

Addis Ababa
University
(Since 1950)



Addis Ababa University

School of Graduate Studies

College of Education and Behavioral Studies

**Department of Educational Planning and
Management**

**The Practices and Problems of School Leadership: The Case of Some
Selected Secondary Schools in Addis Ababa City Administration**

By Ameha Rundassa

A Thesis submitted to School of Graduate Studies, the Department of Educational Planning and Management, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Master of Arts Degree in School Leadership.

July 2017

Addis Ababa

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by Ameha Rundassa Biratu, entitled: The Practices and Problems of School Leadership: The Case of Some Selected Secondary Schools in Addis Ababa City Administration and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Arts (School Leadership) complies with regulation of the university and meets the accepted standards with to Originality and Qualities.

Approved by board of examiners:

_____	_____	_____
Internal Examiner	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
External Examiner	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Advisor	Signature	Date

JULY 2017

ADDIS ABABA

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor Ato Ayalew Shibeshi for his continuous support, friendly approach and valuable comments. He spent his precious time in commenting my work and showing me the right direction that he found very important for the accomplishment of my thesis.

My greatest gratitude is extended to my friends Wondmeneh Belete and Solomon G/silassie for being with me, providing technical support whenever in need and for continuous motivation and encouragement.

Table of Contents

Contents	pages
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
Table of Contents	ii
List of Tables.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
Acronyms	vi
CHAPTER ONE: THE PROBLEM AND ITS APPROACH	1
1.1. Back Ground of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	2
1.3. Objective of the Study.....	3
1.3.1. General Objective.....	3
1.3.2. Specific Objectives	3
1.4. Significance of the Study	4
1.5. Delimitation of the Study	4
1.6. Limitation of the Study.....	4
1.7. Definitions of Operational Terms.....	5
1.8. Organization of the Study	5
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	6
2.1. The Concept of Leadership	6
2.2. Leadership Styles.....	7
2.2.1. Autocratic/authoritarian leadership style.....	7
2.2.2. Democratic/participative leadership style:.....	7
2.2.3. Laissez-faire leadership style/free-reign” or cut-off leader style:	7
2.3. Characteristics of Effective Leadership	8
2.4. The Concept of Principals’ Leadership	9
2.5. History of the School Principal	10
2.6. Changing Role of the Principal	10
2.7. Functions of School Leaders.....	11
2.8. Major Factors that Challenges School Leadership	14
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY.....	18
3.1. The Research Design	18
3.2. Instrumentations of Data Collection	19
3.2.1. Questionnaire.....	19

3.2.2. Interview	20
3.3. Instrument Reliability and validity	20
3.4. Procedures of Data Collection	21
3.5. Ethical Considerations.....	21
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	22
4.1. Characteristics of respondents	22
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	39
5.1. Summary of the Study.....	39
5.2. Conclusions	40
5.3. Recommendations	40
REFERENCES	42
APPENDIX A.....	45
APPENDIX B.....	48

List of Tables

Table 1. Population and Sample Size of Respondents-----	19
Table -2 characteristics of respondents -----	22
Table 3. Setting goals and vision-----	24
Table 4. Relationship with the School Community.....	26
Table 5. Leading Professional Development.....	31
Table 6. Decision Making Process.....	34
Table -7 problems that have affected Principals leadership practices.....	35

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the practices and problems of school leadership: The case of some selected secondary schools in Addis Ababa City Administration. The study employed descriptive survey design and was conducted in five secondary schools from five sub-cities out of 32 secondary schools. To collect the relevant data questionnaire, interview and document analysis were used during the study. Data was gathered from 108 teachers, 19 school principals, 18 supervisors and 55 department heads were analyzing using five rating scales and percentages. The schools and teachers were selected using random sampling techniques and principals, supervisors and department heads taken totally. The review of literature focused on the concept of leadership, leadership styles and characteristics of effective leadership and major factors that challenge school leadership. Descriptive survey design was supported by qualitative study that was employed to study the practices. To collect the relevant data questionnaire of both closed and open ended questions were used. Interview and document analysis were conducted during the study. Accordingly, questionnaire was prepared to be filled by teachers, department heads, vice principals, supervisors and interviews were administered for principals and vice principals. The data obtained through questionnaires were analyzed using statistical tool such as percentages. The major findings of this study were the qualification of school principals and related professional skill and knowledge was against the intended plan of Ethiopian Ministry of education, Educational leaders are poor in inviting change, innovation and creativity, regarding principals' human relation skill was found that there was moderate attempt to form relationship among the staff of the schools, majority of school principals are not active in participating parents' school decision making, , the principals greatly resembles to perform routine tasks than strategic tasks and in schools there are shortage of the needed resources, lower commitment of both teachers and principals, lower of competencies of the principals due to the shortage of relevant and timely professional training. The major conclusions based on the findings were concerning the qualification; all school leaders in selected secondary schools are not qualified with principal ship or not trained in the area of educational leadership. So principals' performance have a negative impact in the attainment of the educational goals of the school, principals by themselves agreed that they were in a poor performance in inviting change and innovation, they were also poorly performed, invite change and innovation., concerning time allocation principals are not spend their academic time for proper work but they mostly consume the time for routine tasks it is another biggest problem in principals work. Depending on the results of the study and the review of related literature, the following recommendations are put forward. Heavily work load has been found impeding principals' effort to support the teaching-learning process in their capacity. Administrative assignments other than the official instructional role were absorbing their time and effort. Thus, principals including the concerned body need to inform and influence parents relentlessly for their more involvement in the school affairs. After principals are assigned they should be continuously monitored, guided and helped by more competent and committed bodies. Hence, their skill and knowledge gaps should be continuously assessed, identified and fulfilled. These might through provision of organizing sufficient and pertinent on the job as well as off the job short and long term training on issues like effective educational leadership, transactional and transformational leadership, effective leadership of institutional change and reformation, forms of leadership etc. through combined forms of training.

Acronyms

ELIP: English Language Improvement program

GEQIP: General Education Quality Improvement Package

MAP: Management and Administration Programs

MDGs: Millennium Development Goals

MOE: Ministry of Education

PASDEP: Plan for Accelerated and Sustained Development to End Poverty

REB: Regional Education Bureau

SIP: School Improvement Program

TGE: Transitional Government of Ethiopia

UNESCO: United Nations Education Science and Cultural Organization

WEO: Woreda Education Office

CHAPTER ONE: THE PROBLEM AND ITS APPROACH

This chapter deals with the background of the study, statement of the problem, basic research questions, objectives of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study, definition of the key terms and organization of the study.

1.1. Back Ground of the Study

Education is recognized as the key factor of economic development. It is the corner stone of a country's development as it is crucial in producing skilled labor force that accelerates the pace of the nation's social and economic advancement (UNESCO, 2005 TGE, 1994).

Currently, different countries, including Ethiopia, are strategically devising various programs to alleviating or minimizing poverty through education. Accordingly, Ethiopia has developed and has been implementing its Plan for Accelerated and Sustained Development to End Poverty (PASDEP). However, ending poverty is difficult without offering quality education to citizens realizing PASDEP's strategic vision [rapid and sustained growth through large domestic investment and scaled up development] purely needs quality education that produces Competent and committed manpower. Additionally, the country has adopted Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). These goals made educational targets as the central fuels and deriving forces for the development endeavors in the country. This in turn demands ensuring quality education in a planned and systematic manner. Hence, different intervention strategies have been planned and implemented in Ethiopia.

Some of these are General Education Quality Improvement Program (GEQIP), School Improvement Programs (SIP), and English Language Improvement Programs (ELIP). Each of these has its own sub programs. For instance, one of the components of GEQIP is Management and Administration Program (MAP) that supports the government's initiatives in strengthening the planning, management, and monitoring capacity of MoE, REBs, and WEOs and in turn makes these organs ensure effectiveness of leadership at school level. This is because, effectiveness of schools falls at the hands of effective school leadership as assisted by the relevant stake holders (McEwan, 2003).

It is obvious that school principals play the key role in making school leadership as effective as possible. School principals apply different styles or skills of leadership including autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, transactional and transformational (Stronge, 2008). Each of these styles

has their own advantage and disadvantage. Moreover, the effectiveness of each style has its own best fitting contingent situations.

However, in implementing educational strategies and in bringing changes in the educational systems, principals in the secondary school face many problems due to their position Morphet et.al, (1982). Their position is vulnerable to many types of role conflicts. They are under pressure from their superordinate to meet the goals of the organization on the one hand and from the teachers to meet their personal needs on the other. Moreover, schools are formal organizations and are staffed predominantly by professionals. This has implications for the nature of management in educational institutions because professionals seek a measure of control over their working environment. In professional organization, then there is an authority of expertise which may come into conflict with professional authority.

Today educational leaders are expected more to facilitate sound, productive teaching learning environment. To address this leadership ability, skill and knowledge is critical (McLaughlin, 1987). Thus educational leaders are expected to be strong, responsible, committed and visionary. To this end, some principals and other educational leaders may lack behind due to limited capacity they have. Therefore, investigating the currently existing leadership practices and problems of the principals have been the central focus of this study.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The essential role of leadership in any organization has been pointed out by Sharma (2005). All successful organizational activity is a result of the exercise of creative leadership towards some mutually accepted attainable objectives. Moreover, organizations are places of determining the future fate of the national and that of its attendants and produce skilled and trained human power that could solve the problem of a country.

The major cause of failures for organization, including schools can be ineffective leadership. It is essential to provide effective leadership at the school level as schools are the scene of implementing educational programs. Based on the study of McEwan (2003) has found out that lack of skills and training, teacher cooperation, vision and good will, and shortage of time are common impediments to educational leadership effectiveness. Inadequate leadership at the school level is the one that adversely affects the progress of education because success in any educational institution depends significantly on effective and sound leadership.

However, from my own experience of secondary school as a vice principal for three years and five years main principal in the Lideta Sub City of Addis Ababa and from observation at different educational conferences, annual educational evaluations meetings and supervision reports, there are a lot of problems related to principals leadership in secondary schools of Addis Ababa like the students' academic performance was not as such improved in national examination in grade 10, the general quality education improvement package was not brought an expected outcome and the school community were not satisfied and all these things did not gave much attention by the concerned bodies.

And also, none of the researchers conducted a study on the practices and problems of principals' leadership in secondary schools of Addis Ababa. Accordingly, the main intention of this study is to investigate the practices and problems of school leadership: The case of some selected secondary schools in Addis Ababa City Administration are under their leadership responsibilities in a participatory manner starting from planning stage up to implementation. In doing so, I use the following basic research questions.

1. To what extent schools principals practicing their leadership responsibilities in secondary schools of Addis Ababa?
2. What are the major challenges of school leadership in selected government secondary schools of Addis Ababa?

1.3. Objective of the Study

1.3.1. General Objective

The overall objective of this study is to assess the practices and problems of the school leadership in government secondary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of the study were:

- To identify the extent of schools principals practicing their leadership responsibilities in the government secondary schools of Addis Ababa.
- To identify the major problems encountered in school leadership of Addis Ababa secondary schools.

1.4. Significance of the Study

Any organizational leaders could play a great role in the development of the country, and give appropriate and integrated service to the society members' as well as to the workers in the organization in particular. Moreover, principals' leadership styles affect teaching and learning process. Unless fruitful and appropriate leadership style is used, the achievement of organizational goal would be in vain. The concerned bodies and leaders' awareness and alertness about the existence of different type of leadership styles take the large part in implementing the school. From the finding of this study, the principals of secondary schools and other co-managerial bodies may get some important information about the effects of leadership. (1) The information may be helpful for higher officials of the regional, sub city and woreda level regarding how the school principals apply their leadership to achieve educational objectives effectively. (2) It may give an awareness to the principals how their leadership affect the teaching learning process negatively or positively. (3) The study provides to regional and sub city/woreda educational leader that what kinds of leadership practices were employed in secondary schools of A.A and could give feedback to school principals. (4) The findings may hope fully assists in enriching the existing literature on the issue of principal leadership.

