teachers with opportunities to learn the methodology of teaching well within their academic areas and ineffective valuating instruction, did not effectively coordinating the curriculum and monitoring student progress to improve SIP; ineffective using appropriate data from curriculum monitoring and evaluation to improving SIP. Therefore, it is possible to conclude, the secondary school principals were not effectively following the teaching learning process, not appropriately motivating the teachers to improve their teaching methods, and ineffective curriculum monitoring and evaluation methods.

The principals were not effective making conducive learning environment to improve principal effectiveness: did not creating conducive environment facilitate collaboration with others and the sharing of best practice to implement SIP; ineffective creating conducive environment to facilitate supervisory activities in the school by organizing all necessary resources to implement SIP; not effectively motivating students by making school safe and

healthy learning environment; did not using shared decision-making, and ineffective developing a culture of mutual respect in the school; ineffective organizing favorable learning environments for students learning to improve SIP.

Therefore, it is possible to conclude, Wolaita zone secondary school principals were ineffective in preparing a learning environment safe and healthy for the learners; did not effectively involve others to make a conducive environment; not making cooperation with stakeholders to make a healthy learning environment; the decision making process is not participatory.

The principals were not effective in observing classroom practice by encouraging teachers to use different teaching methods to provide for specific needs of students; ineffective supporting and guiding teachers in data-based decision making regarding effective practices to maximize student success; did not making frequent and formal class visits to check students' notebooks and assignments to improve SIP; ineffective providing feedback to students and teachers on instructional methods and techniques. Depending on this, it is possible to conclude, the study areas secondary school principals were not supporting teachers to use various teaching methods, ineffective guiding teachers in data based decision making and not effectively checking students notebooks and their activities.

The school principals were did not taking parents as members of school committees and boards to make school decision; ineffective promoting relationships between teachers, parents, students and other school stakeholders to improve students' achievement; not effectively participating stakeholders in the formulation of school rules and procedures and involving stakeholders in making decisions regarding implementing SIP domains to improve school results. Therefore, it is possible to conclude, the secondary school principals were not effectively participating in the students' parents in school decision; there is ineffective relationship with the different school stakeholders on school improvement programs.

Regarding challenges that influence the school principal's leadership effectiveness in implementing school improvement programs (SIP). As the result of the study revealed, the secondary public school-principals was negatively affected by many problems; such as - school teachers did not attending lessons ,lack of budget/income at school level; inadequate number of trained specialized teachers in secondary schools; the school principals were lack of leadership skill, admission of students with marks were the identified problems. Again the result of the study revealed, there is lack of parents' commitment to their children's education

and SIP; limitation of awareness creation to stakeholders to improve SIP, ownerless of different bodies, school principals busy on routine activities and not focus on SIP implementation, lack of stakeholders commitment to participate parents. Some public secondary school principals were leadership skill gaps, and lack of support from different educational organizations.

So, it is better to conclude that the school principals were not effectively following teachers and making good relationships with the teachers who prepare lesson plans. The school principal were not effective involving different stakeholders and generating financial resources; Regional Education Bureau and Zonal Education Department not give value fill full trained personnel to improve SIP implementation; school stakeholders give less value to improve the students achievement; the school principals and the supervisors not give value to create awareness to students learners; the school principals were not effectively delegate other stakeholders and making cooperation with them.

### 5.3. Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study and conclusions drawn, the following recommendations were forwarded:

