



Addis Ababa University
አዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ

Seek Wisdom, Elevate Your Intellect and Serve Humanity



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

PRACTICES OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN FACILITATING
TEACHING AND LEARNING IN GOVERNMENT SECONDARY
SCHOOLS OF HORO GUDURU-WOLLEGA ZONE

BY

Kefyalew Kebede

Advisor: Maeregu Biyabeyen (Asst. Prof.)

September, 2017

Addis Ababa

**THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PRINCIPALS IN FACILITATING THE
TEACHING AND LEARNING IN SECONDRY SCHOOLS OF HORO
GUDURU WOLLEGA ZONE**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANGEMENT IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP**

By:

Kefyalew Kebede

September, 2017

Addis Ababa

Acknowledgements

The completion of this thesis would not have been possible without the support of many people. First and foremost, I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to my advisor Maeregu Biyabeyen (Asst. Prof.) for his enthusiasm, encouragement, constructive suggestions and comments. My deep appreciation also goes to my wife, w/ro Dinke Abdella for her encouragement, patience and support throughout the time the study was in progress.

I am also thankful to Ato Tolessa Asefa, Getnet Tadesse and Garoma Gudeta for providing constructive ideas and encouragement. Finally, I would like to extend my appreciation to all secondary school teachers, principals, and supervisors, for the cooperation they showed in filling research questionnaires, participating in interviews and focus group discussion.

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to examine the practices of principals in facilitating teaching and learning process in secondary schools of Horo-Guduru Wollega zone, Oromia national regional state. Mixed research design was employed to attain the objective of the study. The samples included ten secondary schools of five woredas in the zone. The sources of data were secondary school teachers, principals, and supervisors. Data were collected using questionnaire, interview and focus group discussion. To analyze and interpret the data, both quantitative and qualitative data analysis techniques were applied. The result of the study revealed that there was low degree of principals' practice in facilitating teaching and learning due to lack of experiences and skills. Besides, school principals were less effective in providing supervisory support, in creating positive teaching learning environment they were not applying practices of effectiveness. The ineffectiveness of secondary school principals in facilitating the teaching and learning process contributed to decrease in student achievement. Based on the study results, it was recommended that principals should provide appropriate support to update their skills and be supervised from time to time to be effective in facilitating the teaching and learning process and help them to achieve the goals of school they are leading.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

CPD: Continuous Professional Development

FGD: Focus Group Discussion

MA: Master of Art

MED: Master of Education

MOE: Ministry of Education

MSc: Master of Science

SD: Standard Deviation

D/H: Department Heads

Table of content

Contents	Page
Contents	iv
CHAPTER ONE	1
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.3. Objectives of the Study	6
1.3.1. General Objectives.....	6
1.3.2. Specific Objectives	6
1.4. Significance of the Study	7
1.5. Delimitation of the Study.....	7
1.6. Limitation of the study.....	8
1.7. Operational Definition of Key Terms	8
1.8. Organization of the study.....	8
CHAPTER TWO	10
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	10
2.1. Introduction.....	10
2.2. Concepts of leadership.....	10
2.2.1. Concepts of Instructional Leadership	11
2.3. Effectiveness of School Principals.....	11
2.3.1. Duties and Responsibilities of School Principals.....	12
2.3.2. Effectiveness of School Principals in Facilitating Teaching and Learning.	13
2.3.3. Factors Affecting School Principal Effectiveness in Facilitating Teaching Learning .14	
2.3.3.1. Conceptual, Technical, Human Relations and other related Knowledge and Skill factors.....	14
2.4. Teaching Learning	18
2.4.1. Concept and Effectiveness.....	18
2.4.2. Factors influencing Effectiveness	18

2.4.2.1. Teacher-related: Qualification, Experience and Motivation.....	19
2.4.2.2. School-related: Principal Support and Resources	19
2.4. 2.3. Learner-related: Ability, Interest and Effort.	20
2.4.3. Development of a Positive School Climate.	21
2.4.3.1. Communicating school goals and vision	21
2.4.3.2. Promoting collaborative problem solving.....	22
2.4.3.3. Providing Incentive for Teachers (Motivation).....	22
2.4.4. Planning and Implementing Instructional Support System.....	23
2.4.4.1. Allocating and Providing Resources.....	23
2.4.4.2. Supervising and Evaluating Instruction	23
2.4.4.3. Promoting the Conduct of Action Research.....	24
2.4.4.4. Promoting the Continuous Professional Development	25
2.4.4.5. Engaging in Curriculum Development Activities.....	26
2.4.4.6. Engaging in Consolidating School-Community Linkage	27
2.5. Effectiveness of School Principals in Facilitating Teaching and Learning: Experiences from the World, Africa and Ethiopia	28
CHAPTER THREE	31
3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	31
3.1. Research Design.....	31
3.2. Description of the study site	31
3.3. Sources of data.....	31
3.3.1. Primary sources of data.....	32
3. 4. Population, Sample size and Sampling techniques	32
3.4.1. Population	32
3.4.2. Sample size and sampling technique	32
3.4. Instruments of Data Collection	34
3.4.1. Questionnaire	34
3.4.2. Interview	34
3.4.3. Focus Group Discussion	35
3.5. Data collection procedures.....	35
3.6. Pilot test	36

3.7. Method of data analysis	37
3.8. Ethical Consideration.....	38
Chapter Four	39
4. Data Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of Data	39
4.1. Characteristics of the respondents.....	40
4.2. Presentation, analysis and discussion of the findings of the study.	42
4.2.1. School principals’ practices in facilitating teaching learning.	42
4.2.2. Extent of practices that affects teaching learning.	47
4.2.3. Extent of school principals to create a positive teaching learning environment.	51
4.2.4. School principals’ activities in relation to supervision.	55
4.2.5. School principals’ evaluation of instructional activities.	57
4.2.6. Major challenges that affects the practices of principals in facilitating teaching learning.	60
Chapter Five.....	63
5. Summary, Conclusions and recommendations	63
5.1. Summary of the findings.....	63
5.2. Conclusion	66
5.3 .Recommendations.....	67
REFERENCES	69
APPENDICES	72

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Population and Samples of the Study	33
Table 2: Reliability test results with Cronbach alpha	37
Table 3: Characteristics of respondents	40
Table 4: View of teachers and department heads on School principals’ practices in facilitating teaching learning.....	43
Table 5: View of teachers and department heads on extent of practices that affects teaching learning.	47
Table 6: View of teachers and department heads on Extent of school principals to create a positive teaching learning environment.	51
Table 7: View of teachers and department heads on School principals’ supervision of class room.	55
Table 8: View of teachers and department heads on School principals’ evaluation of instructional activities.	57
Table 9: Major challenges in facilitating teaching learning.....	60

CHAPTER ONE

1. Introduction

This chapter tries to present the introductory part of the study. It included background of the study, statement of the problem, the basic questions, and objectives of the study, significance of the study, Limitation of the study, delimitation of the study, and operational definition of terms and organization of the study.

1.1. Background of the Study

School settings are a place where peoples are trained and shaped to become useful citizens. In order to realize this, school principals play an important role in facilitating the teaching and learning in school. Tschannen and Garries (2004) affirmed that it is widely accepted that good educational leaders are the corner stone of good educational institutions, and without their leadership effort, educational institutions cannot be successful.

According to Davis et al. (2005), the roles of educational leaders are primary characterized as coping with changes and complexities. The educational leaders need professional skills and are expected to be competent in various dimensions. They need to be educational visionaries, instructional and curriculum leaders, assessment experts, disciplinarian, community builders, public relation and communication aspects, budget analysis, facility managers, special program administrators, contractual, and policy makers and initiatives. In addition, Peterson (2002), educational leaders are expected to serve the often conflicting needs and interests of many stakeholders, including students, parents, teachers and officials at various levels.

The term educational leadership come into popularity in the twentieth century as a result of growing complexity of educational systems and concomitant expansion of the role of school leaders, giving rise to demands and expectations that necessitated a move from the prevailing school culture of status quo maintenance to transformational leadership for improvement, reforms, exhibition of practice, production of best results and

accountability. The need for training in educational leadership has thus been widely recognized in the 21st century (Common Wealth secretarial, 1996) as crucial for effective leadership and successful functioning of educational systems, for building effective institutions and the production of best results.

Bush (2008) stated that among pioneers in the preparation of school principals were Canada, Singapore and USA. There were also notable early starters in Europe, some Asian Pacific countries, New Zealand and Hong Kong. Today these countries have evolved fairly well developed systems for the professional and development of educational leaders and managers.