1.5. Delimitation of the Study

In Addis Ababa there are ten sub cities with sixty nine government secondary schools and it is difficult to cover all these schools in the study, because it needs large amount of human, financial, materials and time resources. Thus to make it manageable, the study is delimited only to Lideta, Arada, Kirkos, Nifas Silik Lafito and Yeka sub cities government secondary schools found in Addis Ababa .

1.6. Limitation of the Study

According to Burns and Grove (2003:42), limitations are restrictions in a study that may decrease the credibility and generalize ability of the findings. No research project is carried out without limitations (Marshall & Rossman, 1999:42). Therefore, the following limitations affected this research.

Here to minimize the negative effect of this researcher gradually convinced principals that the study was intended for common benefit to help the principals solve their leadership problem. After the principals were convinced the aim of the research they tried to be transparent and the research made preliminary discussions with principals, teachers and department heads that the research has no any

hidden secrets except identifying the gap, proposing feasible solutions that would solve the problem related to leadership, supporting the teaching learning process practices of the school in particular.

1.7. Definitions of Operational Terms

Leadership: the ability to influence the actions of others and to guide an organization to a desired state of being or functioning (Glover, 2003).

School Leadership: a process of influence based on clear values and beliefs and leading to a 'vision' for the school (Glover, 2003).

School Principal: the leader of the school "Accountable for the academic progress for all students entrusted to their care" (Ubben, Hughes and Norris, 2007).

Secondary School: a school which offers two years of general education for grade 9 and 10.

1.8. Organization of the Study

This thesis is organized into five chapters. Chapter one deals with the introduction which encompasses background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study, definition of terms and organization of the study, Chapter two focuses on review of related literature, Chapter three presents the research design and methodology, chapter four discusses Presentation and Analysis of data and the 5th chapter contains the summary, conclusion and recommendation based on the findings for the research questions.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The major purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the literature on school leadership. These include that the concept of leadership, theories on leadership, leadership styles, characteristics of effective leadership, The concept of principals leadership, history of the school principal, changing role of the principal, functions of school leaders and major factors that challenge school leadership.

2.1. The Concept of Leadership

There are several definitions given to leadership. The term leadership can define in different aspects by different scholars as they perceive what leadership means. Leadership is the art of influencing people to direct their will, abilities and efforts towards the accomplishment of common goals. Leadership is also defined as „“process of encouraging and helping others to work enthusiastically towards objectives”” (Davis, 1967). On the other hand McGregor (1966) defines leadership as a property of individuals, but a complex relationship among those variables. It follows that leadership is the natural and acquired property of an individual manifested in the process of influencing individuals or groups to attain a certain common ends through common grounds and on equal footing. Blanchard and Hersey (1982) define leadership as the activity of influencing people to strive for group objectives. Likewise, Koontz et al (1984) define leadership as the process of influencing people so that they will strive willingly and enthusiastically towards the achievement of group goals. It also implies making people perform up to their full capacity.

Considering the basic principles and concepts of leadership the school leader's role is therefore to encourage the teaching and non-teaching personnel to work together and to fully cooperate in the development and implementation of educational policies, directives and plan for effective and efficient management which ensure proper teaching learning process. According to Northouse (2001), “leadership is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal.” Since leadership is a large part of the influence, the idea of power comes into play. Every instructional leader within the school system has this type of power. “Power is the capacity or potential to influence. People have power when they have the ability to affect others” beliefs, attitudes, and courses of action”. School principals who possess the quality of guiding and directing their teachers towards the attainment of educational goals are leaders. The school principals at all levels have to perform the function of leaders because they lead teachers whose energies have to follow in a definite direction. Accordingly, effective school leaders establish effective groups, good

educational plans, good school programs, adequate facilities, adequately qualified teachers, etc. what is required is good administrative leadership to harness these for the success of the school.

2.2. Leadership Styles

Leadership style is the patterns of behaviors which a leader adopts to influence the behaviors of his/her followers. Strengthening this idea, Kinard, (1988) wrote that “leadership style is a behavior pattern, which a leader exhibits in directing the behavior of the employees toward the attainment of personal or organizational goals.” Thus, effective principals use a wide range of leadership styles adopted by leaders. But many authors and researchers on leadership agreed that there are three major styles of leadership such as autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire.

2.2.1. Autocratic/authoritarian leadership style:

In this leadership style, leaders alone determine policy and make plan, tell subordinates what to do and how to do, power is centralized only to the leader, workers under the leader have little freedom, and show greater concern for work than for his/her worker. In fostering this, Lunenburg and Ornstein (2000) pointed out that autocratic leaders were very directive and not to allow participation in decision makings. They structured the complete work situation for their subordinates.

2.2.2. Democratic/participative leadership style:

In this leadership style the entire groups are involved in and accept responsibilities for goal setting and achievement, subordinate have considerable freedom of action, and the leader shows great concern for people than for high production. In this regard, democratic leader gets result by leading discussions, asking questions to involve others, encourage others to take responsibility, confirming commitments, and asking for a vote to get a consensus or majority decisions.

2.2.3. Laissez-faire leadership style/free-reign” or cut-off leader style:

In this style there is a least intervention of leader, group members perform everything by themselves, and the leader usually maintains contact with outside persons to bring information and materials which the groups/subordinates need. Doran (2003) pointed out that in laissez-fiare leadership style “all authority or power is given to the employees and they must determine, make decision, and resolve problem on their own.

2.3. Characteristics of Effective Leadership

Schools are increasingly under public inspection, supervision at regional level are established for visiting schools to monitor the effectiveness of school management, teachers' performance and students' achievement and principals are becoming more accountable to expectations of school improvement (MoE, 2008). In addition, leadership cannot be separated from the socio political, cultural, historical, or ideological environments in which it exists. Now school leaders are facing the challenge of educating a growing diversity of students; of being responsive to the needs of students and society; and are accountable for effective teaching and learning processes.

Effective school leaders are able to utilize the skills of all in the schools to reach school goals within a minimal time. Riley and Mac Beath (2003) describe effective leaders as follows: "Good school leaders are those who are able to maximize the diverse leadership qualities of others, enabling them to take on leadership within their areas of expertise. School principals are being effective when they are visionary and clear about their mission. Such principals can achieve school success by motivating teachers and creating a collaborative community in schools. If schools lack effective leadership, seldom they can reach their own articulated goals.

Lack of effective leadership is a vital issue in education. Leadership must include positional leaders but it should also stimulate and comprise the leadership activities of others.

Harris' (2004) study examines the essentials of effective leadership in schools facing challenging contexts in terms of achievement rates in public examination and socio economic status. This study explains that to be successful a range of leadership styles is needed; no one style is perfect for all situations Harris found that factors affecting success include the school's vision and values, distributing leadership, investing in staff development, developing and maintaining relationships, and community building. This implies that successful leaders are people centered and those who give importance to human needs rather than to organizational needs according to personal and professional values. They also distribute their leadership to other teachers. They extend the boundaries of participatory leadership and are able to combine a moral purpose with a willingness to promote collaboration amongst colleagues through investing in teacher development. This study suggests that school leadership is a collective endeavor which succeeds by involving all teachers in leadership and tapping their skills.

Under different challenging circumstances, leaders could be successful by building the community of the school through developing relationships and involving others, and providing best opportunities for teaching and learning. Harris believes that success cannot be achieved by the heroic leadership practices of a single principal alone (Salahuddin, 2011).

Effective leadership is developed through collaborative professional learning and aims at purposeful change in schools. All teachers have potential to contribute to leadership for school improvement, but need scope for engaging themselves. The positional leader is designated to develop organizational procedures; build the cultural climate; and provide support for all teachers to be able to contribute their knowledge and skills to leadership that helps to build leadership capacity. This concept of leadership puts school leaders in a position where their leadership roles become more fluid and distributed than any other forms of leadership.

2.4. The Concept of Principals' Leadership

A school system which is made up of departments, teaching and non-teaching staff and the students requires effective educational leaders. The work effectiveness of the school depends on the co-operation between these people and the principal (Ibukun, 2011).

The importance of school principal in leadership responsibilities is becoming very significant particularly in promoting students achievement (John, 2006). Often times, principals seem too busy with all the day-to-day responsibilities of running their schools that they do not seem to have enough time to practice leadership as expected. Adedoyin (2013) states that “the school system is riddled with series of problems which include shortage of funds and materials, incessant strike, poor academic performance, cultism and drug addiction among students, examination malpractices, students and staff indiscipline and so on.” The solutions to these problems cannot be guaranteed where school leaders fail to use the appropriate leadership styles for specific situations in the process of achieving the aims and objectives of the schools. To this end, the need for smooth running of the school system calls for effective leadership.

The principal as the head of the school works together with other members of staff in setting the objectives of the school. He/she, in co-operation with teachers works towards the achievement of objectives. However, the principals' effectiveness as a leader is measured in the school system by how far he/she carries out tangential duties which often reflect personal effectiveness (Ibukun, 2011). Work effectiveness of the school system requires an atmosphere of mutual trust, understanding and cooperation between the school head and the subordinate.

Similarly leadership is an important aspect of an organization. This is due to the fact that the degree of accomplishment of organizational goals by and large lies on the degree of effectiveness of its leadership (Bolden, 2003). Effective leader results in higher performance where as ineffective leadership results in cripple organization. This is the reason that when the leaders are effective, the subordinates are motivated and do up to their best to achieve their organizational objectives.

Hallinger and Heck (1998) argue that educational leadership has a substantial effect on educational organization. It is the heart and soul of an educational institution and crucial for well achievements of an organizational objectives.

2.5. History of the School Principal

Before there was a school principal, the school was in essence, the teacher. Schools consisted of a building with one room, which was solely for classroom space. They were ran by one individual known as the teacher, or master, and answered to their local communities in terms of what was expected of the them (Kafka, 2009). The teacher was the classroom instructor and also the building manager (Rousmaniere, 2007). By the mid-nineteenth century, principals emerged as leaders into U.S. schools (Rousmanier, 2007). The first principals' position was created when students were separated by age and divided by grade, under a single teacher in separate classrooms (Rousmaniere, 2007). The first principal was known as the principal teacher or head teacher. The principal teacher was still a teacher and continued with the duties of a teacher but also had extra managerial and administrative responsibilities (Kafka, 2009). These were simply the middle positions between the district office and the school. The supervising of all classes, administering of discipline, and organizing of the courses of study were under the authority of the head teacher for each grade or department (Rousmaniere, 2007). By the end of the nineteenth century, the principal teacher no longer had teacher responsibilities (Kafka, 2009). The principal teacher was now known as the school principal and was seen as a powerful and important head of the school (Kafka, 2009).

2.6. Changing Role of the Principal

Throughout history, the role of the principal has been in a constant state of change. The early principal's role as Rousmaniere (2007) discusses, varied from different school systems, with some systems assigning the principal minor operational duties and other systems assigning them clerical work such as record keeping duties. In the mid-nineteen hundreds, the role of the principal became more managerial, instructional, and political (Crippen, 2005). Principals were "expected to lead and instruct teachers, to monitor students, to communicate with the district, and to work with parents and members of the community" (Kafka, 2009). The principal's performance and job security were founded on the public's perception of the school's accomplishments based on the highest achieving students in the school (Brown, 2006; Herrington & Wills, 2005).

By the twentieth-century, the position of the principal was viewed much differently. Principals were now considered administrators and holding collegiate degrees in education became a requirement along with licensing (Kafka, 2009).

Education is ever evolving and with this change in the latter part of the twentieth-century, came what we know as accountability. In (2002), No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) brought accountability to the forefront of public education in the United States (Lynch, 2012). Due to NCLB (2002) and IDEA (2002), a principal's job performance became based upon the performance of all students in the school, not just the highest achieving ones (Lynch, 2012).

Consequently, principals are now evaluated on students successes; they are expected to show growth in student achievement and schools are ranked according to the achievement performance indexes and school growth models mandated by NCLB (2002) (Mendel, Watson, and Mac Gregor, 2002). With the new accountability standards, the roles and responsibilities of the principal can be very demanding. The principal not only has the responsibility of managing a school but is also expected to take on the role of a leader (Lynch, 2012).