- To improve instructional material problem, the principals and other school stakeholders have better to undertake development projects that empower schools by availing learning materials for example textbooks and facilities like science laboratories and libraries for principals' effectiveness and to improve SIP implementation.
- To improve SIP implementation and the learner result, the school stakeholders: Kebele Education and Training Boards and Parent Teacher Associations, should be encouraging, involving the student parents, create conducive learning environment for teaching, giving financial support to school, and following the students learning to improve SIP implementation.
- To improve the teaching learning process and the learner achievement, the school teachers should be preparing effective lesson plans, covering textbooks according to their plan and using local available teaching learning materials.
- To minimize the school principal's workload, the school principals should be encouraging the department heads, unit leaders, and other teachers to continuously acquire the principal's roles skills within and outside school systems through school level short training, discussing with them and making awareness creation about instructional leadership.
- To upgrade instructional leadership, the school principals have better to improve their leadership through attending management courses such as those organized and other professional development workshops as a way of ensuring that teaching and learning processes take place smoothly in order to improve students' performance.
- To implement SIP timely and decrease workload, the principals should involving stakeholders like : vice directors and department heads in order to save time, to assess both the students and teachers commitment to their work and improve SIP implementation.
- To solve inadequate human resource, Regional Education Office (REO) and Zonal Education Department (ZED) should employ available trained teachers and school principals to reduce the current teacher workload and ensure timely syllabus coverage as well as the school principal's effectiveness.

## References

- Abiy Zegeye, Alemayehu Worku, Daniel Tefera, Melese Getu and Yilma Silashi (2009). Introduction to analyze methods. Graduate and study office: Addis Ababa University
- Assefa, B. (1991), Female participation and overall performance in Rural Primary School in Ethiopia. Addis Ababa: UNICEF and SIDA.
- BekuretsionHaileSilassie, (2014): An Investigation on into the Principal's Instructional Role: A Case of Four Secondary Schools in Southern, Nations, Nationalities Peoples Region. Ethiopia: University of South Africa.
- Blasé', J. and Blasé', R. (1994). Empowering Teachers: What a success principals Do? Los Angeles: Crowin Press inc.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics, (2010), Educational Administrators: Occupational Outlook. New York: Longman publisher.
- Bush, T. (2007). Educational Leadership and Management: Theory, Policy and Practice, 9 (3), pp.391-406.
- Cohen, J. 2006. Social and emotional education: Core standards and practices. London and New York, Rutledge Flamer.
- Cotton K. (2003), principals and college students achievement. Melbourne: Hawker Brown low.
- Creswell, J.W. (2006). Research design, quantitative and combined approaches (second Ed): London, sage booklet Inc.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009), quantitative, Qualitative, and technique approach. Los Angeles: SAGE booklet Inc.
- Day, C Sammons, P. Leithwoods, K. Hopkins, D. GU, Q. Brown, E&A stariduo, E. (2010). Seven sturdy Claims approximately powerful faculty leadership. Nottingham: National College for Leadership of faculties and children's services.
- Doyle, M.E. 2002. A version for educational leadership, Principal Leadership, Educational Administration, Quarterly 3(3) Nov, (2002).
- DuFour, R. 2002. Learning- focused standards. Leadership Journal. 59 (8), 12-15.
- DuFour, R, and Eaker, R. 2008, Revisiting Professional Learning Communities' at Work: New insights for enhancing institutions. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

- DuFour, R, and Eaker, R, and Karhanek, G.2010, Raising the embled closing. The gap: Whatever it takes. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Performance. Boston, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.
- Elliot, N. and Capp.2001.Review of research: How leadership influences student learning. Wallace Foundation.
- English, F.W.2008.The Art of Educational Leadership: Balancing Performance and Accountability, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Estyn (2001) . Good exercise in Leadership and control of school. Anchor court:UK.
- Fransua Dalachew,(2019); Leadership practice and School overall performance in Secondary Schools of wolaita Zone, Degree of Doctor Thesis, AAU.
- Fullan, M., Hill, P., and Crevola, C.2006.Breakthrough.ThousandOaks, CA: Corwin
- Fullan, M. and St. Germain, C.2006.LearningPlaces: A Field Guide for Improving the Schooling, Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Fullan, M.2010.Allsystems go: The Change Imperative for Whole System Reform. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Fulton, I.KI.YoonandC.Lee.2005.Induction into Learning Communities. Washington: National Commission on teaching and America’s Future.
- Glutton, A.A.2012.Curriculum Leadership: Strategies for development and Implementation, (3<sup>rd</sup>ed).Washington, DC: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Glikman.D.Gordon, S.P,and Ross-Gordon, J.M.2007. Supervision and instructional Leadership.(7<sup>th</sup>ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Goslin, K.G .2009.How instructional leadership is conveyed by high school principals: The Finding of three case studies. A paper presented at the international congress For School effectiveness & improvement, New Departures for a learning world of Quality and Equity Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
- Hallinger, P.2008.A review of PIMRS studies of principal instructional leadership: Assessment of progress over 25 years. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), New York.
- Hal linger, P. & Murphy, J.1987.Instructional leadership in the school context. In W.Green field (Ed.), Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and. Controversies (pp 179-201).Boston: Allyn and Bacon
- Hal linger, P.andJ.F.Murphy.1997. “Assessing and Developing Principal Instructional Leadership: Educational Leadership.Vol.45, No.1, pp.54– 61.
- Harris, A. 2003, Effective leadership for school improvement. New York: Rout ledge.