In African countries many researches were conducted. For instance in Nigeria among the recent studies on educational leadership and management, Arkiewuyo (2009:4) stated that training of secondary school principals in Nigeria is a neglected area in education. As in other African countries, school heads in Nigeria are drowning from the teaching force. Their appointment is based on teacher qualification and teaching experience of ten years and above (Arkiewuyo, 2009). However, this basic requirement is not always up held. Udey et al. (2009) warns against political favoritism that education administrators have progressively moved from generation and defending knowledge in to a political arena where they have become centers of political system.

In Ethiopian context, principal ship traces its origin to the introduction of Christianity during the ruling era of Ezana of Aksumite; around the 4th century A.D. Ethiopia for long time had found schools for children of their adherents (Teshome, cited in Ahimed, 2006), However, the western type of educational system was formally introduced in to Ethiopia in 1908 with the opening of Menelik II school. According to Ahmed (2006) the history of principal ship in Ethiopia was at its early age was dominated by foreign principals.

In all government schools which were opened before and after Italian occupation, Expatriate from different European countries were assigned as school principals. Late in 1941, after restoration of independence education was given high priority which resulted in opening of schools in different parts of the country. At that time most of the principals and teachers were from foreign countries (ICDR, 1999). Prior to 1962, expatriate principals were assigned in the elementary and secondary schools of different provinces

of Ethiopia during the 1930's and 1940's (MoE, 2002). During this time, the principal ship position was given to Indians, because of their experience in principal ship. In 1964, it was a turning that Ethiopians started to replace expatriates. This new chapter of principal ship began with a supervising principal. Such a person was in charged not only for a single school but for the educational system of the community where the school was located (Teshome cited in Ahmed, 2006). After 1960 it was a time that Ethiopians who were graduated with B.A/B.sc degree in any field were assigned as principals by senior officials of the MoE. The major criteria to select them were educational level and work experience (MoE, 2002). However, in the first decades of 1960's graduates of B.A degree in pedagogy were directly assigned in secondary schools. On the other hand, career structure promotion advertisements which were issued from 1973-1976 showed that secondary school principals were those who held first degree, preferably in educational administration field. In addition to these teachers who had experiences as a unit leader or department head were candidates for principal-ship.

Lately, the job description issued by the Ministry of Education in 1989 indicated that secondary school principals should have a first degree in school administration and supervision with sufficient working experience (MoE, 202).

After 1994, an attempt has been made to make the educational management decentralized and professional. As stated in the education and training policy, it encompasses overall and specific objective, implementation strategies, including formal and informal from kindergarten to higher and specific education. Education management will be decentralized to create the necessary condition to expand, enrich and improve the relevance of quality (TGE, 1994).

A lot remains to be done particularly in the area of training principal ship because principals have failed to play their leader ship role. Ethiopia has expanded access to education dramatically in the last 20 years, but the quantitative achievement has contributed to declining quality. Among interventions government put in place to improve quality was professional development of school principals through centrally organized in - service workshops. Workshops are still mounted occasionally a study of

this intervention strategy by Tekleselassie (2002 in Bush 2008) reported that principals attended a one - month in - service courses on school management.

Limitation of the training included curriculum unresponsiveness to the training needs of principals, short duration of training, and ill preparedness of trainee and incompetence of trainers, disconnect between the training and the vision of the Ministry of Education and the training did not reach all teacher principals. Hence the impact of the training to bring students' achievement, through principals was negligible.

MoE (2005) emphasized that though much has been done during ESDP I, II, III and VI, still more efforts need to be exerted to strengthen managerial leadership, to meet the desired cognitive and attitudinal level of students. Again among the various overall strategies of ESDP III to improve quality education one is the need for establishment of efficient school leadership and management.

In Oromia Regional State and similarly in Horo Guduru Wollega Zone concerning school leadership, the selection of secondary school principal is from subject teachers. This indicates that principals are not recognized as professionals. So the government should give attention to professionalize school principals.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Competent school principals have powerful influence in getting teachers, students, workers and parents involved in affairs essential to attain goals of the school. In this regard, Sergiovanni (2001) emphasized that although principals are important and their visions key in focusing attention on change and successfully implementing the process of change, what counts in the end is bringing together the ideas and commitments of a variety of people who have a stake in the success of the school. Therefore, in order for schools to achieve their objectives by way of providing a suitable environment of teaching and learning, principals play a crucial role. However, as preliminary investigation suggested, principals do not seem to be facilitating teaching and learning since teachers are not provided with adequate materials, supervisory support, and similar assistance so essential to create a learning environment suitable to teach student better and achieve more.

In many parts of the world, academic achievement of students has been a major concern to the parents, teachers and even to the education board officers. Research has been conducted in Nigeria that some secondary school principals are lacking leadership competences, resulting in low quality of instruction, indiscipline among staff and students (Aina 2011).

In Ethiopia Habtamu (2012) in his study found that Schools, which were found to be relatively low in their instructional leadership practices, also exhibited minimum results in school improvement, while those which were rated top in their instructional leadership practices were also rated to be high in their school improvement endeavors. Consequently, MoE (2005) under persistent challenges facing the education system urgent improvement need to be achieved in the area of supervision of teaching and learning process, which is mainly carried out by school leaders. Moreover, as an action plan among the overall goals of ESDP - III; it expresses, to increase access to quality secondary schools are appropriately guided by strong leadership.

Similarly, in 2007 the preliminary study conducted on the performance of principals in facilitating teaching and learning with the 3 principals and 6 teachers in the Harato Preparatory School found in Horo Guduru Wollega Zone using interview and focus group discussion suggested that principals tend not to adequately carry out : supervisory support for teachers, organize effective continuous professional development, involve the community in diverse activities, supply adequate resources for teachers on a timely basis, make adequate attempts to enrich the curriculum and make it relevant to local school situations and resources, work to create a conducive school compound .

Therefore, the problem was about the low level of support provided by principals. The above outcomes of the study conducted on a smaller-scale suggested that there is a problem to be studied regarding the effectiveness of principals in facilitating and improving teaching and learning in the Zone and from the experience of the researcher as a teacher and as a principal there was less support of principal as instructional leader to facilitate teaching learning. It was this that motivated the researcher to conduct a study on the area in the secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone found in the Oromia National Regional State.

As the purpose of the study was to investigate the effectiveness of principals in facilitating teaching and learning in secondary schools of Horro Guduru Wollega Zone, attempt was to answer the following basic research questions.

1. What are the leadership practices in facilitating teaching learning in secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone?
2. To what extent do school principals create a positive teaching learning environment?
3. How do school principals supervise and evaluate instructional activities?
4. What are the major challenges that affect the leadership practices of principals in facilitating teaching learning?

1.3. Objectives of the Study

1.3.1. General Objectives

The general objective of the study was to investigate the effectiveness of school principals in facilitating teaching and learning in secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of the study were to:

- Identify the practices of school principals' to facilitate the teaching learning.
- Examine practices that affect teaching learning practices.
- Examine how school principals created a positive teaching and learning environment.
- Investigate how principals support teaching and learning by way of providing supervisory and evaluative support.
- Identify the challenges that affect the practices of principals in facilitating teaching learning process.

1.4. Significance of the Study

The importance of the study lies in what it does help to improve the situation in secondary schools so that they may be more effective in creating a suitable teaching and learning environment. In more specific terms, it contributes in the following ways:

- It helps in creating awareness about effective secondary school principals to woreda and Zonal Education Offices and other stake holders.
- It aware principals to be more effective in supporting teaching and learning through improved instructional, administrative and community related efforts.
- Supporting teachers to have better teaching-learning environment made by effective principal.
- Improving the situation for students to learn better and achieve more.
- It will serve as a stepping stone for future studies on the area.
- It may help policy makers as guiding information.
- Planners may use as a sources of information.

1.5. Delimitation of the Study

It is very important to assess the effectiveness of principals at all levels of school system all over the country. But this is difficult due to various resource related constraints and geographical settings. Because of these problems, this study was delimited to Horro Guduru Wollega zone, where the researcher was easily access the information on the problem under the study. To make the study manageable among 10 woredas and 36 secondary schools in the Zone, it was delimited to ten secondary schools of five woredas and selected by simple random sampling, namely: Sekela and Chambe From Horo Woreda, Wayu and Goban from Jimma Rare woreda, Kombolcha and Tulu Abib from Guduru Woreda, Agemsa and Achane from Abay Choman woreda, Dadu and Kawo from Ababo Guduru woreda.