Today's principal ship has evolved from principal-teacher to manager to now an instructional leader with the accountability of improving the achievement of the students and the school as a whole. Leone, Warnimont, and Zimmerman (2009), suggest that tomorrow's principal must be an active manager of change in the school. Marzano et al. (2005) state that today's principals are leading others to change without knowing the outcomes and constantly thinking of better ways of doing things. Cawelti (1984) clearly states his thoughts of a leader when he comments: "Continuing research on effective schools has verified the common sense observation that schools are rarely effective, in any sense of the word, unless the principal is a "good" leader". According to Gorton et al. (2007), the principal is the most influential person in the school with the most significant role in the school's improvement.

2.7. Functions of School Leaders

The roles and responsibilities of school leaders are changing frequently due to a wave of reforms which cause leaders to face continuous challenges in their jobs. As there are ambiguities about the activities which may actually be considered leadership, it is difficult to sketch the boundaries of leaders' work (Mayrowetz, 2008). Depending on the school situation and personal characteristics, leaders may work alone or collaboratively to reach their goals.

Heroic forms of leadership, where leaders work mainly alone, tend not to use the leadership capabilities and aptitudes of others (Duignan, 2006; Riley & MacBeath, 2003).

As noted many times in this study, principals play an important role as leaders of the school and they influence different functions within the schools with their behaviors, personal characteristics,

and biases. Researchers have attempted to define different characteristics of a successful principal (Hughes, 1999). Though there is a wide range of characteristics listed by these researchers, there are several commonalities. Most importantly, nearly all of these studies list the following characteristics as being important: the principal as a learner, planner, visionary, politician, advocate, organizational developer, manager, leader, and agent of change. Though these characteristics are described in slightly different manners, they all demonstrate that to support the leadership style and work effectiveness, the following elements of management are functions of the leader to make the teacher to be effective in an organization (Adedoyin, 2013; Walter, 2003; Everard, 2004).

1. Planning: among the line of action in an educational administrator can be the Process of preparing a set of decisions for action in the future. Planning is aimed at goal achievement in respect of a particular thing or situation and hence it involves pre-thinking, predication and forecasting the future expectations in administration.

2. Organizing: this is next to the planning. It has to do with the group of people and activities into a defined unit and trying to establish a relationship with them. A formal structure is established and there is a division of labor among the people in order to attain stated goals in the organization. Here, work is scheduled among members of the establishment following the organizational chart, in this respect, it is required of a manager to delegate, establish the appropriate procedure for accomplishing the work, provide requirements in terms of materials, fund, information and other resources to where and when needed.

3. Directing: a leader directs to ensure that workers obey and perform their duties appropriately. However, to direct effectively, adequate motivation and effective communication system in the establishment is required. A leader will direct others successfully by setting the pace i.e. leading by good examples. Coordinating: this is referred to as the ability of a leader to advice a method of unifying the institution for goal achievement. Coordination has to do with the integration of various parts of the work in order to ensure a match between the operating result and the goal to be achieved. Equally, it involves managing the use of personnel and material resources to operate an organization. A good leader will always ensure that things are done in sequence in the organization (school). That is, doing the right thing at the right time, in the right place using the appropriate method for good attainment.

4. Supervision: a leader needs to guide the operational activities of the workers. Educational supervision is a process, which aims at helping the professional growth and cooperation among the teachers so that they can be self-directive, creative and more productive. As a school leader, legitimate effort should be made in assisting the classroom teacher to improve on their own in order

for them to be self-propelling practitioner as well as ensuring favorable setting for effective teaching and learning.

5. Controlling: this refers to the ability of a leader to have the subordinate subjected to him in order to achieve the institutional goals and objectives. Controlling is to ensure that results are as planned. It involves the setting of standard, which provides the basis for comparing the actual output against the intended output in order to make corrective measures.

6. Staffing: this implies the ability of a manager or principal to employ the right people at the right time and have them placed on the right job. The need for personnel in any organization is indispensable. Organizational goals can only be achieved through people and it is the major duty of the principal to service, train, maintain, assign and supervise the personnel requirement in his goal achievement.

7. Reporting (Communication): the principal must realize that he or she must be excellent communicator and develop positive relationships not only with the superintendent but with members of the community, the staff, and the students. Report and acceptance are important to have survival of the new principal. If the principal is going to have any goals achieved, he or she must be able to gain acceptance and articulate the vision to willing followers.

8. Motivation: The key to effective management is the ability to get results from other people, through other people and in conjunction with other people. If the underlying psychology is wrong, the most carefully constructed system and techniques will fail. Efficient head teachers are not necessarily effective. But if relationships and motivation are good, people will readily accept and overcome some administrative or environmental flaws. Motivation is the drive, energy or degree of activities and individuals displays towards goal achievement, there are many means that can be used by the school manager in motivating personnel in the school system for a higher productivity and these factors range from payment of good salaries and wages, good incentives system, work ethics and social value.

Motivating the personnel by the school manager will help in achieving quality control in the school, improve level of co-operation among the staff and enable the school personnel in putting in their best in the work they do.

9. Evaluation: Among the major indispensable functions of an educational manager is the programme evaluation. In any educational institution, there is need for the school administrator to evaluate the performance of his school against the goals and objectives of the society inform of annual report. As the school head, one must be prepared to take the pains of assessing the success and failures in the achievement of the school aims and objectives for necessary improvements.

Furthermore, Everard, (2004) state that inspectors have become more experienced in evaluating the quality of management and leadership in school, using different criteria. For leadership, they look for: Clear vision, sense of purpose, high aspirations and relentless focus on pupil achievements, Strategic planning, Leaders inspiring, motivating and influencing staff and pupils, Creation of effective teams, Knowledgeable and innovative leadership of teaching and curriculum, Commitment to an equitable and inclusive school where each individual matters Similarly, Stronge, (2008) states that today's principals concentrate on building a vision for their schools, sharing leadership with teachers, and influencing schools to operate as learning communities. Accomplishing these essential school improvement efforts requires gathering and assessing data to determine needs, and monitoring instruction and curriculum to determine if the identified needs are addressed. Consequently, principals are expected to promote and develop the school vision, empowering stakeholders to build and maintain the conditions necessary for the success of all students.

2.8. Major Factors that Challenges School Leadership

The major factors demoralizing teachers in secondary schools are lack of incentives, poor conditions of service, low regard for teachers, large class size, poor career promotions, inadequacy of teaching facilities/materials, and irregular payment of teachers' salaries (MoE, 2008).

Similarly, according to Harris (2004) problems that principals face are classified in various ways: problems related to principals and their relationship with top authorities, problems related to Principals and relationship with top to personal characteristics of principals, problems related to time, and problem related to parents For the sake of convenience, in this study, the problems that would be dealt with are as follow.

1. Problems related to instructional staff

Aboneh (cited Lunenburg and Ornsetin, (2004) have stated the following points in this regard. Teachers consider their principals ill-qualified to manage an effective school and that they concentrate on routine activities only and do not enhance innovations in their schools, research results have suggested the teachers did not view for example, curriculum instructional leadership as a major responsibility of principals did not see much evidence of such leadership on the part of principals and were not to accept principals in his leadership capacity.

2. Lack of vision

McEwan (2003) has maintained that another biggest impediment of effective instructional leadership is lack of vision, will and encourage on the part of instructional leaders. Successful instructional leader requires having the kinds of courage that allows one to take risks to thrive on

complexity and ambiguity, to enable other to empower themselves to be willing to work long and hard duties.

3. Lack of support from top authorities

Another problem affecting effective instructional leadership is lack of support from top authorities. The principals operations are influenced by that authority above him/her. The frustration and discouragement of some principals regarding the perceived lack of support, form those round hem is clearly barrier to becoming an effective instructional leader (McEwan, 2003). In strengthening this idea, Boyd (2002) has pointed out that where there is lack of support, either perceived actual from other designated leaders, the added frustration of working in a complex environment coupled with natural or anticipated challenges, become overwhelming.

4. Lack of sufficient time

Lack of sufficient time is also another problem to instructional leadership. Time is the bane of any busy professional, but for instructional leader, it poses a particular challenge because they seek to spend substantial time in classroom where instruction is delivered.

Every principal operates with in the same time constrains. One major difference among principals is how they choose to use the time they do available (McEwan, 2003, P.13).

Rosser, Vicki J. (cited Roaden, 1970) further stated that in order to enhance the schools performance, principals should focus on major missions of the school, teaching and learning, research and community service, Unless the principals free themselves from the routine chores of the office, however, and reserve some free tie for study and reflection on the purposes and the program of the academic body over which they prided, their decisions must inevitably be super filial, un informed, and often inconsistent.

5. Personal characteristics of the principals

Another impediment of instructional leadership is the personal characteristics of the principals which affects their decision making processes and their style of instructional leadership. It is evident that the principal brings something to his/her principal ship position.

His /her energy, devotion, loyalty and many other personal attributes such as originality, adaptability, and emotional stability, are significant factors, in the kind of instructional leadership to be found in the school.

6. Lack of skilled teachers

The principals revealed the lack of skilled teachers, indicating a need for ongoing professional learning for teachers. Improvement also depends on creating opportunities for teachers to co-operate and collaborate with their colleagues (Camburn, Rowan & Taylor, 2003).

7. Decision-making

Decision-making is an important component in any organization. In particular, we argue that schools are distinctive organizational settings in that the administrator is often required to address daily operations as well as long term adaptive planning and vision. They must, as a regular characteristic of the position, be equally able to manage and lead. Furthermore, the challenges of school leadership include daily, regular decision making as well as incorporating long-term planning and situational adjustments as need arises. Simply put, schools require both excellent managers who address the regular operations of schools and high-quality leaders to face the challenges that exist today for educators (Kruse, B. L., 2009).

In addition, Biech.,(2010) identified using survey five leadership challenging models, Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act and Encourage the Heart are the challenges of every institutions.

In conclusion, the chapter reviewed literature on the leadership practices of secondary school principals discussed the theoretical framework that guided the study. Leadership is defined as “process of encouraging and helping others to work enthusiastically towards objectives” (Davis, 1967). On the other hand McGregor (1966) defines leadership as a property of individuals, but a complex relationship among those variables. Effective leadership is developed through collaborative professional learning and aims at purposeful change in schools. All teachers have potential to contribute to leadership for school improvement, but need scope for engaging themselves.

The importance of school principal in leadership responsibilities is becoming very significant particularly in promoting students achievement (John, 2006). Often times, principals seem too busy with all the day-to-day responsibilities of running their schools that they do not seem to have enough time to practice leadership as expected.

By the end of the nineteenth century, the principal teacher no longer had teacher responsibilities (Kafka, 2009). The principal teacher was now known as the school principal and was seen as a powerful and important head of the school (Kafka, 2009).

The following elements of management are functions of the leader to make the teacher to be effective in an organization (Adedoyin, 2013; Walter, 2003; Everard, 2004). These are planning, organizing, directing, supervision, controlling, staffing, reporting (communication), motivation and evaluation.

The major factors that challenges school leadership are: Problems related to instructional staff, Lack of vision, Lack of support from top authorities, Lack of sufficient time, Personal characteristics of the principals, Lack of skilled teachers and Decision-making.

From the reviewed related literature, the school principals lack the deep knowledge and skill about school leadership, poor using of leadership styles as appropriate time and condition in a balanced way, they were not as such effective at their work, delegation practices of tasks minimum, cooperation with teaching and non-teaching staff and students was not strong as expected, lack the system to motivate, supervise, communicate and properly evaluate teaching and non-teaching staff.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to analyze the practices and problems of school leadership: The case of some selected secondary schools in Addis Ababa City Administration. In this chapter the research design, sources of data, population and sample of the study, instrumentation of data collection and procedures and data analysis is discussed as follows.

3.1. The Research Design

The research design that the researcher is used a descriptive survey. It is used to describe the way how secondary school leaders practice their roles facing challenges in the schools. Descriptive research is a type of quantitative research that involves making careful descriptions of educational phenomena, concerned primarily with determining „“ what is „“ (Gall and Borg: 2003).