- Harris, A. and Daniel, M.2005, *Improving School through Teacher Leadership*. NewYork Open University, Press.
- Harris, A.W, and Lowery, S,(2002).A view from the classroom. *Educational Leadership; Educational Administration Quarterly*.59 (8), 64-65.
- Hopkins, D. &Ahtaridis, E.2003.*Improving School Leadership, Country Background Report for England, are prepared for the Department for Children, Schools and Families, England, available at [www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership](http://www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership).*
- Hoy, A.W. and How, W.K.2006.*Instructional leadership: A learning-centered guide*. (2nd)Boston: Pearson.
- Jacobson, P.B.J.D.LogsdenandR.R.andR.RWiegman.1973. *The principal ship: New Perspectives*. New Jersey: Prentice \_ Hall, IncJoyce, B, and Calhoun, E.2010.*Models of Professional Development: A Celebration of Educators*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Krug, S.E.1992. “Instructional Leadership: A Constructivist Perspective, *Educational Administration Quarterly*.28 (3), 430–443.
- Lambert,L. and Harris, A. (2002). *Building management capacity for institution Improvement*. London: open University
- Lash way, L.2002a.*Developing Instructional Leaders*. ERICC studying residence house on Educational Management Eugene, OR.(ERIC Document Reproduction ServiceNo. ED466023.)
- Leith Wood, K.A.2003.*What we know about successful school leadership*.[www.cepn.gse.rutgers.edu](http://www.cepn.gse.rutgers.edu).
- Leith wood, K.2010.*Leadership:Instructional*.Baker &.Peterson (Eds.) *International Encyclopedia of education*, Oxford: Elsevier Press.
- Leu.E. (2005). *The Role Teachers, Schools, and Communities in Quality Education: Global Education Center*. Retrieved July 23/2012 Form:
- Lockheed, M.E., A.M.Verspoor andAssociate.1991.*Improving Country Education Developing Countries*. Washington D.C: World Bank Publication.
- Lunenburg, F.C.and Ornstein, A.O.2008.*Educational Administration: concepts and Practices* (5<sup>th</sup>ed) Belmont, C.A: Wadsworth/Cengage.
- Lunenburg, F.C.2010.*The Principal as Instructional Leader*, *National Forum of Education and Supervision Journal, Samouston State University*.27 (4), 45-56.