The study used both quantitative and qualitative methods, and data was collected using questionnaires, interview and focus group discussions.

1.6. Limitation of the study

The most pressing problem encountered by the researcher in the course of conducting this research work include: Shortage of time and material resource were limit the effort made to investigate the area and complete the study as scheduled.

1.7. Operational Definition of Key Terms

Secondary Schools: Educational institutions which consist of grades 9 and 10 and are supposed to prepare students for preparatory schools in Ethiopia.

Positive School climate: This refers to the physical, social, and academic environment which is suitable for teaching learning as perceived by teachers and supervisors as well as students.

Curriculum development: is a process of developing plans for guiding educational programs. In this study, it refers to what principals do to examine and adapt the existing curriculum to the prevailing school conditions as perceived teachers and supervisors.

Continuous Professional Development (CPD): is a career-long process of improving knowledge, skills, and attitudes centered on the local context and particularly classroom practice (MOE, 2009).

School Principals: Principals and vice principals of secondary schools.

Facilitating teaching learning: is where the students are encouraged to take more control of their learning process. The trainer's role becomes that of a facilitator and organizer providing resources and support to learners.

1.8. Organization of the study

This study was organized in five chapters. The first chapter consist introduction part: back ground of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance of the study, Limitation of the study, delimitation of the study, organization of the study and definition of operational terms. Chapter two deal with the review of related literature.

The third chapter was presented the research design and methodology: research method, sources of data, sample and sampling techniques. Chapter four was contained data analysis and presentation. The fifth chapter was contained the summary of major findings of the study, conclusion and recommendations. Finally appendices and references were attached at the last part of the study report.

CHAPTER TWO

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter was to discuss the major theoretical concepts about the effectiveness of the principals in facilitating the teaching and learning. Its emphasis was on the principals' effectiveness on facilitating teaching and learning. The literatures were used to support the study by clarifying the strength and weakness of school principals.

2.2. Concepts of leadership

Leadership is the act of influencing people so that they strive willingly and enthusiastically towards the accomplishment of goals (Ezeuwa, 2005).

The school principal is essential to make teaching and learning easier and more effective.

Glanz (2006) argues that the effective instructional leader needs to be able to do three things: First effective principals support teachers, by providing resources to improve instruction and they make an effort to hire experienced teachers who promote student' achievement. Secondly effective principals improve instructional practices by conducting instructional conferences with teachers, providing staff development, and developing teacher reflection. When instructional leaders apply theory into practice, they can use these guidelines to be successful instructional leaders. Also Bennis (2003) argues that leaders create and communicate a vision as one of his four critical characteristics of effective leadership. People are often drawn to leaders because of their ability to be a visionary. Leaders of the future also engage in creative collaboration. Collaborative teams rally around the vision and be guided toward the collective goals of the organization.

2.2.1. Concepts of Instructional Leadership

Instructional leadership can be defined as those actions that principals take, or delegate to others, to Promote growth in students' learning. In practice, this means that the principal ensures educational achievement by making instructional quality the top priority of the school. Instructional leaders spend most of their time dealing strictly with curricula matters rather than administrative functions.

The principals as instructional leaders should at all times strive for excellence in teaching and learning with the sole purpose of improving student achievement. Principals should serve foremost as instructional leaders in schools, and that their commitment to instructional improvement should not only be strongly articulated but should be reinforced with experience in the classroom (Glanz, 2006). In order to secure legitimacy in the eyes of the teachers, principals should have sufficient teaching experience and should understand with firsthand experience the instructional challenges faced by teachers.

Instructional leadership demands high standards of academic excellence: setting high expectations for learner success; having knowledge and experience with effective teaching or instructional strategies. Glanz (2006) instructional leadership is thus about encouraging best practices in teaching. Principals should become familiar with innovative theories and practices and motivate teachers to model them in classrooms.

2.3. Effectiveness of School Principals

Effectiveness of School Principal is the successful exercise of personal influence of one or more people with the aim of accomplishing organizational objectives through obtaining the followers' approval (Cooper et al., 2004).

Blanchard (1997), in an attempt to validate Fiedler's contingency theory, carried out a study of leadership effectiveness of school principals. He tested his hypotheses according to Fiedler's methodology, which included assessing the leaders' situational control and subsequently correlating the leaders' leadership style with the measure of effectiveness. Blanchard found that the higher the situational control, the more effective a principal. His

research could not however confirm principals' effectiveness as a function of leadership style. Rather the work affirmed that principals' effectiveness was a function of situational variables, which he identified as experience on the job, position power, leader-member relations, and knowledge. This finding was in agreement with Fiedler's contingency model. Blanchard concluded that for effectiveness to be increased the principal must increase situational control, meaning that leader-member relations should be improved, and that knowledge and experience on the job and position power should be expanded.

In the context of this study, principals' leadership effectiveness refers to the ability of the school principals to effectively carry out administrative tasks related to instructional programming, staff personnel administration, student personnel administration, financial and physical resources, and school-community relations toward achieving the school goals and objectives.

2. 3. 1. Duties and Responsibilities of School Principals

The school principal is one of most responsible person for every activity of the school. He/she is expected to organize schools in such a way that instructional programs can be carried out effectively and efficiently. In an attempt to facilitate the smooth functioning of school activities he/she needs to play certain roles. These roles embodied; facilitating the development of goals and policies, maintain staff development, generating and controlling community resources, providing and improving professional development of students, personnel services and creating conducive atmosphere in interaction with the community (Nwankow, 1982: 16-17). The schools included small and large organizations from urban and rural communities. These schools all had similar elements, which help them to be successful. Principals relied on their beliefs and experiences, community input, and their desired goals and vision in order to manage school climate in the structure of the organization to provide successful student outcomes.

2. 3. 2. Effectiveness of School Principals in Facilitating Teaching and Learning.

One of the areas that need attention is the effectiveness of the principal in school setting, particularly his/her acts and influences for the success of the teaching – learning process. To support this, Campbell, Corbay and Ramsayer (1962:215) stated that;

Each school is directed towards the accomplishment of the teaching-learning objectives. In any particular area the achievement of the objectives of a given school depends on the standards by which people evaluate the actual results of the school. Therefore, in making teaching and learning more effective, the secondary school principal is the chief responsible person.

A key administrative position in the public school is that of principal. As the “man-in-the-middle” posed between central administration and the teaching staff, the principal must put in to operation the policy of the school district while, at the same time, he/she must meet personal and professional needs of teachers (Griffiths, 1966).

The position of the principal in school demands experience, training and qualification. Hence, in such complex organization, the managerial function of the principal is very essential (Peters, 1976:11). Now a day’s principals act as a leader as well as a manager (managerial and leadership functions are activities of principal in the school). Concerning the activities of principal, Zewdneh (1987:235) explained that the principal should be the most concerned person in the school. He/she is in charge of knowing where the strong and weak activities of the school lie, giving solutions to problems, managing and sharing the feeling of the staff and developing harmonious relationship between teaching and non-teaching staff with in the school is, to a great extent, determined by the skill and ability of the principal.

The skill and ability of the principal is essential to facilitate teaching and learning. The leading ability of principal is reflected on the activities he/she performs in the school. The ability of the principal in managing the staff determines the effectiveness of the total activities of the school (Nwanko, 1982:71).

2.3.3. Factors Affecting School Principal Effectiveness in Facilitating Teaching Learning

The effectiveness of school principal in facilitating teaching learning is affected by a number of factors. The skill of principal, qualification, experiences and styles are some major factors in facilitating teaching learning for school principals.

2.3.3.1. Conceptual, Technical, Human Relations and other related Knowledge and Skill factors.

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

Conceptual skill: It is true that school principals' utmost responsibility and accountability regarding the overall achievement of their respective schools. As a result, they are required to have clear understanding about the activities carried out in their schools. Principals with appropriate conceptual skills can have the ability to view the school, the district in which they work, the total education policy, programs and objectives at national level as well as their interdependence in process of achieving common goals.

According to Robbins (2001:5) conceptual skill refers to "...the mental ability of the manager to analyze and diagnose complex situations". Therefore, School principals as educational managers are required to have conceptual skills that enable them operate in the process of organizing schools for the cooperative action, become well informed about the changes and development introduced in the education system as well as develop and enhance best practices that suit the teaching and learning activities in the schools. The impact of conceptual skill can influence the principal effectiveness in facilitating teaching at school level. This result in lack of generating new ideas that helps in facilitating teaching.