3.1.1. Sources of Data

The researcher is used both primary and secondary data as a source. The primary data was gathered through interview and questionnaire while the secondary sources were from written documents as to have some background information about the issues. Documents like magazines, books, journals, research papers, published and unpublished materials and annual abstracts are examined.

3.1.2. Population and Sample of the Study

According to Gay (1981), to take the acceptance sample size for descriptive research sample of 10% of the population is considered minimum and for a small population 20% may be required.

The study is included five schools taken as targets of the study. The schools are located in five different sub cities and schools are selected using random sampling method in order to give equal chances. And also principals, vice principals, department heads and supervisors are taken totally in order to the researcher obtain more reliable information related to the title of the study while teachers are selected using simple random sampling method.

The schools included in the study were: Africa Hibret (Lideta Sub-City), Temenja yazie (Kirkos Sub-City), Fana No. 2 (Nifas Silik-Lafito Sub-City), Dej.Belay Zeleke No.1 (Arada Sub-City) and Tesfa Birhan (Yeka Sub-City).

Regarding respondents, 108 (50%) out of 215 teachers are selected using random sampling method to get reliable data. However, 14 vice principals, 5 principals, 18 supervisors and 55 department heads are taken as a whole. This is because it gave the researcher a chance to get more relevant and resourceful individuals (Bogden and Biklen, 2007).

Table1. Population and Sample Size of Respondents

Sample Secondary School	Principals			Vice Principals			Department Heads			Teachers			Supervisors		
	P	S	%	P	S	%	P	S	%	P	S	%	P	S	%
Africa Hibret	1	1	100	2	2	100	11	11	100	45	23	50	3	3	100
Temenja Yazie	1	1	100	3	3	100	11	11	100	46	23	50	3	3	100
Tesfa Birhan	1	1	100	3	3	100	11	11	100	54	27	50	3	3	100
Deja.Belay Zelege No.1	1	1	100	3	3	100	11	11	100	31	15	50	3	3	100
Fana No.2	1	1	100	3	3	100	11	11	100	39	20	50	6	6	100
Total	5	5	100	14	14	100	55	55	100	215	108	50	18	18	100

Key:- P=population, S=sample size

3.2. Instrumentations of Data Collection

Information is obtained through various ways Close ended questionnaire will set by the investigator and responded by teachers to gather quantitative data for the study (Appendix A). The Questionnaire is comprised of items using a 5–point–likert scale. There is an interview with principals and vice principals to gather qualitative data for the study (Appendix B).

3.2.1. Questionnaire

Questionnaire was used to gather data for descriptive both open and close ended items is used in this study. The researcher used questionnaire to address the large number of respondents in an efficient way. It helps respondent express their ideas freely and easily with less time. In order to gather the appropriate information about current status of the practices and problems of principals' leadership in selected secondary schools of Addis Ababa. Close ended questionnaires were also developed in five (5) point Likert's scale items for respondents. It helps to elicit their feeling about the practices and major problems related with principals' leadership. The close-ended questionnaire were constructed in five point likert scale to cover the whole range of possible response allowing

respondents to choose the answer that fit their opinions. Open ended questionnaires were employed to give opportunity to express their feelings, perception, problems and intensions related to principals' leadership. Thus, open ended question was used to elicit general information so as to supplement information obtained from close ended questions.

3.2.2. Interview

The interview permits in-depth of response which is not possible through any other means. Thus, the purpose of the interviews to collect more information about the respondents point of view, so to cross check the questionnaire responses semi-structured interview was conducted to elicit an in-depth response about the issue of the study. Semi-structured interview items are selected because of the advantages of flexibility in which new questions can forwarded during the interview based on the responses of the interviewee. In this case five (5) principals and five (5) vice principals were involved in the interview.

3.3. Instrument Reliability and validity

Checking the reliability of the questionnaire using a pilot test was carried out. Reliability indicates the accuracy or precision of the measuring instrument (Norland, 1990). The pilot test seeks to answer the questions, does the questionnaire consistently measured. The question was pilot tested. They were distributed, first to 5 teachers, 2 vice principals and 3 department heads. In pre-testing questionnaire, the main concern was to detect problems which might cause confusion to the respondents, which is to identify ambiguous items in the questionnaire suitability for collecting the required data. It was also needed to improve the format of the questionnaire to be cleared. The pilot survey was used to determine whether the words in each question were properly understood. Depending on the feedback obtained two questions were repeated and not relevant to the study were omitted. After correction has been made to the questionnaire, it was distributed to all respondents. After three days the respondents returned the questionnaire and depending on their response, analysis was made.

The use of reliability types of internal consistency depends on the nature of data test re-test. Reliability was established using a pilot test by collecting data from the sample. Data collected from the pilot test was analyzed using the alpha coefficient formula.

Therefore, the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was obtained to check for internal consistency for all items was 0.735 which was considered reliable. The Cronbach's alpha based on the standardized item was 0.735. Hence, questionnaire items were considered to be consistent.

3.4. Procedures of Data Collection

The questionnaire is distributed to the respondents and given adequate time for the participants to answer the survey and returned within the time frame. To ensure data integrity, the data is collected through questionnaire and analyzed an interview. Informants were selected by convenience sampling for the interview portion of the study. The respondents are conducted face to face and are asked to participate in the study. Interviews is conducted in person at their respective working places. The interviewees are given sufficient time to preview the questions and consent information prior to the interviews. A professional, but relaxed atmosphere is maintained in the interviews. After that, the gathered and collected data is analyzed, presented and interpreted quantitatively as well as qualitatively. Finally the study is summarized and concluded; the suggested recommendations are also forwarded.

3.5. Ethical Considerations

I started gathering data in accordance with the informed consent and interest of the respondents. On top of this, I also assured to the respondents that the information gathered would never be used for other purpose rather than the consumption for only this study. To keep confidentiality of the information and security of the respondents that data were collected without asking their names. Additionally, since researchers have the responsibility to their profession as well as to subjects in the process of conducting research, so as to form smooth accomplishment of the research objective. I started by explaining the purpose of the research to subjects. Practicing the above ethical elements were not only helped me to elicit tangible and adequate data from the subjects but also helped to establish “friendship which is ongoing and over lasting” (Bogdan, and Biklen, 2007,p.49).

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

In this part of the study, data collected from different sources were presented analyzed and interpreted. Respondents characteristic and issues related to the practices and problems of school leadership: The case of some selected secondary schools in Addis Ababa City Administration. Out of 200 of the whole samples, all of them filled out, returned and included in this section for analysis. The responses of principals' and vice principals interview were discussed, analyzed and presented in order to compare the responses reliability.

4.1. Characteristics of respondents

The study discussed about respondents sex, age, educational level, and year of service in teaching.

Table -2 characteristics of respondents

No	Characteristics		Principals		Vice principals		Department heads		Teachers		Supervisors		Total	
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1.	Sex	Male	5	100	12	85.7	45	81.8	79	73.1	15	83.3	156	78
		Female	-	-	2	14.3	10	18.2	29	26.9	3	16.7	44	22
		Total	5	100	14	100	55	100	108	100	18	100	200	100
2.	Age	25 and below	-	-	-	-	11	20	12	11.1	-	-	23	11.5
		26-35	-	-	5	35.7	29	52.7	76	70.4	3	16.7	113	56.5
		36-45	4	80	8	57.1	12	21.8	9	8.3	11	61.1	44	22
		46-55	1	20	1	7.2	3	5.5	11	10.2	4	22.2	20	10
		Above 55	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Total	5	100	14	100	55	100	108	100	18	100	200	100
3.	Educational level	Diploma	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		1 st degree	5	100	1.4	100	55	100	108	100	9	50	191	95.5
		2 nd degree	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	50	9	50
		Total	5	100	14	100	55	100	108	100	18	10.0	9	50
4.	Total Years of Service As teacher	5 and below	-	-	-	-	11	20	24	22.2	-	-	35	17.5
		6-10	-	-	6	42.9	24	43.6	47	43.5	3	16.7	80	40
		11-15	2	40	2	14.2	13	23.7	13	12.1	7	38.9	37	18.5
		16-20	1	20	6	42.9	2	3.6	9	8.3	5	27.8	23	11.5
		Above 20	2	40	-	-	5	9.1	15	13.9	3	16.6	25	12.5
		Total	5	100	14	100	55	100	108	100	18	100	200	100

As shown in the above table 2, of the total respondents the majority 156(78%) were males while 44 (22%) were females. This implies that the greater majority of secondary school teachers, department heads, vice principals, sub-city supervisors and all principals were males. This in turn shows that the participation of females in school and educational leadership was still limited.

Regarding the age of respondents, the majority 113(56.5%) of the respondents belongs to the age group of 26-35, 44(22%) from 36-45, 23(11.5%) 25 and below, and 20(10%) from 46-55 and none of respondents were found in the age group of above 55. This indicates that principals, vice principals, department heads, teachers and sub city supervisors were mature enough to give relevant data for the purpose of the study.

Concerning the educational level of the respondents, all of principals, vice principals, Department heads and teachers were first degree holders. From sub city supervisors 9 (50%) were first degree holders and 9(50%) were second degree holders. This shows that all principals, Vice principals and 50% sub-city supervisors were working under qualification because the criteria indicated in the blue print of teachers development program (MoE, 2007, P.P -30-). In this program document it is stipulated that academic qualification required for the secondary school principal ship and supervisors are a master's degree. So, the qualifications of all principals, vice principals and 50% sub-city Supervisors have a negative impact on school improvement and quality assurance programs.

As shown in the above table 2, 80(40%) of the respondents had 6-10 years of teaching experience, the rest 37 (18.5) , 35(17.5) , 25(12,5) and 23 (11.5) of them . 11-15, 5 and below, above 20, and 16-20 years of experience in teaching respectively . This indicates that most of the respondents have 5 and above years of experience about their profession day to day activities of the teaching learning process.

Table 3. Setting goals and vision

No .	Items	Respondents	No	Alw ays (5)	%	Mostl y (4)	%	Rarely (3)	%	Not at all (2)	%	I don't know (1)	%
1	Inspiring a shared vision	Vice principal	9	3	33.3	6	66.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	12	21.9	29	52.8	12	21.5	2	3.4	-	-
		Teachers	108	27	25	60	55.6	12	11.1	9	8.3	-	-
		Supervisors	18	3	16.7	10	55.6	5	27.7	-	-	-	-
2	Articulating clearly the strategic goals of the school	Vice principal	9	3	33.3	5	55.6	1	11.1	-	-	-	-
		Department Heads	55	18	32.7	24	43.7	6	10.9	7	12.7	-	-
		Teachers	108	42	38.9	39	36.1	18	16.7	9	8.3	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	11	61.1	-	-	7	38.9	-	-
3	Aligning school Goals with then atonal Educational statement	Vice principal	9	3	33.3	6	66.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	16	29.9	28	50.1	9	16.4	2	3.6	-	-
		Teachers	108	30	27.8	42	38.9	36	33.3	-	-	-	-
		Supervisors	18	6	33.3	9	50	3	16.7	-	-	-	-
4	Demonstrating vision and long range planning	Vice principal	9	-	-	6	66.7	3	33.3	-	-	-	-
		Department Heads	55	6	10.9	27	49.1	18	32.7	4	7.3	-	-
		Teachers	108	36	33.3	51	47.2	21	19.4	-	-	-	-
		Supervisors	18	5	27.8	12	66.7	-	-	1	5.6	-	-
5	Creating Consensus with Stake holder And staff about the school's goals	Vice principal	9	-	-	6	66.7	3	33.3	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	8	14.6	18	32.7	28	50.9	1	1.8	-	-
		Teachers	108	37	34.3	45	41.2	21	19.4	5	4.6	-	-
		Supervisors	18	6	33.3	7	38.9	5	27.8	-	-	-	-
6	Collectively establish School goals and revise goals annually with all stake holder	Vice principals	9	1	11.1	6	66.7	2	22.2	-	-	-	-
		Department Heads	55	17	30.9	23	41.8	12	21.8	3	5.5	-	-
		Teachers	108	24	22.2	62	57.5	21	19.4	1	0.9	-	-
		Supervisors	18	3	16.7	7	39.9	8	44.4	-	-	-	-
7	Encouraging new and creativity	Vice Principals	9	1	11.1	6	66.7	2	22.2	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	11	20	4	7.3	19	34.5	21	38.2	-	-
		Teachers	108	13	12.1	31	28.7	54	50	10	9.2	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	9	50	9	50	-	-	-	-
8	Creating conducive environment in the school	Vice Principals	9	1	11.1	8	88.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	19	34.5	24	43.6	9	16.4	3	5.5	-	-
		Teachers	108	21	19.4	58	53.8	28	25.9	1	0.9	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	6	33.3	9	50	3	16.7	-	-
9	Making the school To use school Improvement plan as abases for progress	Vice Principals	9	3	33.3	6	66.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Department Heads	55	12	21.8	29	52.7	13	23.7	1	1.8	-	-
		Teachers	108	24	22.2	66	61.1	16	14.8	2	1.9	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	6	33.3	12	66.7	-	-	-	-
10	Manage change constructively	Vice principals	9	3	33.3	6	66.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Department Heads	55	9	16.4	32	58.1	8	14.6	6	10.9	-	-
		Teachers	108	21	19.4	63	58.4	21	19.4	3	2.8	-	-
		Supervise	18	-	-	12	66.7	6	33.3	-	-	-	-

Goals and vision always shows the destiny of an organization. In any organization they are too crucial in showing the direction towards future success. Hence data were collected and analyzed based the items indicated in the table 3 above.