- Marks, M. Helen & Susan M. Printy 2003. Principal leadership and school performance; an international and instructional leadership, *Educational Leadership Quarterly*. Vol. 39 (3), 370– 397.
- Marzano, R.J. and Waters, T. 2010. *District Leadership that Works: Striking the Right Balance*, Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- McEwan, E.K. 2003. *Seven steps to effective instructional leadership*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) California: Corwin Press, Inc.
- MoE, (1994) *Educational and Training Policy*, Addis Ababa, EMPDA.
- . 2004. *Woreda capacity Building program course work book*. Addis Ababa.
- . 2006. *Binding guideline of school improvement, Blueprint*, Addis Ababa.
- . 2007. *Review of Ethiopian education and Training policy and Its Implementation*. Addis Ababa, USARD.
- 2010a *Education Sector Development Programme IV (ESDP-IV)*, Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.
- MoE. (1994) “The new education and training policy”, *Policy Document of the Ethiopia Ministry of Education*: Addis Ababa University.
- MoE, (2002), *coeducational leadership, administration community participation and financial directive*. Addis Ababa: EMPDA
- Musungu, L. L. and Nasongo, J. W, (2009). *The Head teacher’s Instructional Role in Academic Achievement in Secondary School in Vihiga District, Kenya Educational Research on Review*
- Murphy, J. 2010. *The educator’s handbook for understanding and closing achievement Gaps*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Northouse, P.G. 2010. *Leadership: Theory and practice* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Oakland, E. (1993). *Total Quality Management: The route to Improving Performance*. London: clays, St. Ives pLc.
- Phillips, J.A. 2012. *Manager-Administrator or instructional leader: shift the role of the Principal*, From <http://www.Learning domain.com/principal Instructional Leader>, (Retrieved March 14, 2012).
- Popham, W.J. 2010a. *Educational assessment: What School Leaders Need to know?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Rossouw, L.F. 1990. *The Principal ship: Dimensions in Instructional Leadership*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

- Sabitu, A.O. and Ayandoja, A. C. (2012).Impact of selected modes of instructional Supervision activities on students' academic performance in senior secondary schools in Ondo state, Nigeria. *Education Research Journal* Vol. 2(1): 1 - 6, January 2012.Accessed on 12
- SetoumArarso, (2014), Leadership Effectiveness of School Leaders in Implementing School Improvement program in Illubabor Zone Government:Jima University
- Sergiovanni, T.T.2001. *The principal ship; are elective practice perspective* :( 4thed).London, Allyn and Bacon.
- Sergiovanni, T.J.2005.*The Virtues of Leadership*. The Educational Forum, New York, Rout ledge.
- Smylie, M.A.2010.*Continuous School Improvement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Stronge, J.H.2013.*Principal evaluation: Standards, rubrics, and tools for effective Performance*, Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Taole,M. J.2013.*Exploring principals' role in providing instructional leadership in rural High schools in South Africa*, MA Thesis. Pretoria University, South Africa.
- Teck-Hong,T. and Waheed,A. (2011), Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory and job Satisfaction in the Malaysianretail sector: The mediating effect of love of money. *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 16, No. 1, 73–94
- Walker, D.2009. *Effective Leadership in the Workplace: The network Journal*. Available from <http://www.tntj.com/career-advice/effective-leadership>.
- Wakoli, M. (2014).*Principals' Management Strategies and Performance of Students in Secondary Schools in Mount Elgon, Sub County, Kenya*.
- Waters, T. Marzano, R. J. & McNulty, .B (2002). *(Balanced Leadership: What 30 Years Research Tells Us about the Effect of Leadership on Student Achievement*.
- UNESCO (2005): *Education for All (EFA) Global Monitoring Report: The Role of the Organization and Social Context of Schools*; <http://portal.org/education>.
- Uebersax, John S. *Likert Scale: Dispelling the confusion*. *Statistical Method for Rater Agreement* .31 Aug. 2006.20 Oct.2007
- Yenew, A.(2012).*Effectiveness of instructional leadership in preparatory schools in South Wollo Zone*.MA Thesis, A.A.U.

**APPENDIX-A**  
**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**  
**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES**  
**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT**

**Questionnaire for principals and teachers**

**Directions:**

This questionnaire is designed to assess the school principal's leadership effectiveness in the implementation of the school improvement program in secondary schools of Wolaita zone. The study focuses on government secondary schools (9-12) in the zone. This research will be conducted to assess the school principal's leadership effectiveness and is in no way affecting you personally and your identity remaining confidential. Evidently, the success of this study depends on your honest response to all parts of the questionnaire. Therefore, I kindly request you to fill this questionnaire openly.

Please tick (x) where applicable or fill in the required information on the spaces provided.