Technical skill: lack of technical skill of school principal can affect effectiveness in teaching learning. Technical skill is knowledge about and proficiency in a specific type of work or activity. It includes competencies in a specialized area, analytical ability, and the ability to use appropriate tools and techniques (Ayalew, 2000:3) in his part, has also elaborated the technical skill required for managers as "...a skill all about specialized knowledge, understanding and analytical power in the use of tools and techniques of the specific discipline." School principals, as managers of educational institutions should, therefore, is proficient enough in the techniques and methods as how to manage the school activities. Absences of technical skill for school principal affect the effectiveness in facilitating teaching learning.

Human skill: The human relation skills of principal are highly affect the effectiveness in facilitating teaching. Since education in most cases is labor intensive activity, school principals as they closer to the real school work situations and with direct responsibilities for the overall school effectiveness should be better qualified by training and experience. They should also be well versed in the human relations skill. Sergiovanni and Carver (1980:13) have described human skill as "...the school executives (principals) ability to work effectively and efficiently both in groups and individually". Hence, human skills require principals' ability to deal with people, communicate their thoughts without causing offensives, respect the value of all staff, motivate and stimulate the school community to strive for the realization of the school goals.

Therefore, school principals as they are required to accomplish their school tasks through other people must acquire skills and ability to work with other people, promote cooperation and team work, and foster a more collaborative culture in their respective schools, show respect and concern about the needs and feelings of their staff.

Decision-Making is also a major activity real test of a school principal because any administrative activity regarding teachers, students and any school plan need decision before they put in to function. Inappropriate decision made by principal affects the implementation of teaching process in the school. Decision making is the selection from alternatives of courses of action (Weihrich and koontz, 1988: 135). Concerning the importance of decision making Nwankwo (1982:77-78), has stated that to make an

effective decisions on any administrative affairs, the school principal should have a skill of not only the different alternative actions that exist, but also what type of decision to be made, who should make, and how the decision would be implemented. The principal is responsible to implement the decision and the result of action, but he is not the only person to be involved in making practical decisions. Therefore, it is essential for all participants to accept the decision and be willing to the action to be taken. The participation of the staff in decision making process will encourage them to apply maximum effort in facilitating the teaching.

Community Support: one of factors that influence effectiveness of principal in facilitating learning is community support for the school. Sanders (2001) found that school-community partnership activities were variously used as strategies for student and family support, school improvement, and community development. Taylor (2008) concedes that schools are more effective and caring places when they are an integral part of the community. This contributes to enhanced academic performance, fewer discipline problems, higher staff morale, and wide use of resources. The relationship between the school and the community ultimately has an impact on the learning that takes place in the school.

Curriculum is other factor that affects teaching in a school. One of the major tasks of secondary school principal is to enrich the curriculum and to facilitate the teaching process. These can be done by making teaching easier and more effective; in other words by improving the quality of instruction in a school. The principal is responsible for providing the necessary leadership and establishing the type of situations in which he/she and teachers can work cooperatively to design and carry out the desired type of instructional program for students (Jenkins, 1991:84).

School climate also affects the effectiveness of teaching process. Unsafe and unattractive school compound reduce the quality of teaching. The principal more than any other individual, is responsible for the creation of a good climate in the school. He/she is the key figure in promoting an academic learning environment within the school that is conducive to teachers teaching. In relation to this, Edmonds (1979a) indicated that schools that were effective had a climate which allows all children to succeed to high

levels. Since good teacher morale and high student achievement go hand in hand, the school principal has to make the school environment conducive and motivate teachers on their job to indirectly promote students' achievement and bring about school improvement.

Supervision: Classroom supervision also other factors for effectiveness of principal in facilitating teaching learning. Student test scores rose as the number of times the school principal visited the classroom increased (Sindhvad, 2009). Visiting classroom is a supervision strategy that has positive effect on teachers. In this strategy, principals can use both formal and informal visits to classrooms to learn what teachers are doing, to assess whether sound instruction is being delivered for learner, and to interact with teachers. Therefore classroom supervision by principal has an impact on facilitating teaching learning.

Proper allocation of support for teaching learning process affects principal activities in facilitating teaching learning. Lack of resources may hamper teachers not to use different instructional strategies to bring about quality education. If this is the case, principals also face challenges and may not achieve their objectives for school improvement.

Providing resources is viewed by teachers as effective leadership by principals (McGhee and Lew, 2007). That is to say, those principals who gave more attention to instruction in the provision of resources were viewed by teachers as strong instructional leaders.

Lack of **Continuous professional Development** is affecting the teaching learning process. Updating and upgrading are ways of teacher development in their profession. Among the role of an instructional leader is promoting school wide professional development. The aim of CPD is to improve teachers' performance in the classroom in order to raise student achievement and learning because, directly or indirectly, there is a link between students' result and teachers' performance (MoE, 2009).

2.4. Teaching Learning

2.4.1.. Concept and Effectiveness.

Learning is the activity or process of gaining knowledge or skill by studying, practicing, being taught, or experiencing something; the activity of someone who learns: knowledge or skill gained from learning. Definitions for teaching effectiveness abound, which makes it difficult to identify any one as definitive. We have defined it by asking those concerned (teachers, students, and administrators) what the term means to them. The definition extracted from descriptions of teachers nominated for teaching awards used these words: approachable, presents material well, makes subject interesting, helpful, and knowledgeable (Maryellen Weimer; 2013).

Effectiveness is the ability to plan, organize and coordinate many and often-conflicting social energies in a single organization so adroitly (Adams 1963), cited in Besong (2001). It implies that, it is the right and duties attached to an individual irrespective of the gender of the incumbent. It could be identified as a plan proposed in advance and accomplished later but within a stipulated time or duration of school. Uche (2002) identified effectiveness in a series of his studies related to effectiveness, that it is a symbol of good administrative style of the incumbent, team work, morale or motivation of staff, good teaching conducive social climate and counseling as well as rules and regulations. The principal's ability to control and maintain school facilities, initiates projects and completes both the new ones and also those abandoned by his predecessor(s) is exemplary of effectiveness.

2.4.2. Factors influencing Effectiveness

The effectiveness of teaching learning is more influenced by teacher-related, school-related and learner related factors. A positive attitude toward teaching style leads to higher achievement and teaching learning performance (Paswan and Young, 2002; Young et al., 2003). A higher degree of pedagogical affect leads to higher perceived learning. These indicate that teachers teaching approach and the school facilities lead learner achievement to the higher rate.

2.4.2.1. Teacher-related: Qualification, Experience and Motivation.

Teachers' qualification, experiences and motivations are some teacher-related factors which influence teaching effectiveness. In many countries teacher qualifications that are considered to be related to student learning have become desirable targets of teacher education reform. Some of these reforms call for the professionalization of teacher education by making it longer, upgrading it to graduate programs, and regulating it through mechanisms of licensure, certification, and promotion aligned with standards. Studies on the effect of teachers experience on student learning have found a positive relationship between teacher effectiveness and their years of experience, but not always a significant or an entirely linear one.

The evidence currently available suggests that while in experienced teachers are less effective than more senior teachers, the benefits of experience appear to level off after a few years (Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2000). The study of transformational leadership theory emphasizes principal work to inspire and motivate, develop commitment to a common vision, and work collaboratively. Recent studies, however, have tended to find very small effects of transformational leadership behaviors, particularly as compared to instructional leadership (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Robinson et.al, 2008), reinforcing instructional leadership as the main lens through which to consider principal effectiveness.

2.4.2.2. School-related: Principal Support and Resources

Principal Support by providing resources, financial planning, supervision etc. are school-related factors that influence teaching. In order to facilitate teaching schools should full of resource and principals support and engage teachers by frequent supervision. Principals build trust by supporting and nurturing teacher development by providing feedback that helps teachers to improve. This is more likely to occur when principals exercise the collegiality of leadership. Additionally, principals are in the best position to help teachers improve in areas of weakness and can accomplish this through observations

and dialogue that shows respect for teachers as professionals (Cooper, Ehrensals, & Bromme, 2005).

2.4. 2.3. Learner-related: Ability, Interest and Effort.

Ability is the ease with which an individual is able to perform a movement or routine. We often call these individual gifted or talented as they often show ease and precision when executing a skill. Ability can also be seen in the way in which an individual is able to learn and implement new skills. Ability incorporates a range of factors, such as sense of acuity, perception, reaction time and intelligence, which combine to allow the individual to do readily what is intended.