The data in table 3 item 1, reveal that 6(66.7%) vice principals, 29 (52.8%) of department heads and supervisors said mostly practiced. While 2 (3.4%) department heads and 9(8.3%) teachers said not at all practiced. Articulating clearly the strategic goals of the school in table 3 item 2, 5(55.6%) vice principals, 24(43.7%) department heads, 39(36.1%), and 11(61.1%) responded mostly implemented. Aligning school goal with the national educational statement in table 3 item 3, 6 (66.7%) vice principals, 28 (50.1%) department heads, 42(38.9%) of teachers and 9(50%) supervisors said mostly practice. In other side 9(16.4%) department heads and 3 (16.7%) supervisors said rarely implemented.

From the above table 3 item 4, 6(66.7%) vice principal, 27(49.1%) department heads, 51(47.2%) and 12(66.7%) supervisors responded mostly implemented. In other side 3 (33.3%) vice principals, 18(32.7%), department heads and 21 (19.4%) teachers said rarely practiced. This indicate that inspired a shared vision, developing long range planning, articulating the strategic goals of the school and aligning school goals with the national educational statement respectively were mostly practiced in the schools.

From the total of 195 vice principals, department heads, teachers and supervisors in table 3 items 5, 124(63.6%) respondents said mostly implement creating consensus with staff and stake holders. On the other side 8, (14.6%) department heads, 37, (34.3%) teachers always are participating and creating consensus with stakeholders about the school goals this shows the school leaders were found to be effective creating consensus about school goals.

The above table item 6 show that 6, (66.7%) vice principals, 23(41.8%) department heads, 62(57.5%) teachers and 10, (55.6%) of supervisors respond collectively establish school goals and revise annually with stakeholders practiced. In the other side 3, (5.5%), department heads and 1, (0.9%) teacher said not at all implemented. This implies most of the schools establish school goals collectively and revise annually with the participation of stakeholders.

From the above table item 7, 8(88.9%) of vice principals, 40(72.7%) department heads, 54(50%) of teachers and 9(50%) of supervisors respond encourage new ideas and creativity in the school rarely implemented. Then 21(38.2%) department heads and 23(21.3%) teachers replied not at all practiced. This implies that encourage new ideas and creativity were done rarely.

The data in table 3 item 8, reveal that 8(88.9%) vice principals, 28(50.9%) department heads, 58(53.8%), teachers and 9(50%) supervisors said mostly implemented creating conducive environment in the school. In the other side 1 (11.1), vice principal 19(34.5%) department heads

and 24(22.2%) teachers respond always creating conducive environment in the school. From the above data indicated that was not always but mostly creating conducive environment in the school.

The above table 3 item 9 show that 6(66.7%) vice principals, 29(52.7%), department heads, 66(61.1%), teachers and 12(66.7%) supervisors were replied mostly making the school to use school improvement plan as the basis for progress. In the other side 1(1.8%) department heads and 2 (1.9%) teachers said schools rarely making the school to use SIP as basis for progress. This shows that the majority of vice principals, department heads, teachers and supervisors confirmed making the school to use SIP as a bases for Progress done at a high level.

As we can see the above tables 3, item 10, 6(66.7%), vice principals, 32(58.1%) department heads, 63(58.4%) teachers and 12(66.7%) supervisors were replied mostly practice manage changes constructively. While 8(14.6%) department heads 21 (1.9.4%) teachers were replied rarely practices teachers were replied rarely practiced. However, small minorities of them were replied rarely practice and this condition was need attention to correct the difference.

Table 4. Relationship with the School Community

No.	Items	Respondents	No	Alw ays (5)	%	Mostly (4)	%	Rarel y (3)	%	Not at all (2)	%	I don't know (1)	%
1.	Trust in others	Vice principals	9	2	22.2	6	66.7	1	11.1	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	18	32.7	31	56.4	6	10.9	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	12	11.1	63	58.3	33	30.6	-	-	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	11	61.1	7	38.9	-	-	-	-
2.	Accepted by others	Vice principal	9	-	-	6	66.7	3	33.3	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	12	21.8	25	45.1	18	32.7	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	25	23.1	54	50	29	26.9	-	-	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	9	50	9	50	-	-	-	-
3.	Good in human relation skill	Vice principal	9	1	11.1	6	66.7	2	22.2	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	5	9.1	32	58.2	18	32.7	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	14	12.7	39	36.1	55	51.2	-	-	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	9	50	9	50	-	-	-	-
4.	Understanding of the needs and concerns of the staff	Vice principal	9	-	-	6	66.7	3	33.3	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	15	27.3	32	58.2	8	14.5	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	26	24.1	65	60.2	17	15.7	-	-	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	9	50	9	50	-	-	-	-
5.	Understanding of the needs and concerns of the students	Vice principal	9	-	-	9	100	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	15	27.3	30	54.5	10	18.2	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	30	27.8	55	50.9	23	21.3	-	-	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	12	66.7	6	33.3	-	-	-	-
6	Treat individuals fairly and with respect	Vice principal	9	-	-	6	66.7	3	33.3	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	11	20	23	41.8	21	38.2	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	27	25	56	51.9	25	23.1	-	-	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	12	66.7	6	33.3	-	-	-	-
7	Maintain positive and productive relationship with all the school community	Vice principal	9	-	-	6	66.7	3	3.33	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	10	18.2	28	50.9	17	30.9	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	30	27.8	58	53.7	18	16.7	2	1.8	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	9	50	9	50	-	-	-	-
8	Listen to and communicate with all academic and administrative staff	Vice principal	9	1	11.1	5	55.6	3	33.3	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	9	16.4	33	60	13	23.6	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	27	25	57	52.8	22	20.4	2	1.8	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	10	55.6	8	44.4	-	-	-	-
9	Communicate priorities to upper level administration	Vice principal	9	3	33.3	6	66.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	17	30.9	23	41.8	15	27.3	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	31	28.7	57	52.8	19	17.6	-	-	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	11	61.1	7	38.9	-	-	-	-
10	Insure that fair administration	Vice principal	9	3	33.3	6	66.7	-	-	-	-	-	-

	procedures are followed in the school equally	Department heads	55	16	29.1	31	56.4	6	10.9	2	3.6	-	-
		Teachers	108	23	21.2	56	51.9	29	26.9	-	-	-	-
		Supervisors	18			12	66.7	6	33.3	-	-	-	-
		Vice principal	9			8	88.9	1	11.1	-	-	-	-
11	Trust and delegate tasks to others subordinate	Department heads	55	4	7.2	33	60	16	29.1	2	3.6	-	-
		Teachers	108	12	11.1	59	54.6	37	34.3	-	-	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	12	66.7	6	33.3	-	-	-	-
		Vice principal	9	-	-	9	100	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	Communicating with parents to obtain resources	Department heads	55	-	-	41	74.6	14	25.4	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	-	-	87	80.6	17	15.7	4	3.7	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	9	50	9	50	-	-	-	-
		Vice principal	9	-	-	3	33.3	6	66.7	-	-	-	-
13	Participating parents in decision making	Department heads	55	-	-	16	29.1	37	67.3	2	3.6	-	-
		Teachers	108	-	-	28	28.9	74	68.5	6	5.6	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	6	33.3	12	66.7	-	-	-	-
		Vice principal	9	-	-	3	33.3	6	66.7	-	-	-	-
14	Develop a system to participate parents in day to day activities	Department heads	55	-	-	14	25.5	34	61.8	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	-	-	33	30.6	62	57.4	4	3.7	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	-	-	18	100	-	-	-	-
		Vice principal	9	-	-	3	33.3	6	66.7	-	-	-	-

Under different challenging circumstances, leaders could be successful by building relationships within the community of the school and providing best opportunities for teaching and learning. This is because success in the school cannot be achieved by the heroic leader ship practices of a single principal alone (salaiddin, 2011:14)

The data in table 4 item 1 reveal that 6(66.7%), vice principals, 31(56.4%), department heads, 63 (58.3%), teachers and 11(61.1%) and supervisors replied mostly the behavior of trust in others. In other side 6(10.9%) department heads, 33(30.6%) teachers and 7(38.9%) supervisors responded rarely the behavior of trust in others.

From the above table 4 item 2, 6(66.7) vice principals, 25(45.1) department heads, 54(50%) teachers and 9(50%) supervisors responded mostly principals accepted by others. In other way 3 (33.3%) supervisors replied principals rarely accepted by others.

As table 4 item 3 shows, 6(66.7%) vice principals, 32(58.2%) department heads, 39(36.1%) teachers and 9(50%) supervisors respond principals have mostly good in human relation skill. In other side 55(51.2%) teachers 18(32.7%) department heads and 9(50%) supervisors replied rarely well in human relation skill.

From the above table 4 item 1 and 2 indicated their responses with agreement that principals in the selected secondary schools were mostly demonstrating the behavior of trust in others an acceptable behavior by others.

In other way considerable number of respondents replied rarely so, this forced to check the acceptance of principals by others. Item 3 shows their responses of vice principal, department heads and supervisors demonstrate principals have mostly good in human relation skill on the other hand

teachers (51.2%) showed disagreement on Good human relation skill in the school or principals reflect rarely good in human relation skill therefore this condition was need to attention.

As table 4 item 4, 6(66.7%) vice principals, 32(58.2%) department heads, 65(60.2%) teachers and 9(50%) supervisors replied mostly principals understanding of the needs and concerns of the staff. In other ways 3(33.3%) vice principals, 8(14.15) department heads, 17(15.7) teachers and 9(50%) supervisors said rarely.

The data in table 4 item 5 9(100%) vice principals, 30(54.5%) department heads, 55(50.9%) teachers and 12(66.7%) supervisors mostly principals understanding of the needs and concerns of students. In other side 10(18.2%) department heads, 23(21.3%) teachers and 6(33.3%) supervisors replied rarely.

From the above table 4 item 4 and 5 shows the majority of respondents confirm principals understanding of the need and concern of the staff and students. But un-ignorable percentage of respondents had replied rarely therefore this condition was need improvement.

The data in table 4 item 6 reveal that 6(66.7%) vice principals, 23(41.8%) department heads, 56(51.9%) teachers and 12(66.7%) supervisors said mostly treat individuals fairly and with respect on the side 3(33.3%) vice principals, 21(38.2%) department heads, 25(23.1%) teachers and 6(33.3%) supervisors replied rarely.

As we can see the above table 4 item 7 6(66.7%) vice principals, 28(50.9%) department heads, 58(53.7%) teachers and 9(50%) supervisors said mostly practice. In other way 3(33.3%) vice principals, 71(30.9) department heads, 18(16.7%) teachers and 9(50%) supervisors said rarely.