**NOTICE:**

Please, read all the questions before attempting to answer the questions.

No need to consult others to fill the questionnaires.

You do not need to write your name on the questionnaire.

**Part I: Personal Data**

Please, write your personal background on the space provided.

School.....Sex: Male.....Female.....

Academic Qualification..... Service Years.....

**Part II:** Please use one of the following Likert scales to point out your response by marking (x) against each closed ended item from the given rating scales.

Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1; Disagree (D) = 2; Undecided (U) = 3; Agree (A) = 4; Strongly Agree (SA) = 5.

**Item1: Leadership roles used by school principals in implementing SIP.**

N	Styles	Options				
		1	2	3	4	5
	Items related to classroom observation to support teachers					
1	The principal holds a classroom visit to observe a teacher to improve students and teachers.					
2	The principal holds productive discussions with the teachers after classroom visit.					
3	The principal ensures that teachers have lesson notes before the classroom their teaching learning methods.					
4	The principal coaches the class to mark the teachers who attend lessons and those who do not.					
	Items related to Support to teachers from supervisors and heads					
1	The principal advises teachers on issues related to school curriculum and teaching methods.					
2	The principal requested the head of departments to check if teachers attend lessons or not.					
3	The principal asks reports from the head of departments on syllabus coverage to check the semester course coverage.					
	Items related to Monitoring students					
1	The principal gives advice to students on different disciplinary issues.					
2	The Principal frequently visits classrooms to check student's activities.					
3	The principal allows students to participate in different Co-curricular activities.					

What are the additional activities expected from school principal's to the effectiveness of principals' leadership in implementing school improvement programs (SIP).

.....

.....

.....

.....

**Items 2: The relationship between leadership roles and principals effectiveness in implementing SIP.**

No	Activities	Options				
		1	2	3	4	5
<b>A</b>	<b>Items related to provides instructional materials</b>					
1	Principals provide textbooks and other teaching/learning materials to improve school.					
2	The school principals select and organize teaching materials and make them available for use by teachers for effective implementation of SIP.					
3	The school leaders, like principals, allocate resources to improve instructional activities.					
4	School principals ensure teaching learning resources like laboratories...well equipped to promote school achievement.					
<b>B</b>	<b>Items related to curriculum monitoring and Evaluation</b>					
1	Principals properly monitor the curriculum and student learning outcomes to improve school improvement programs.					
2	School leaders provide teachers with opportunities to learn the methodology of teaching well within their academic areas.					
3	Principals valuates instruction, coordinates the curriculum and monitors student Progress to improve SIP.					
4	School leaders use appropriate data from curriculum monitoring and evaluation to improve SIP.					
<b>C</b>	<b>Items related to creates conducive environment</b>					
1	Principals to create a conducive environment facilitate collaboration with others and the sharing of best practice to implement SIP.					
2	School leaders create a conducive environment to facilitate supervisory activities in the school by organizing all necessary resources to implement SIP.					
3	The school leaders motivate students by making a safe and healthy learning environment.					

4	Principals used shared decision-making, and developed a culture of mutual respect in the school.					
5	Leaders organize favorable learning environments for students learning to SIP.					
<b>D</b>	<b>Items related to observe classroom practice/supervision/</b>					
1	Principals encourage teachers to use different teaching methods to provide for specific needs of students.					
2	Leader's support and guide teachers in data-based decision making regarding effective practices to maximize student success.					
3	The school principals make frequent and formal class visits to check students' notebooks and assignments to improve SIP.					
4	Leaders provide feedback to students and teachers on instructional methods and techniques.					
<b>E</b>	<b>Item related to improve stakeholders participation</b>					
1	School principals take parents as members of school committees and boards to make school decisions.					
2	School leaders promote relationships between teachers, parents and students and other school stakeholders to improve students' achievement.					
3	School leaders have willing and dedicated stakeholders in the formulation of school rules and procedures.					
4	Principals involve stakeholders in making decisions regarding implementing SIP domains to improve school results.					
5	Stakeholders participate in Preparing the school budget and working with the school principals to maximize the school achievement.					
6	Stakeholders participate in setting school rules and disciplinary measures with principals to promote students character and result.					