Student interest reflects input into the course, such as attention level in class, interest in learning the material, perception of a course's intellectual challenge, and acquired competence in the field. Student interest facilitates effective teaching and creates a more favorable learning environment (Marsh and Cooper, 1981). Students reject a learning environment that runs contrary to their preferences (Hsu, 1999). When learners are more interested, they perceive themselves as learning more (Tynjala, 1999), and this would reflect their overall evaluation of the learning process. Higher student interest leads to higher perceived learning.

When satisfactory success in a cognitive task is perceived to be challenging but probable and attainable, learners with low expertise would invest more cognitive effort. Less effort would be invested if the task is perceived to be either unchallenging or improbable and unattainable. In a relevant study by Schnotz and Rasch (2005), low expertise students demonstrated low performance in learning with animated pictures when they found a given task too easy. As the animation made the task unchallenging, they did not have to engage in more cognitive processing to construct mental representations on their own. Cooper et al. (2001) also confirmed that the presentation of animation usually lead low-expertise students to exert less cognitive effort and less time to construct mental representations and learn.

2.4.3. Development of a Positive School Climate.

School climate is an important ingredient that relates to the productivity and well-being of staff members, parents or guardians, and students. The principal, more than any other individual is responsible for the climate in the school. As an instructional leader, he is the key figure in promoting an academic learning environment within the school that is conducive to student learning. Promoting an academic learning climate, according to Murphy (1990), has to do with the behaviors of the principal that influences the norms, beliefs, and attitudes of the teachers, students, and parents. Since good teacher morale and high student achievement go hand in hand, the school principal has to make the school environment conducive and motivate teachers on their job to indirectly promote students' achievement and bring about school improvement.

2.4.3.1. Communicating school goals and vision

School principals communicate school goals or visions in many different ways. Among these are communicating goals through faculty meetings and Departmental chair meetings. They communicate them through individual meetings such as follow up conference to classroom observations. Frequent communication of school goals by instructional leaders promotes accountability, a sense of personal ownership and instructional improvements.

The function of communicating school goals refers to the ways the principal expresses importance of the school goals to staff, parents and students. With regard to the communication of school visions and goals, Hoy (2003) explained that principals have to communicate clear vision on instructional excellence and continuous professional development. This is one of the instructional leadership practices at school level.

Sheppard (1996) made it clear in his study that communication of school goals by the principal has a significant positive relationship with teacher classroom innovativeness, which in turn can contribute to school improvement. He found out that, at the high school level, communication of school goals by the principal accounted for the largest amount of variance in classroom innovativeness. The communication of school goals by the

principal gives confidence to teachers to use more reflection, which may lead to teachers adjusting their instructional techniques to address different learning needs of students (Blasé & Roberts, 1994).

2.4.3.2. Promoting collaborative problem solving

Creating a collaborative environment has been described as the “single most important factor” for successful school improvement initiatives. Virtually all contemporary school reformers call for increased opportunities for teacher collaboration. Student achievement is likely to be greatest where teachers and administrators work together, in small groups and school-wide, to identify sources of student success and then struggle collectively to implement school improvement. Creating and sustaining change requires creating a critical mass of educators within the school who are willing and able to function as change agents.

2.4.3.3. Providing Incentive for Teachers (Motivation).

All good schools are likely to have staff members who are motivated to do their best. Sometimes people are surprised why some schools are staffed by highly motivated, energetic persons while others are not. Sybouts and Wendel (1994) have the following to say regarding this: “Very likely, the principals of good schools have a high level of personal motivation and have discovered ways of capitalizing upon motivated staff members and maintaining their motivation at high levels” (p.130). Different organizations use incentives such as praise, good working conditions, material rewards, pride in work completed, and emotional attachment to the organization, and positive working relationships with colleagues to motivate employees. Providing incentives for teachers is a strategy principals can use to motivate teachers to change their instructional practices.

Blase and Roberts (1994) found that principals motivate teachers to try instructional strategies through rewards such as praise and material rewards. So a school principal as an instructional leader need to identify the motivation level of his/her staff and use various mechanisms to stimulate them. Motivation is more of intrinsic by its nature. What

is expected of a principal is doing his/her best to motivate the work force if they want them put forth their knowledge and efforts for the attainment of the required organizational goals.

2.4.4. Planning and Implementing Instructional Support System

2.4.4.1. Allocating and Providing Resources

Among the roles played by the school principal is the allocation of resources to the instructional activities. Those who work in schools as teachers and associate staff, school premises, furniture, books and equipment all provide some of the means by which we transform our hopes and aspirations for student's education into daily learning opportunities and experiences and, beyond that, into the longer-term outcomes of schooling (Thomas and Martin, 2003). As indicated earlier, the prime and crucial activity of a principal should be instruction or teaching and learning. Hence, school principals are expected to exercise their responsibilities for resource management by giving due attention to the instructional aspect.

Lack of resources may hamper teachers not to use different instructional strategies to bring about quality education. If this is the case, principals also face challenges and may not achieve their objectives for school improvement.

Providing resources is viewed by teachers as effective leadership by principals (McGhee and Lew, 2007). That is to say, those principals who gave more attention to instruction in the provision of resources were viewed by teachers as strong instructional leaders.

2.4.4.2. Supervising and Evaluating Instruction

The supervision of instruction by the school principal is among his roles/practices as an instructional leader. As an instructional leader, he/she needs to follow up the day to day activities of teachers and supervision is the major instrument for this. The instructional leader's repertoire of instructional practices and classroom supervision offers teachers the needed resources to provide students with opportunities to succeed.

A study of primary school effectiveness in Burundi documents a strong and significant relationship between the frequency of teacher supervision by the school principal and student achievement: student test scores rose as the number of times the school principal visited the classroom increased (Sindhvad, 2009).

2.4.4.3. Promoting the Conduct of Action Research

Unlike the traditional approach of acquiring knowledge using various means like insightful observation, experience, and intuitive learning (all of which are unscientific), the contemporary approach to problem solving relies on the collection, analysis and interpretation of data. Action research is one of those terms that we hear quite often in today's educational circles. Typically, action research is undertaken in a school setting. It is a reflective process that allows for inquiry and discussion components of the "research." Action research provides teachers and administrators with an opportunity to understand what happens in their school. This process establishes a decision-making cycle that guides instructional planning for the school and individual classrooms. Creating the need for research and establishing an environment for conducting classroom action research is the responsibility of a school administrator (Ferrance, E. 2000).

A principal's support of any new initiative is crucial in order for the practice to be sustained and influence student learning. Often, action research is a collaborative activity among colleagues searching for solutions to everyday, real problems experienced in schools, or looking for ways to improve instruction and increase student achievement. In a school environment, the term action research is the research that teachers carry out to examine their teaching processes and the results of these processes with the primary focus of improving their instruction. As one of their major roles, principals need to promote the practice research in general and that of action research in particular

To make this operational in their schools, principals need to fulfill the following (Ferrance, E. 2000):

First, they themselves need to have the skill and knowledge of conducting research and updating themselves with the new and modern technology. Before urging others towards the activity, it is wise to evaluate oneself on this basis as an instructional leader and take

the necessary remedial action. Second, they need to encourage their staff to jointly do action research on sensitive educational problems. The encouragement ranges from giving the required technical assistance to the provision of the necessary financial and material resources. In some schools, it is not uncommon to observe the principals urging teachers to conduct research but retreat when the question of financial or material support comes. Those leaders need to know that school effectiveness can best be achieved through the actions taken based on research findings. Further, the provision of technical assistance is very important especially in aiding the newly employed teachers. Thirdly, principals need to organize special occasions (for instance workshops and experience sharing programs) on which teachers share the findings of their research with other staff members. This allows for constructive comments and also encourages others to conduct research on any topic of their interests. Lastly, principals need to choose some research works that can serve as exemplary and reward. It is better if they also cite those works as example on different occasions so that the staff members will be motivated (Ferrance, E. 2000).

2.4.4.4. Promoting the Continuous Professional Development

Among the role of an instructional leader is promoting school wide professional development. If the intention of the principal is to get school improvement programs implemented and if his/her target is to provide quality education for all students, one of the major and most important concerns should be promoting school-wide continuous professional development (CPD). Hence, a school principal as an instructional leader needs to motivate all individuals who are eligible to take part in CPD program and work with them.

According to the Ethiopian Ministry of Education (MoE, 2009), the aim of CPD is to improve teachers' performance in the classroom in order to raise student achievement and learning because, directly or indirectly, there is a link between students' result and teachers' performance. CPD is a career long process of improving knowledge, skills, and attitudes centered on the local context and particularly classroom practices. Therefore, attracting, retaining, and developing teachers across the professional life cycle have

become policy priorities in many countries (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development/OECD, 2005).