From the above table 4 item 6 and 7 indicates that the majorities of respondents demonstrate mostly practiced treat individuals fairly and with respect maintain positive relationship with school community. But some department heads, teachers and supervisors responded rarely practice. So this needed much attention for the future.

The data in table 4 item 8, 5(55.6%) vice principals, 33(60%) department heads, 57(52.8%) teachers and 10(55.6%) supervisors respond mostly practice while, 3(33.3%) vice principals, 13 (23.6%) department heads 22 (20.4%), teachers and 8 (44.4%) supervisors replied rarely implement and 2(1.8%) teachers said not at all practiced.

As we can see the above table item 9, 6 (66.7%) vice principals, 23(41.8%) department heads, 57 (52.8%) teachers and 11 (61.1%) supervisors said mostly practice. In other ways 15(27.3%) department heads, 19 (17.6%) teachers and 7 (38.9%) supervisors replied rarely implemented.

From the above table 4 item 8 and 9 the majority of respondents agreed on principals listen to and communicate all staff and also communicate priorities to the upper level administration mostly practiced. But significance percentages of respondents replied rarely implemented so, there were need additional work to fill the gap.

Based on the above table 4 item 10, 6 (66.7%) vice principals, 31 (56.4%) department heads, 56 (51.9%) teachers and 12 (66.7%) supervisors said mostly practiced in other ways 6 (10.9%) department heads, 29 (26.9%) teachers and 6 (33.3%) supervisors said rarely implemented. This indicates that most of the respondents were demonstrate mostly practice insure that fair administration procedures are followed in the school equally. But significance percentage of respondents especially teachers (26.9%) and supervisors (33%) said rarely practice, so this condition need too much attention and follow up.

As we can see the above table 4 item 11, 8 (88.9%) vice principals, 33 (60%) department heads, 59 (54.6%) teachers and 12 (66.7%) supervisors said mostly practice. In other way 16 (29.1%) department heads, 37 (34.3%) teachers and 6 (33.3%) supervisors replied rarely implemented. In general we are expected to give attention that to improve the trust and delegation tasks to others.

From the above table 4 item 12, 9 (100%) of vice principals, 41 (74.6%) department heads, 87 (80.6%) teachers and 9 (50%) supervisors mostly practice while 14 (25.4%) department heads, 17 (15.7%) teachers and 9 (50%) supervisors said rarely implemented.

The data in table 4 item 13, 6 (66.7%) vice principals, 37 (67.3%) department heads, 74 (68.5%) teachers and 12 (66.7%) supervisors said rarely participating parents in decision making. In other way 3 (33.3%) vice principals, 16 (29.1%) department heads, 28 (25.9%) teachers replied mostly participated while 2 (3.6%) department heads and 6 (5.6%) teachers said not at all participating parents in decision making.

As we can see the above table 4 item 14, 6 (66.7%) vice principals, 34 (61.8%) department heads, 62 (57.4%) teachers and 18 (100%) supervisors replied rarely. In other way 3 (3.33%) vice principals, 14 (25.5%) department heads and 33 (30.6%) teachers said mostly practiced.

From the above table 4 item 12 the majority of respondents confirmed mostly communicating with parents to obtain in resource had been practiced under the leadership of principals in the selected secondary school.

In item 13 and 14 most of the respondents said participating parents in decision making and develop a system to participate parents in day to day activities rarely practiced. Therefore, it needs more attention in order to bring remarkable change.

Table 5. Leading Professional Development

No	Items	Respondents	No	Always (5)	%	Mostly (4)	%	Rarely (3)	%	Not at all (2)	%	I don't know (1)	%
1	Encourage action research in the school	Vice principals	9	1	11.1	6	66.7	2	22.7	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	8	14.5	19	34.5	26	47.3	2	3.7	-	-
		Teachers	108	18	16.7	33	30.6	51	47.2	6	5.5	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	9	50	9	50	-	-	-	-
2.	Encouraging be use different instructional strategies and skills	Vice principals	9	-	-	6	66.7	3	33.3	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	13	23.6	31	56.9	9	16.4	2	3.7	-	-
		Teachers	108	18	16.7	54	50	36	33.3	-	-	-	-
		Supervisors	18	3	16.7	11	61.1	4	22.2	-	-	-	-
3.	Encourage to practice curriculum and program development	Vice principals	9	-	-	6	66.7	3	33.3	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	-	-	42	76.4	13	26.4	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	-	-	54	50	51	47.2	3	2.8	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	12	66.7	6	33.3	-	-	-	-
4.	Arrange skill development programs for teachers	Vice principals	9	-	-	5	55.6	4	44.6	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	-	-	33	60	21	38.1	1	1.9	-	-
		Teachers	108	-	-	57	52.8	44	4.7	7	6.5	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	12	66.7	6	33.3	-	-	-	-
5.	Focus on staff training opportunities to improve the quality of teaching and learning	Vice principals	9	-	-	6	66.7	3	33.1	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	-	-	30	54.5	3	33.3	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	-	-	66	61.1	39	36.1	3	2.8	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	15	33.3	3	16.7	-	-	-	-
6	Organize experience sharing programs among colleges	Vice principals	9	1	11.1	5	55.6	3	33.3	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	10	18.2	29	52.7	16	29.1	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	18	16.7	61	56.5	29	26.8	-	-	-	-
		Supervisors	18	3	16.7	12	66.7	13	16.6	-	-	-	-
7	Plan and executive in service programs for staff (CPD)	Vice principals	9	1	11.1	6	66.7	2	22.2	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	6	10.9	28	50.9	20	36.4	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	33	30.6	54	50	21	19.4	-	-	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	13	72.2	5	27.6	-	-	-	-
8	Provide administrative support to in built supervision	Vice principal	9	3	33.3	6	66.7			-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	12	21.8	36	65.5	7	12.7	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	29	26.7	69	63.9	10	12.4	-	-	-	-
		Supervisors	18	6	33.3	9	50	3	16.7	-	-	-	-
9	Solving programs collaboratively	Vice principals	9	2	22.5	5	55.6	2	22.2	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	12	21.8	28	50.9	15	27.3	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	24	22.2	56	51.9	26	24.1	2	1.9	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	9	50	9	50	-	-	-	-
10	Provide constructive comments to teachers through evaluation	Vice principal	9	1	11.1	6	66.7	2	22.2	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	11	20	29	52.7	13	23.6	2	3.7	-	-
		Teachers	108	21	19.4	63	58.4	24	22.2	-	-	-	-
		Supervisors	18	5	27.8	12	66.7	3	35.3	-	-	-	-
11	Reward teachers for innovative works	Vice principal	9	-	-	6	66.7	3	33.3	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	-	-	38	69.1	17	30.9	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	-	-	81	75	27	25	-	-	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	10	55.6	8	44.4	-	-	-	-

Teachers professional development is the result of learning opportunities organized for teachers in the school system. The best way to help staff members change and update their practices, learn new skill, approaches and functions more productively to plan and implement professional development programs data were gathered on this issues as indicated below.

Item 1, shows that 6 (66.7%) of vice principals, 9 (50%) supervisors said mostly practiced. In other way 26 (47.3%) department heads, 51 (47.2%) teachers and 9 (50%) of supervisors responded rarely practice. This indicates un-ignorable percentages of respondents said rarely implementation therefore, it needs additional attention.

As we can see item 2, 6 (66.7%) vice principals, 31 (56.3%) department heads, 54 (50%), teachers and 11 (61.1%) supervisors replied mostly implemented. In other way 3 (33.3%) vice principals, 9 (16.4%) department heads, 36 (33.3%) teachers and 4 (22.2%) supervisors said rarely practice.

Item 3, shows 6 (66.7%) of vice principals 42 (76.4%) department heads 54 (50%) of teachers and 12 (66.7%) supervisors responded mostly implemented. On the other side 3 (33.3%) vice principals, 13 (26.4%), department heads, 51 (47.2%) teachers and 6 (33.3%) supervisors said rarely.

From the above table 5 item 2 and 3 shows that the majority of the respondents confirmed mostly practiced in the school. But we can see a gap because of sensible percentages of respondents especially teachers and department heads replied encouraging to use different strategies, skills also practiced curriculum and program development rarely practiced and this condition need improvement.

From the above table 5 item 4, 5 (55.6%) vice principals, 33 (60%) department heads, 57 (52.8%) teachers and 12 (66.7%) supervisors said mostly arrange skill development programs for teachers. In other way 4 (44.6%) vice principals, 21 (38.1%) department heads, 44 (40.7%) teachers and 6 (33.3%) supervisors replied rarely implemented. While 7(6.5%) teachers said not all implemented. This indicates that mostly arrange skill development programs for teachers. But unignorable percentages of respondents said rarely a practice. This should give an attention in order to promote teacher skills.

As we can see the above table 5 item 5, 6 (66.7%) vice principals, 30 (54.5%) department heads, 66 (61.1%) teachers and 15 (83.3%) supervisors confirm mostly focus on staff training opportunities to improve the quality of teaching learning process. But 3 (33.3%) vice principals, 25 (45.5%) department heads, 39 (36.1%) teachers and 3 (16.7%) supervisors replied rarely practiced. This indicates that majority of respondents response demonstrate focus on staff training opportunities to improve quality of teaching and learning. But considerable number of respondents especially department heads (45.5%) and teachers (36.1%) replied rarely implemented. So, this should give an attention in order to know the cause.

From the above table 5 item 6, 5 (55.6%) vice principals, 29 (52.7%) department heads, 61 (56.5%) teachers and 12 (66.7%) supervisors replied mostly implemented. on the other side 3 (33.3%) vice principals, 16 (29.1%) department heads 29 (26.8%) and 3 (16.6%) supervisors confirm mostly organize experience sharing programs among colleagues. This implies that the majority of respondents replied mostly practiced. While considerable percentage of respondents said rarely implemented.

As we can see the above table 5 items 7, 6 (66.7%) vice principals, 28 (50.9%) department heads, 54 (50%) teachers and 13 (72.2%) supervisors said mostly practiced. In other way 2 (22.2%) vice principals, 20 (36.4%) department heads, 21 (19.4%) teachers and 5 (27.8%) supervisors replied rarely implemented. This shows that the majority of the respondents demonstrate mostly practiced unignorable number of respondents replied rarely practiced. So, it was need attention and follow up.

From the above table 5 item 8, 6 (66.7%) vice principals, 36 (65.5%) department heads, 69 (63.9%) teachers and 9 (50%) supervisors replied mostly implemented. In other way 7 (12.7%) department heads, 10 (12.4%) teachers and 3 (16.7%) supervisors said rarely implemented. This implies that the greater majority of the respondents confirmed mostly provide administrative support to inbuilt supervision but we should consider the responses of 7 (12.7%) department heads, 10 (12.4%) teachers and 3 (16.7%) supervisors said rarely implemented.

The data in table 5 item 9, 5(55.6%) vice principals, 28 (50.9%) department heads, 56 (51.9) teachers and 9 (50%) supervisors said mostly solve the existing problems collaborately. On the other side 2 (22.2%) vice principals, 15 (27.3%) department heads, 26 (24.1%) teachers and 9 (50%) supervisors respond rarely implemented. This shows that mostly principals solving problems collaboratively however considerable percentages of respondents responded rarely implemented. This condition needs attention in order to fill the gaps.

As we can see the above table 5 item 10, 6 (66.7%) vice principals, 29 (52.7%) department heads, 63 (58.4%) teachers and 12 (66.7%) supervisors confirm provide constructive comments to teachers through evaluation. On the other side 2 (22.2%) vice principals, 13 (23.6%) department heads, 24 (22.2%) teachers and 1 (5.5%) supervisors said rarely practiced while 2 (3.7%) department heads said not at all implemented. This indicates that the majority of respondents shared the response of mostly practiced. But considerable percentages of department heads and teachers replied rarely implemented and these needs too much attention and follow up.