What are the other leadership styles/approaches expected from a school principal's effectiveness to improve student performance?

.....

.....

.....

**Item 3: challenges that influence the school principal’s leadership effectiveness in implementing school improvement programs (SIP).**

No	Challenges	Options				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	The school teachers are not attending lesson plans.					
2	There is lack of budget/income at school level					
3	Involvement of respective stakeholders in school affaires					
4	Inadequate number of trained teachers in school.					
5	Teachers not completing syllabus in time to improve SIP.					
6	In school the admission of students with low marks.					
7	There is Strikes or high students’ indiscipline at school level.					
8	In school there are limitations, like inadequate textbooks and revision books.					
9	To improve the teaching learning process there are inadequate science laboratories.					
10	Lack of time to check teachers’ schemes of work, lesson plans, records of work and lesson attendance.					
11	In school, teachers Lack of time to check student’s notes, assignments.					
12	Lack of parents’ commitment to their children’s education and SIP implementation in school.					

What are the additional challenges that influence the school principal’s leadership effectiveness in implementing school improvement programs (SIP)?

.....

.....

.....

.....

Thank You for your cooperation!

**APPENDIX-B**  
**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**  
**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES**  
**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT**

**Focus Group Discussion Question for Student’s**

This focus group discussion seeks to gather information to be used to establish the role of the principal in principals’ leadership and the effectiveness in implementing school improvement programs (SIP). Discuss freely on the issues of school principals' activity in the effectiveness of principals’ leadership in implementing school improvement programs (SIP).

**Part I: Background**

School Name..... Academic year.....

Part II: write your answer briefly

1. What are principals' leadership styles that are implemented in your school principals and are used to improve school improvement programs (SIP)?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

2. In your school, the principals to what extent monitor curriculum and evaluate performance of students to improve school improvement programs?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

3. How leadership styles and principals effectiveness are related to implementing your school improvement program (SIP).

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

4. Does your school principal allow you to act as coaches in various Co-curricular activities in implementing school improvement program (SIP)?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

5. What do you think are the main challenges facing your principal's leadership effectiveness in implementing school improvement programs (SIP)?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

Thank You for Your Group Discussion!

**APPENDIX- C**  
**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**  
**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES**  
**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT**

**Document Analysis**

Name of the School..... Year.....

1. Does the school principal allocate sufficient budget to teaching learning activities?

How much is the school annual budget?

.....  
.....  
.....

2. The school principal records specific activity on the principals' leadership effectiveness in implementing school improvement programs (SIP)?

What type of records does the school have?

.....  
.....  
.....

3. The school principal discusses with stakeholders on a student's performance to improve SIP?

How do they solve the student's problem?

.....  
.....  
.....

**Thank You for your cooperation!**

**APPENDIX- D**

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES**

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT**

**Interview questions for school supervisors, SIP directorates, Kebele Education and Training Boards (KETB) and Parent Teacher Association (PTA):**

The objective of this study is to collect necessary information for the study of the principal’s leadership effectiveness in implementing SIP in the public secondary schools of Wolaita zone. Therefore your contribution of this study is highly valued and you are kindly requested to respond to the questions. Finally the researcher would like to assure that your identity is strictly confidential.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation!!

Part one: General information

School Name.....Current position.....

**Part two:** please, openly reflect your idea of the questions raised below

1. What are the major roles that are implemented in your school by the school principals to implement SIP?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

2. In your school, how do the school principal’s follow teaching learning process implementation to improve SIP?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

3. Leading schools with different school stakeholders make principals' leadership effective. How?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

4. According to your view, what are the major challenges that influence principals to implement SIP?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

5. What are the possible solutions you suggest to overcome challenges that influence principals' leadership effectiveness in implementing SIP?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

Thank You for your cooperation!