2.4.4.5. Engaging in Curriculum Development Activities.

Curriculum development is among the major activities of an instructional leader. The school principals should know that the existing curriculum is in agreement with the needs of the students or the community. They need to assess this on a regular basis. Curriculum can be defined as the total learning experience of pupils under the auspices and guidance of the school. Tanner and Tanner (1995) defined curriculum as “plan or program of all experiences which the learner encounters under the direction of a school” (p.158). Generally, it is the totality of the experiences of children for which schools are responsible. It consists of an interrelated set of plans and experiences which a student completes under the guidance of the school. From the definitions, it can be deduced that curriculum is a planned activity comprising content and the experience of the learner. This valuable experience should be designed and developed jointly. It is a cooperative process involving all, who have an influence on the instruction. Hence, school principals need to involve staff members, pupils, parents and appropriate lay citizens in the development of curriculum at the school level. Staff involvement is essential if curriculum improvement is to become a reality (Telfer, 2010).

The school administrator who fails to recognize this concept will in fact fail to provide the instructional program to meet the challenge of the changing social, political, and economic order of modern times. Daily, school leaders face problems for which they must find answers or provide solutions. These problems may include developing an in-service education program for their building, selecting new text materials, or charting the course of the social studies program (Telfer, 2010). School principals as instructional leaders are required to involve the staff and the community in the planning, implementation and evaluation of curriculum. They also need to examine political, social, economic, technological, and environmental factors having, influence on curriculum design.

2.4.4.6. Engaging in Consolidating School-Community Linkage

One of the major tasks of an instructional leader is creating a good linkage with the local community because schools exist in the heart of each community. Adelman and Taylor (2008) concede that schools are more effective and caring places when they are an integral part of the community. This contributes to enhanced academic performance, fewer discipline problems, higher staff morale, and wide use of resources. School-community links are mutually beneficial relationship in which the principal can play a leading role. The nature of the relationship between the school and the community ultimately has an impact on the learning that takes place in the school and the community. If properly approached, community members can do a lot for school. For instance, they take part in school management functions, in contributing resources, in recruiting volunteers, in contributing their ideas and labor (Adelman and Taylor, 2008).

Parents and the community can take part in different school committees like parent teacher association, school improvement committee, school fund raising committee, school day program coordinating committee and the likes. Schools can hardly meet their target without involving the community in school activities. Good school principals use community partnership as a strategy for school improvement. The report of the study conducted by Sanders and Harvey noted that high performing schools make use of their communities and reach out beyond the schools' walls (Sanders and Harvey, 2003).

Further Studies conducted in the United States showed that strong district involvement in curriculum and instruction that supports principals' instructional goals is one aspect of an effective school (Leithwood, Strauss, & Anderson, 2007). However, district involvement (as mentioned by the above writers) is dependent upon the principal's power within the district. In addition, they explained that principals of effective schools are effective within the community. They understand community power structures and maintain appropriate relations with parents. The community can also help the school by contributing financial and material resources. This is particularly the case in some rural areas where the government's budget was very less to support schools.

Experienced principals use community as a source of resource for their schools and find various means to attract them to the school compound. However, what should not be overlooked is that school-community relation is bidirectional. That is to say, schools should not solely seek support from the community. They should also be ready to support the community in their day-to-day life (MoE, 1999).

Community members can also contribute their own labor and ideas for the betterment of the school. In some local areas (Example Ethiopia) parents and the community assist with constructing schools, repairing classrooms, constructing houses for teachers and so on. They further help schools by taking part in labor education program together with teachers and students. The good ideas and constructive comments of the community are also the invaluable assets to schools. Hence, in order to ensure the provision of proper instruction and implement the school improvement program, school principals need to collaborate with, parents and the local community. For parents, collaboration with schools can strengthen their children, their families, their schools, and the community in which they live. Sanders (2001) also found that school-community partnership activities were variously used as strategies for student and family support, school improvement, and community development. Researchers, practitioners, and policy makers in education also underscore the value of the partnership and importance of community involvement for more effective schooling.

2.5. Effectiveness of School Principals in Facilitating Teaching and Learning: Experiences from the World, Africa and Ethiopia

According to the National Governors Association/NGA (2003), effective principals bring to their schools innovative individuals and innovative ideas, programs, and instructional strategies that can improve teaching while maintaining a coherent reform agenda. They also engage teachers, parents, and community members as collaborators and leaders in school improvement efforts. Different writers have also expounded on the relationship between instructional leadership and school effectiveness/improvement. For instance, as to Findley and Findley (1992), the improvement observed in a school is directly or indirectly linked to principal's leadership roles, particularly in the area of instruction.

In the words of Flath (1989, p. 20), "Research on effective schools indicates that the principal is pivotal in bringing about the conditions that characterize effective schools". If our goal is to have effective schools, then we must look at different ways to emphasize instructional leadership, which is strongly linked to school improvement.

In Ethiopia, a School Improvement Program (SIP) was initiated on a pilot base in 2006 as part of the General Education Quality Improvement Program (GEQIP), as indicated in ESDP IV (MoE, 2011). Following the educational decentralization system in the country, high emphasis has been given to lower levels. Authority for making decisions for school improvement is devolved to the school-level which puts unprecedented pressure on school principals to be accountable for the quality of education provided by their school.

Evidence suggests that principals' attitudes and behaviors play a large role in shaping how schools create a context in which students can effectively learn. There is a growing consensus regarding the knowledge, skills, and dispositions commonly found among effective principals (Leithwood et al., 2004). Facilitating and supporting teaching and learning and implementing strategies that focus on ongoing school improvement have become centrally important elements of both the emergent professional standards that guide administrative development and practice and the increasingly diverse range of principal preparation and professional development programs nationwide. However, little is known about how to help principals develop the capabilities to influence how schools function or what students learn. Most empirical literature in the field tracks the structures, processes, and methods used to prepare prospective administrators and relies heavily on self-reports individual perceptions, and personal testimonies (Murphy & Vriesenga, 2004).

In Africa, study shows Principals skill and school effectiveness are related. Akinola Oluwatoyin Bolanle (2013) find out the leadership skills possessed by Principals of public secondary schools and the relationship between these leadership skills and school effectiveness in terms of student academic achievement.

School effectiveness is the extent to which the set goals or objectives of a school programs are accomplished. A school would be regarded as effective if "school processes result in observable positive outcomes among its students, consistently over a period of time" (Iyer, 2011, p.4).

The parameters for measuring the effectiveness of a secondary school include the level of discipline tone of the school, school climate, teachers' performance and the number of students who successfully pass their school leaving certificate examinations (Purkey and Smith, 1983; Hargreaves, 1995).

Educational leadership has been found to be an important characteristic of school effectiveness (Andrews & Soder, 1987; Kythreotis, Pashiardis & Kyriakides, 2010). This leadership is portrayed by the leadership skills the principal as the educational leader of the school exhibits. A skilled and competent principal is one who facilitates the use of the inputs to the school, in order to ensure the achievement of desired goals. She/he is the one who oversees all the processes involved in the running of the school for overall effectiveness. Leadership skills are "the learned ability to bring about pre-determined results with maximum certainty often with minimum use of time..., energy or both" (Knapp, 2007, p.1). Educational reform efforts in developed countries have focused on the significance of the leadership role and skills of the principal for the achievement of school effectiveness (Sergiovanni, 1994; Short and Greer, 1997; Kochamba and Murray, 2010). Principals as leaders who are in a position to influence others must have the skills that will make them take advantage of that position (Schlechty, 1990). We can therefore conclude that school effectiveness would depend on the competence of a principal. To be competent as school leaders, principals need the requisite leadership skills.

CHAPTER THREE

3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

The main objective of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of principals in facilitating teaching and learning in secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone. The design chosen for the study was mixed. Best and Kahn (2003) state that descriptive research is also concerned with conditions or relationships that exist, opinions that are held, processes that are going on, and effects that are evident or trends that are developing. Moreover, in order to collect more in-depth information on the area under investigation, qualitative data gathering method was used by employing interview and focus group discussion and Quantitative data gathering method was used for questionnaire.

3.2. Description of the study site

Horo Guduru Wollega is one of the Zones found in Oromia regional state bounded by Amhara regional state in north, west Showa in east, in west and south by east Wollega. The zone has approximately 82,348,330 hectares of area. Around 85% of the population depends on farming land and raring cattle. According to 1999 national counting information the number of male was 322,494, and of female was 327,701 and total population of 650,195. The popular language in the zone is Afan Oromo. The climatic condition of the study area is dega 37.39%, weyine dega 54.75% and kola (desert) 7.86%. Its astronomical location is 37⁰07min longitude and 9⁰34min latitude and found at 2457m altitude. Shanbu is the Zonal capital and is located 600 km away from Addis Ababa.