From the above table 5 item 11, 6 (66.7%) vice principals, 38 (69.1%) department heads, 81 (75%) teachers and 10 (55.6%) supervisors replied mostly reward teachers for innovative work. but considerable percentage of respondents especially 17 (30.9%) department heads, 27 (25%) teachers replied rarely practiced. This indicated that the majority of respondents confirmed mostly rewards

teachers for innovative works but considerable numbers of respondents said rarely. So, it force to check and follow up.

Table 6. Decision Making Process

N o	Items	Respondents	No	Always (5)	%	Mostly (4)	%	Rarely (3)	%	Not at all (2)	%	I don't know (1)	%
1	Ability to prioritize problems	Vice principals	9	3	33.3	5	55.6	11	11.1	-	-	-	-
		Department heads	55	7	12.7	35	63.6	13	23.7	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	15	13.5	63	58.3	29	26.6	1	0.9	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	12	66.7	6	33.3	-	-	-	-
2	Ability to address problems timely	vice principals	9	1	11.1	6	66.7	2	22.2	-	-	-	-
		Department Heads	55	6	10.9	31	56.4	16	29.1	2	3.6	-	-
		Teachers	108	24	22.2	57	52.8	26	24.1	1	0.9	-	-
		supervisors	18	-	-	12	66.7	6	33.3	-	-	-	-
3	Ability of using participatory decision making process	vice principals	9	1	11.1	5	55.6	3	33.3	-	-	-	---
		Department Heads	55	5	9.1	22	40	28	50.9	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	12	11.1	36	33.3	56	51.8	4	3.8	-	-
		supervisors	18	-	-	9	50	9	50	-	-	-	-
4	Follow up for continuous improvement	vice principals	9	2	22.2	6	66.7	1	11.1	-	-	-	-
		Department Heads	55	10	18.2	26	47.2	17	31.1	2	3.6	-	-
		Teachers	108	12	11.1	57	52.8	33	30.6	6	5.5	-	-
		supervisors	18	2	11.1	9	50	7	38.9	-	-	-	-

From the above table 6, items item1, 5(55.6%) vice principals, 35(63.6%) of department heads, 63(58.31%) and 12(66.7%) supervisors confirm mostly principal share ability to prioritize problems. On the other side 13(23.7%) department heads, 29(26.6%) teachers and 69 (33%) supervisors replied rarely practice principals ability to prioritize problems. This indicate the majority of respondents demonstrate mostly implemented by principals.

As we can see the above table 6, items 2 6(66.7%) vice principals, 31(56.4%) department heads, 57(52.8%) teachers and 12 (66.7%) supervisors said mostly principals have ability to address problems timely, while 2(22.2 %) vice principals, 26(24.1%) teachers and 6(33%3) supervisors said rarely practiced .This shows that the majority of respondents replied mostly principals ability to address problems timely but un-ignorable number. So, it needs more attention to the future.

The data in table 6 items 3, 5(55.6%) vice principals, 22(40%) department heads, 36(33%) teachers and 9(50%) supervisors replied mostly principals ability of focusing participatory decision making process. while 28(50.9%) department heads, 56(53.7) teachers, 9(58%) supervisors and 3(33%) vice principals confirm rarely implement participatory decision making process in the school . so, It needs serious follow up for principals to continuous improvement.

From the above table 6 item 4, 6 (66.7%) vice principals, 26(47.2%) department heads, 57(52.8%) teachers and 9(50%) supervisors replied mostly principals follow up for continuous improvement while 1(11.1%) vice principals, 17(31.1%) department heads, 33(30.6%) teachers and 7 (38.9%) supervisors rarely implemented. It shows the majority of respondents confirm mostly principals

follow up for continuous improvement. But significant percentages of respondents (teachers and department heads) replied rarely practiced. Therefore additional attention and in needs continuous follow up.

Table -7 problems that have affected Principals leadership practices

No	Items	Respondents	No	Alwa ys (5)	%	Mostl y (4)	%	Rarely (3)	%	Not at all (2)	%	I don't know (1)	%
1	Occupied by routine administration tasks	Vice principals	9	3	33.3	5	55.6	1	11.1	-	-	-	-
		Department Heads	55	12	21.8	33	60	10	18.2	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	24	22.2	64	59.3	20	18.5	-	-	-	-
		Supervisors	18	6	33.3	9	50	3	16.7	-	-	-	-
2	Lack of leader ship competency	vice principals	9	-	-	2	22.2	7	77.8	-	-	-	-
		Department Heads	55	-	-	19	34.5	36	66.5	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	-	-	32	29.6	76	70.4	-	-	-	-
		supervisors	18	-	-	6	33.3	12	66.7	-	-	-	-
3	Shortage resources of	vice principals	9	1	11.1	5	55.6	3	33.3	-	-	-	-
		Department Heads	55	3	5.5	29	52.8	21	38.1	2	3.6	-	-
		Teachers	108	12	11.1	57	52.7	38	38	35.21	0.9	-	-
		supervisors	18	-	-	13	72.2	5	27.8	--	-	-	-
4	Shortages finance of	vice principals	9	3	33.3		6	66.7	-	-	-	-	-
		Department Heads	55	4	7.3	28	50.9	23	41.8	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	12	11.1	45	41.64	42	38.9	9	8.4	-	-
		supervisors	18	-	-	12	66.6	3	16.7	-	-	-	-
5	Lack of qualified teachers	vice principals	9	-	-	-	-	6	66.7	3	33.3	-	-
		Department Heads	55	-	-	-	-	47	85.5	8	11	-	-
		Teachers	108	-	-	-	-	97	89.9	7	6.4	4	3.7
		supervisors	18	-	-	-	-	-	88.9	2	11.1		
6	Lack of supporting Staff	Vice principals	9	-	-	4	44.4	5	56.6	-	-	-	-
		Department Heads	55	-	-	15	27.3	32	58.2	8	14.5	-	-
		Teachers	108	10	9.2	30	27.8	64	59.3	4	3.7	-	-
		Supervisors	18	-	-	3	16.7	15	83.3	-	-	-	-
7	Problem budgeting of to each activity	vice principals	9	-	-	6	66.7	3	33.3	-	-	-	-
		Department Heads	55	2	3.6	37	67.2	16	29.2	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	-	-	62	54.24	39	36.1	7	6.5		
		supervisors	18	-	-	12	66.7	6	33.3	-	-	-	-
8	Lack of adequate support from higher official	vice principals	9	-	-	6	67.2	3	33.3	-	-	-	-
		Department Heads	55	-	-	32	58.2	22	40	1	1.8	-	-
		Teachers	108	-	-	67	62	39	36.1	2	1.9	-	-
		supervisors	18	-	-	12	66.7	6	33.3	-	-	-	-
9	Shortages training of on education leader ship	vice principals	9	-	-	7	77.8	2	22.2	-	-	-	-
		Department Heads	55	-	-	41	74.5	14	25.5	-	-	-	-
		Teachers	108	4	3.7	79	73.1	23	21.3	-	-	2	1.9
		supervisors	18	-	-	12	66.7	6	33.3	-	-	-	-
10	Lack commitment of	vice principals	9	-	-	2	22.2	6	66.7	3	33.3	-	-
		Department Heads	55	-	-	34	61.81	19	34.5	2	3.7	-	-

	Teachers	108	3	2.8	58	53.7	47	43.5	-	-	-	-
	supervisors	18	-	-	14	77.8	4	22.2	-	-	-	-

The data in table 7 item1, 5(55.6%) vice principals, 33(60%) department heads, 64(59.3%) and 9(50%) supervisors replied mostly principals occupied by routine administration tasks. This indicate them majority of respondents agreed that principals of this school were mostly engaged on routine works. So, this condition would negatively affect the quality and the amount of work done by their schools.

As we can see the above table 7 items 2, 7(77.8%) vice principals, 36(65.5%) department heads, 76 (70.4%) teachers and 12(66.7%) supervisors said rarely. It shows lack of leadership competency. This indicates that there was need much attention to improve leadership competency.

From the above table 7 items 3, 5(55.6%) vice principals, 29(52.8%) department heads, 57(52.7%) teachers and 10(55.6%) supervisors said mostly schools face shortage of resources. On the other side 3(33.3%) vice principals, 21(38.1%) department heads, 39(36.1%) teachers and 8(44.4%) supervisors said rarely .This shows that the majority of respondents confirm mostly shortage of resources have a great influence in leadership practices.

The data in table 7, items 4, 6(66.7%) vice principals, 28(50.9%) department heads, 72(66.6%) teachers and 12 (66.6%) supervisors responded mostly approve shortage of finance in the school .Therefore, there was need additional means of finance and serious follow up.

As we can see the above table 7 item 5, 6(66.6%) vice principals, 47(85.5%) department heads, 97(89.8%) teachers and 16 (88.9%) supervisors said rarely school faced lack of qualified teachers. This indicates that the lack of qualified teachers were not a serious problem on selected secondary schools.

The data in table 7 items 6, 5(56.6%) vice principals, 32(73.7% department heads, 64 (59.3%) teachers and 15(83.3%) supervisors replied confirm teachers said not at all .This indicate there was need future continuous follow up and give much attention.

From the above table 7 items 7, 6(66.7%) vice principals, 37(67.2%) department heads, 62(54.4%) teachers and 12(66.7%) supervisors said mostly problem of budgeting to each activity in the school. This shows problem of budgeting influence leadership competency on the part of principals.

As we can see the above table 7 items 8, 6(66.7%) vice principals, 32(58.2%) department heads, 67(62%) teachers and 12 (66.7%) supervisors said mostly lack of adequate support from higher officials. while 20(40%) department heads, 39(36.1%) and 6(33.3%) supervisors replied rarely. This

indicates that the majority of respondents confirm lack of adequate support from higher officials in the schools were a serious challenge to the principals.

The data in table 7 items 9, 7(77.8%) vice principals, 41 (74.5%) department heads, 79 (73.1%) teachers and 11 (61.1%) supervisors replied mostly shortage of training on educational leadership. This shows that shortage of pertinent training for principals had been always influencing the leadership of the principals in selected secondary schools.

From the above table 7, items 10, 6 (66.7%) of vice principals replied rarely lack of committeemen in the schools. But on the other side 34(61.8%) department heads, 58(53.7%) teachers and 14(77.8%) supervisors committed in their tasks. This indicates that the majority of respondents especially department heads, teachers and supervisors confirm lack of commitment was a serious problem in the school.

Interview Questions Responses

Question No 1. What Kind of leadership practice in your school in most cases?

All (10) of principals responses showed that they practiced different type of leadership styles based on the situation. However, they mostly used democratic leadership style and try to participate from school command post, process council, unit department heads, development group etc. Through these organization units the tasks distributed to implement in manageable way. If there is a problem of implementing a task the school prepares different types of training and continuous follow up. And in the other side, Seven (seventy percent) of respondents mentioned that the challenge in leadership practice in participatory ways were dissatisfaction of teachers and the principals. So, the principal and other concerned bodies give much attention to solve the problem.

Question No 2. Do you think that your leadership style is effective on areas like delegation of work, handling the human capital, solving problems collaboratively? Can you give me example?

4 principals and 4 vice principals responses that schools used different tasks, employees treated equally in all cases and if there is a problem tried to solve the problem through negotiation and discussion. For example 6 (60%) of respondents confirm tasks were delegated to department heads and the rest 4 (40%) of respondent replied that principals used additional different committees led by experienced teachers. The right person at a right place was practiced in staffing and in case of inefficiency the school prepared training. If there is an existence of a problem the school community

discussed and put solutions collaboratively. So, the principals strengthen participation and delegation of tasks in the future.

Question No 3. It is obvious that the principals encounter a lot of problems in carrying out leadership functions. Please specify some of the major problems that negatively affect leadership practices?

All respondents (10) of them responses that routine administrative tasks hinders accomplishing strategic tasks in the school and eight (80%) of principals confirm that shortage of finance also a serious problem to affect leadership practice in the school. Six (60%) of respondents mentioned that negative interference from the woreda and sub city offices created uncomfortable situation and discourage principals initiatives. All (10) of principals approve that lack of commitments and interest of a teachers towards their job also a serious problem. So, these problems need much attention in order to perform leadership functions.