(Source: Information and communication Beauru of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone).

3.3. Sources of data

In this study, primary sources of data were used to investigate the issue under consideration.

3.3.1. Primary sources of data

The sources of primary data were school principals, department heads, teachers, and supervisors. This was because their day to day activity was related to the objectives of the study.

3. 4. Population, Sample size and Sampling techniques

3.4.1. Population

The population of the study was all 36 secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone, All 293 teachers, the selected ten schools, ten principals, ten academic vice principals, five supervisors, and totally 40 department heads of the selected schools.

3.4.2. Sample size and sampling technique

Horo Guduru Wollega Zone has 36 secondary schools found in 10 woredas. Among woredas, 5 were selected and 2 schools from each woredas and total of 10 schools were selected which covers 30% of the total secondary schools in the zone. As Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2009) suggested regarding size determination, at least 10% of the population is a good representation where the population is large and 20 % and above is used when the population is small. Then since the population was small the researcher used 30% of total secondary schools and 50% of total woredas. Since the woredas and the schools had almost similar characteristics Simple random sampling technique were used to select 5 sample woredas and 2 schools from each woredas. With regard to this, Cresswell (2005:133), stated that in a simple random sampling technique, every individual has equal chance of being and the chance of one individual does not affect the chance of another individual.

Accordingly, the selected woredas were Horro, Jimma Rare, Guduru, Abay Choman and Ababo Guduru. The respective secondary schools were Sekela and Chambe from Horro, Wayu and Goban from Jima Rare, Kombolcha and Tulu Abib from Guduru, Achane and Agamsa from Abay Choman, Dadu and Kawo from Ababo Guduru.

The subjects of the study were school principals. Since there were 10 principals and 10 vice principals in 10 selected schools, one principal and one vice principal were selected from the 10 schools adding up to 20. The vice principals for the academic affairs were selected by available sampling for inclusion in the study because academic vice principal is more closely related to instructional activities.

In order to enhance data obtained about the role of principal play in facilitating teaching and learning, supervisors, department heads, and teachers were used. Total numbers of supervisors in 5 woredas were 5. Thus, all the 5 supervisors working in the 5 woredas where the sample schools found were taken as samples by availability sampling.

Each of the schools selected for the study had 4 departments which add up to 40 in total. Considering the smaller size of departments and in order to obtain much richer data and information, all the 40 department heads were taken as respondents by using availability sampling method for the study. Populations of the study were shown as follows.

Table 1: Population and Samples of the Study

Participants	Population	Sample	Percent	Sampling technique	Data	
					gathering tools	Data type
Principals	24	20	83.3%	Available	Interview	Qualitative
Department heads	40	40	100%	Available	Questionnaire	Quantitative
Teachers	293	149	50.9%	simple random sampling	Questionnaire	Quantitative
Supervisors	5	5	100%	Available	Focus group discussion	Qualitative
Total	358	214	59.78%			

3.4. Instruments of Data Collection

Since the study was used both quantitative and qualitative methods, data were collected using questionnaires, interview and focus group discussions. Employing multiple instruments of data collection help to combine, strengthen and amend some of the inadequacies and for triangulation of data (Cresswell, 2005:62).

3.4.1. Questionnaire

Questionnaire was selected as an instrument since it helps to collect data in an effective and manageable way from a relatively large population. As suggested by Morrison and et,al (2000), questionnaire is a most widely used and useful instrument for collecting survey information, providing structured, often numerical data, being able to administer without the presence of the researcher, and often being comparatively straight forward to analyze.

Questionnaires were used to collect information from 147 teachers and 40 department heads. The questionnaire was developed based on basic research questions and the literature reviewed and constructed in English because secondary school principals and teachers were expected to be diploma, 1st degree, and 2nd degree holders. The questionnaires included both open and closed ended items. The closed-ended items was formulated in five point Liker scales (very low= 1, low =2, moderate =3, high= 4, and very high=5).Open-ended items were included the respondents to freely express their ideas.

3.4.2. Interview

Interview was selected as an instrument since it permits the exploration of issues, which might be too complex to investigate through questionnaires and also justified as it allows better chance to explain more explicitly what the respondent knows on the issue (Best and Kahn 2004). The interviews were used to collect information from all 20 school principals' (principals and academic vice principals). It was carried out in the school compound when they were free of work.

The interviews were developed based on the basic research questions and literature review. The interviews were two parts: the interviewees' personal characteristics and items relevant to effectiveness of principals in facilitating teaching and learning in secondary schools. First of all, contact was made with principals of each school by orienting the purpose of the study to create rapport with them. After securing necessary willingness the questionnaire was conducted.

3.4.3. Focus Group Discussion

Focus group discussion was selected as an instrument since it helps to collect a large amount of comparatively in-depth information from a larger number of discussants. As suggested by Krueger, (1988) a focus group discussion (FGD) is a good way to gather people from similar backgrounds or experiences to discuss a specific topic of interest. The group of participants was guided by a moderator (or group facilitator) who introduces topics for discussion and helps the group to participate in a lively and natural discussion amongst them.

The tool for the focus group discussions was developed based on the basic research questions. The source of the items was literature and basic research question. The focus group discussions were used to collect information from 5 supervisors. Supervisors of the Zone had meeting once per two month, then researcher was collected their ideas at that time.

3.5. Data collection procedures

At the beginning, contact was made with principals of each school by orienting purpose of the study to create rapport with them. After securing necessary willingness the current list of total population of the teaching staff was obtained. Then respondents who filled in the questionnaires were identified by simple random sampling techniques. The distribution, continuous follow up and the collection of questionnaires were made by the principals and unit leaders. To maximize the quality of responses of the respondents and the rate of return, convenient time gap was arranged. Interviews with principals was administered by the researcher, Focus group discussion with supervisors was organized

and administered by the researcher when they met during their two month meeting at Zone.

3.6. Pilot test

Checking the validity and reliability of data collecting instruments before providing for the actual study subject is the core to assure the quality of the data (Yalew, 1998). To ensure validity of instruments, the instruments were developed under close guidance of the advisor and, also a pilot study was carried out on 30 teachers of Shambu secondary school to pre-test the instrument. The pilot test was provided an advance opportunity for the investigator to check the questionnaires and to minimize errors due to improper design of instruments, such as problem of wording or sequence (Adams et al., 2007). After the dispatched questionnaires were returned, the necessary modification on 3 items, complete removal and replacement of 5 unclear questions were done. Additionally, the reliability of the instrument was measured by using a Cranach alpha test. A reliability test is performed to check the consistency and accuracy of the measurement scales. As explained by Drost (2004), if the result of Cranach's coefficient alpha is 0.7 and above it is considered to be satisfactory, indicating questions in each construct are measuring a similar concept. So, the results of Cranach's alpha of this study of all items ranged 0.720-0.840 this showed good reliability test, and then researcher distributed questionnaires of the main study for respondents.

Table 2: Reliability test results with Cronbach alpha.

No	Items	No of items	Cronbach alpha
1	Items related to school principals effectiveness in facilitating teaching learning	10	0.751
2	Extent of dimensions of effectiveness that affects teaching learning	11	0.742
3	Items related to creating positive teaching learning environment	8	0.840
4	Items related to Supervision and evaluation of instructional activities	12	0.720
5	Challenges that hamper school principals in facilitating teaching learning	5	0.830
Average reliability result			0.7766

3.7. Method of data analysis

The gathered data was classified and tallied in the respective groups and schools. Following that, the data of each group was arranged and organized in each tables and problem areas. Data obtained from open ended questions was used for interpreting the problem areas under consideration and for suggestions. Thus the organized data was analyzed and interpreted using descriptive statistics. Different statistical techniques were employed on the basis of the basic questions stated and on the nature of the data collected. The data collected through questionnaires was tabulated and analyzed by using frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation and t-test. The percentage was used to interpret the characteristics of the respondents. Mean and standard deviations were used for organizing and summarizing sets of numerical data collected by Likert type scales in the questionnaires. These mean and standard deviation were used because they were generally considered as the best measures of a sample record on a particular measure (Best and James, 2004). The t-test was also used to test whether there was any significance difference happened in responses of the two groups. To this end, descriptions

were made based on the results of the tables. The results that were obtained from the interviews and focus group discussion were used for the purpose of strengthening the analysis made based on the questionnaires.