Question No 4. What solutions do you suggest to solve the encountered problems?

Five (50%) of principals responses that they focus on more strategic task than the routine once. Eight (80%) of respondents explained that schools can scaling up of resources by requesting different organizations (NGOs, GOs). So, the schools practice their tasks according to the law and denied negative interference with evidence and finally reward system and also create transparency condition in the school.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Under this chapter, major findings of the research were summarized. After the results of the study were reviewed, conclusions are drawn and recommendations are forwarded as follows.

5.1. Summary of the Study

The following are the major findings of this study. And based on the findings the conclusions were drawn.

1. The qualification of school principals and related professional skill and knowledge was against the intended plan of Ethiopian Ministry of education. It was against what was stipulated in the blue print that claims, ‘secondary school principals need to have second degree in Educational leadership’. Whereas, all school principals have first degree in subject area. Here, lack of professionally capable principals was still found to be greatly influencing performances of schools in general and effectiveness of the leadership of the principals in particular. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that effectiveness of the leadership of principals is highly influenced by the miss match between their qualification and educational levels that were rated to be below the standard set by Ethiopian Ministry of Education.
2. Educational leaders are poor in inviting change, innovation and creativity.
3. Regarding principals’ human relation skill was found that there was moderate attempt to form relationship among the staff of the schools.
4. Majority of school principals are not active in participating parents’ school decision making.
5. School principals were moderately rated in their role of staff development in developing mechanism by which competent teachers share their experience with colleagues, in providing short term training by preparing academic meeting and workshop, in reading current educational publication and encouraging teachers to attend professional development program.
6. The principals greatly resemble to perform routine tasks than strategic tasks.
7. In schools there are shortage of the needed resources, lower commitment of both teachers and principals, lower of competencies of the principals due to the shortage of relevant and timely professional training.

5.2. Conclusions

The following are the major conclusions based on the findings.

- Concerning the qualification, all school leaders in selected secondary schools are not qualified with principal ship or not trained in the area of educational leadership. So principals' performances have a negative impact in the attainment of the educational goals of the school.
- Principals by themselves agreed that they were in a poor performance in inviting change and innovation. They were also poorly performed, invite change and innovation.
- Concerning time allocation, principals are not spend their academic time for proper work but they mostly consume the time for routine tasks it is another biggest problem in principals' work. So principals were not following their work procedure to use their time in a proper and wise way.
- There were a problem of encouragement to participate in all activities, student parent participation and higher official support from the sector.

5.3. Recommendations

Depending on the results of the study and the review of related literature, the following recommendations are put forward.

- ❖ Heavily work load has been found impeding principals' effort to support the teaching-learning process in their capacity. Administrative assignments other than the official instructional role were absorbing their time and effort. Thus, the education Bureau need to put continuous monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.
- ❖ Parents' involvement in schools affairs has been found to be low. Thus, principals including the concerned body such as parents, students, sub city and woreda administrative need to inform and influence parents relentlessly for their more involvement in the school affairs. Moreover, principals themselves need to work more with parents.
- ❖ Continuously capacitating the competencies and updating the skills and knowledge of school principals through training and workshops. After principals are assigned they should be continuously monitored, guided and helped by more competent and committed sub city and woreda education offices. Hence, their skill and knowledge gaps should be continuously assessed, identified and fulfilled through provision of organizing sufficient and pertinent on the job as well as off the job short and long term training on issues like effective educational leadership, transactional and transformational leadership, effective leadership of institutional

change and reformation, forms of leadership etc. through combined forms of training. The forms of training can involve organizing forum, workshop, experience sharing, benchmarking, formal training, etc.

- ❖ Schools are organizations where different school communities exist to work together for the attainment of schools goals and objectives which are not possible for principals alone. However, principals were not participative in involving and working with school communities in different school affairs. Hence, principals must work together with school communities in different school affairs by involving them like fulfill school internal infrastructure (library and laboratory inputs) and participate in school decision making process.

REFERENCES

- Aboneh Tadesse (2010). “A Comparative Study of Instructional Leadership Roles of Principals in Selected Government and Private Secondary Schools of Jimma Administrative City”. Unpublished MA Thesis. AAU.
- Adedoyin, E. K. (2013). Leadership Styles and Work Effectiveness of School Principals in Ekiti State: Case Study of Ado-Ekiti Local Government Area. *Developing Country Studies*, 12 (64-73).
- Berhanu Gebereslassie (2014). “Principals’ Leadership Effectiveness in Secondary Schools of Addis Ababa. Unpublished Dissertation University of Addis Ababa.
- Bolden, R. G. (2003). *A Review of Leadership Theory and Competency Frame works*, London: University of Exeter.
- Burns, N. & Grove, S.K. (2003). **Understanding Nursing Research**. (3rd edition). Philadelphia:
- Bush, T. and Heystek, J. (2006), **School Leadership and Management in South Africa: Principals’ Perceptions**; *International Studies in Educational Administration*, Forthcoming.
- Duignan, P. (2006). **Educational Leadership: Key Challenges and Ethical Tensions**. Australia: Cambridge University Press.
- Glover, T. B. (2003). *School Leadership: Concept and Evidence*. London: National College for School Leadership.
- Gorton, Richard A, (1983). **School Administration and Supervision: Leadership**

Challenges and Opportunities. 2nd ed. Dubuque, Iowa: W.C. Brown Co.

Publishers.

Hallinger, H., Philip, G. and Ronald H. (1998). Exploring the Principal's Contribution to Effectiveness: School Effectiveness and School Improvement. The Netherlands: Springer.

Harris, A. (2004). **Distributed Leadership and School Improvement, Educational Management Administration and Leadership**, Vol. 32. No. 1, pp. 11-24.

Hughes, L.W. (1999). **The Principal as Leader**, Second Edition, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Ibukun, O. &. (2011). Personality Characteristics and Principal Leadership Effectiveness in Ekiti State, Nigeria. International Journal of Leadership Studies, 6 (2), 64. State, Nigeria. International Journal of Leadership Studies, 6(2),64. Retrieved on May12,2013,fromhttp://www.regent.edu/acad/.../5_Ibukun_Oyewole_Abe_pp247-262

Indris Seid (2014). "The Practice of Educational Leadership in Government Secondary Schools of Yeka Sub City in Addis Ababa City Administration." Unpublished Dissertation University of Addis Ababa.

Mayrowetz, D. (2008). Making sense of distributed leadership: Exploring the multiple usages of the concept in the field. Educational Administration Quarterly, 44(3),

Mc Gregor, D. (1966), **Leadership and Motivation**: USA.

McEwan, E. K. (2003). **Seven Steps to Effective Instructional Leadership** (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

- MoE. (2008). General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP), Addis Ababa: Ethiopia.
- MoE. (2012). National Professional Standard for School Principals. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Ministry of Education.
- Northouse, P.(2001). **Leadership theory and practice**. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Riley, K., & MacBeath, J. (2003). **Effective Leaders and Effective Schools**. In Bennet, N., Crawford, M., & Cartwright, M. (Eds.), **Effective Educational Leadership** (pp. 173-185). London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Salahuddin, A. (2011). Perceptions of Effective Leadership in Bangladesh Secondary Schools: Moving towards Distributed Leadership. (Unpublished master's Thesis). University of Canterbury; New Zealand.
- Weindling, P. E. (2004). **Understanding School Leadership**. New Delhi: Paul Chapman Publishing.

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

**A questionnaire to be filled by vice principals, department heads, supervisors
and teachers**

Dear respondents,

The main purpose of this questionnaire is to investigate The Practices and Problems of School Leadership: The Case of Some Selected Secondary Schools in Addis Ababa City Administration. Through this questionnaire, I would like to get your view regarding the leadership practices and problems of your principals at your school. Since the information you provide will serve as a basis to identify Principals Leadership practices and problems, your genuine responses to the questions that follow are highly valued and taken as essential assets to the success of this study. I would like to make sure that all the information you provide will remain confidential and will be used for research purpose only. So please be confident and frank to give your responses to the best of your knowledge.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Note:

1. There is no need to write your name
2. For every item, you have to give only one answer.
3. All information you provide will be strictly kept confidential
4. All data will be aggregated and will not be personalized

Part I. Background Information of the Respondents

Please respond to the following questions by putting(x) mark in the box and write on the space provided when necessary.

A. Name of the school _____

B. Sex 1. Male ☐ 2. Female ☐

C. Age
_____ ☐

1. 25 years and below ☐ 3. 36-45 years
 2. 26 -35 years ☐ 4. 46-55 years ☐ 5. above 55 years ☐

D. Level of Education

1. Diploma ☐ 2. 1st Degree ☐
 3. 2nd Degree ☐ 4. If any other, specify.....

E. Total years of service as a teacher

1. 5 years and below ☐ 2. 6-10 years ☐
 3. 11-15 years ☐ 4. 16-20 years ☐ 5. Above 20 years ☐

F. Your position/status

1. Vice principal ☐
 2. Department head ☐
 3. Teacher ☐
 4. Supervisor ☐

Part II: The following are the major dimensions which supposed to measure Principals leadership practices and problems at your school. Please read each statement carefully and put tick "x" mark against each rating scale.

For each response, 5= Always, 4= Mostly 3= Rarely, 2= Not at all, 1= I do not know

No.	Setting goals and vision	5	4	3	2	1
1	Inspiring a shared vision					
2	Articulating clearly the strategic goals of the school					
3	Aligning school goals with the national educational statement.					
4	Demonstrating vision and long range planning					
5	Creating consensus with stakeholders and staff about the school's goals					
6	Collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually with all stakeholders.					
7	Encouraging new ideas and creativity					
8	Creating conducive environment in the school					
9	Making the school to use a school improvement plan as a basis for progress.					
10	Manage changes constructively					
	Relationship with the school community					
1	Trust in others					
2	Accepted by others					
3	Good in human relation skill					
4	understanding of the needs and concerns of the staff					
5	understanding of the needs and concerns of students					

6	Treat individuals fairly and with respect					
7	Maintain positive and productive relationship with all the school community					
8	Listen to and communicate with all academic and administrative staff					
9	Communicate priorities to the upper level administration.					
10	Insure that fair administration procedures are followed in the school equally					

11	Trust and delegate tasks to others subordinate					
12	Communicating with parents to obtain resources					
13	Participating parents in decisions making					
14	Develop a system to participate parents in day to day activities					
	Leading professional Development					
1	Encourage action research in the school					
2	Encouraging teachers to use different instructional strategies and skills					
3	Encourage to practice curriculum and program development					
4	Arrange skills development programs (workshops ,coaching) for teachers					
5	Focus on staff training opportunities to improve the quality of teaching and learning					
6	Organize experience sharing programs among colleagues					
7	Plan and execute in service programs for staff (CPD)					
8	Provide administrative support to inbuilt supervision					
9	Solving problems collaboratively					
10	Provide constructive comments to teachers through evaluation					
11	Reward teachers for innovative works					
	Decision Making Process					
1	Ability to prioritize problems					
2	Ability to address problems timely					
3	Ability of using participatory decision making process					
4	Follow up for continuous improvement					
	Problems that have affected principals' leadership practices					
1	Occupied by Routine Administrative Tasks					
2	Lack of Leadership Competency					
3	Shortage of resources					
4	Shortage of finance					
5	Lack of qualified teachers					
6	Lack of supporting staff					
7	Problem of Budgeting to each activity					
8	Lack of adequate support from higher officials					
9	Shortage of training on educational leadership					
10	Lack of commitment					
	If there are other, please specify and rate it					

APPENDIX B

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Interview questions for Principals and vice Principals

Part II. Interview Guided Questions

1. What kind of leadership practice do you apply in your school in most cases?
2. Do you think that your leadership practice is effective on areas like delegation of work, handling the human capital, solving problems collaboratively? Can you give me examples for this?
3. It is obvious that the principals encounter a lot of problems in carrying out leadership functions. Please specify some of the major problems that negatively affect leadership practices.
4. What solutions do you suggest to solve the encountered problems