3.8. Ethical Consideration

Attempts were made to formulate the research process professional and ethical. To this end, the researcher was tried to clearly inform to the respondents about the purpose of the study that is purely for academic reason. It was introduced its purpose in the introduction section of the questionnaire and interview guide to the respondents, the researcher was confirmed that subjects, confidentiality protected. In general, the researcher was not tried to personalize any of the reaction of the respondents during data presentations, analysis and interpretations. Besides, all the resources used for this research was appropriately acknowledged

Chapter Four

4. Data Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of Data

The purpose of this research was to investigate the effectiveness of school principals in facilitating teaching learning process in government schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone. To this end, a total of 149 questionnaires were distributed to 149 teachers and 40 department heads. The returned questionnaires were 182 (96.3%). Moreover, 20 school principals were interviewed and 5 supervisors were participated in focus group discussion. The data were analyzed in terms of the frequency, percentage, Mean scores and Standard Deviation. Subsequently, this chapter deals with presentation, analysis and interpretation of data collected on the effectiveness of school principals in facilitating teaching learning. It contains two major parts. The first part presents the characteristics of the respondents in terms of sex, age, academic qualifications and service years.

Item scores for each category were arranged under five rating scales. The range of rating scales were very low=1, low=2, moderate=3, high=4, very high=5. For the purpose of analysis, the above five rank responses of the questionnaire were grouped and labeled into three categories i.e. low, moderate and high. In categorizing the rating scales, the frequency and percentage results of 'very low' and 'low' were combined into 'low' and the results of 'very high' and 'high' combined into 'high'.

The second part deals with the results of findings from the data gathered through the questionnaire, interview and focus group discussion.

4.1. Characteristics of the respondents.

Table 3: Characteristics of respondents

No	Items	Characteristics	Respondents							
			Teachers		Department heads		Principals		Supervisors	
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Sex	Male	136	95.77	40	100	20	100	5	100
		Female	6	4.23	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Total	142	100	40	100	20	100	5	100
2	Age	21-25	21	14.79	-	-	-	-	-	-
		26-30	32	22.54	7	17.5	-	-	-	-
		31-35	34	23.94	12	30	9	45.83	1	20
		36-40	25	17.60	13	32.5	6	33.33	2	40
		41-45	16	11.27	6	15	3	12.5	2	40
		Over 45	14	9.86	2	5	2	8.33	-	-
		Total	142	100	40	100	20	100	5	100
3	Qualification	Diploma	7	4.93	-	-	-	-	-	-
		1 st Degree	130	91.55	38	95	20	95.8	4	80
		2 nd degree	5	3.52	2	5	-	4.2	1	20
		Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Total	142	100	40	100	20	100	5	100
4	Service Years	1-5	24	16.90	1	2.5	-	-	-	-
		6-10	39	27.46	3	7.5	2	8.3	-	-
		11-15	32	22.54	17	42.5	10	54.2	1	20
		16-20	25	17.61	14	35	6	29.1	1	20
		21-25	12	8.45	4	10	1	4.2	2	40
		26 & over	10	7.04	1	2.5	1	4.2	1	20
		Total	142	100	40	100	20	100	5	100

As presented in Table 3, 136(95.77%) of teachers and 40(100%) of department heads were males. Similarly, all the interviewers (supervisors) and principals (focus group discussion) were males. From this one can realize that the numbers of females in teaching secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone were much lower and no female in leadership position. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that, females were under represented in the secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone.

As table 3, item 2 above showed, 53(18.67%), 59(20.77%), 30(10.57%), of teachers' fall under the age range between 21-30, 31-40, 41 and above 45 years respectively. This

shows that the majority of teachers in the secondary schools of the sample schools were in the middle age and younger. Therefore, being in these age categories might help the teachers to work actively and facilitate the teaching learning. Similarly, 19(23.5%), 19(23.5%), 2(5%), of department heads age in the range of 26-35, 36-40, and above 45 respectively, and 1(20%), 2(40%), and 2(40%) of supervisors age fall in the range of 31-35, 36-40, 41-45, respectively. Hence, this might show that at this age level, they might have sufficient experience to play the leadership role.

Table 3 item 3 also depicted the qualification of respondents. Accordingly, 7(4.93%), 130(91.55%), and 5(3.52%) of teachers have diploma, 1st degree and 2nd degree holders respectively. Majority (91.55%) of teachers of secondary schools in sample schools were 1st degree holders. One of the most important indicators of quality education is the number of qualified teachers. According to the education and training policy, the minimum qualification requirement for teachers at secondary school is that teachers should have 1st degree in the subject they are assigned to teach (MoE, 1994). As depicted in table 3, 20(95.8%) of principals and 4(80%) of supervisors were 1st degree holders. From these facts, it is possible to deduce that the majority of principals and supervisors in secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega zone lacked the appropriate qualification (Master degree) required for the position they currently assigned. Therefore, it could be difficult for secondary school leaders to regulate and monitor quality of education without having appropriate qualification.

As indicated in table 3, item 4, 63(22.18%), 57(20.08%), 22(7.75%), of teachers fall in the range of service year 1-10, 11-20, 21 and above respectively. Accordingly, as the data revealed the majority of teachers were fall in the range 1-10 and 1-20 service years respectively. Therefore, at this age levels teachers are expected to be energetic, well induced and would have enough experience to be responsible for their job. Similarly, 17(42.5%), of department heads and 13(54.2%) of principals fall in 11-15 years of service respectively. Additionally, 5(100%) of supervisors within and above 11-15 years range of service, which indicated that the majority of department heads, principals and all supervisors in the secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone were well experienced and this might help them to contribute much to play the leadership role.

4.2. Presentation, analysis and discussion of the findings of the study.

This part of the study was devoted to the presentation, analysis and discussion of the data obtained from various groups of respondents in relation to the effectiveness of school principals in teaching learning in government schools of Horo Guduru Wellega zone. Teachers and department heads responded to 42 closed ended and 8 open ended questionnaires. The closed ended questionnaires were responded to and resulting answers interpreted in terms of mean scores and standard deviation. T-test was also computed to test the significance difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents (teachers and department heads). Item scores for each category were arranged under five rating scales. The range of rating scales were ≤ 1.49 =very low, 1.5-2.49=low, 2.5-3.49=moderate, 3.5-4.49=high, ≥ 4.5 =very high. For the purpose of analysis, the above five rank responses of the questionnaire were grouped with a mean value below 2.49 were rated as low performance in their level of application; mean value from 2.50 to 3.49 were rated as moderate performance and mean value from 3.50 to 5.00 were labeled in the category of high performance. Finally, the data obtained from the interview and focus group discussions were presented and analyzed qualitatively to substantiate the data collected through the questionnaires and to validate the findings of the study.

4.2.1. School principals' practices in facilitating teaching learning.

Teachers and department heads were asked to rate the extent to which efforts made by school principals in facilitating teaching learning. For the respondents; questionnaire, which had five rating scales were dispatched. The result was summarized in the following table.

Table: 4. View of teachers and department heads on School principals’ practices in facilitating teaching learning.

No	Items	Respo ndents				Overall X	P- Value
			No	X	S D		
1.1	Implementation of strategy through which teachers can acquire appropriate teaching methods	T	142	2.20	0.88	2.2	0.99
		D/H	20	2.20	1.10		
1.2	Encouraging teachers to use continuous assessment to enhance students’ performance	T	142	2.65	1.17	2.5	0.30
		D/H	20	2.35	1.38		
1.3	Promoting teachers’ training which enables them to have sufficient knowledge of subject matter.	T	142	2.42	1.16	2.24	0.19
		D/H	20	2.05	1.34		
1.4	Culture of public practice in teaching learning	T	142	2.24	1.14	2.22	0.88
		D/H	20	2.20	1.39		
1.5	Treating diversity in school equally	T	142	2.13	1.28	2.14	0.70
		D/H	20	2.25	1.25		
1.6	Creating of favorable working environment	T	142	2.13	1.15	2.24	0.45
		D/H	20	2.35	1.46		
1.7	Principals in relation to school community	T	142	2.19	1.25	2.3	0.49
		D/H	20	2.40	1.50		
1.8	Allocation of resources to support student and staff learning.	T	142	2.16	1.25	2.11	0.70
		D/H	20	2.05	1.05		

Key: SD=standard deviation, X=mean, p-value at $\alpha=0.05$ and degree of freedom=96, T=teachers, D/H=department heads. Scales; ≤ 1.49 =very low, 1.5-2.49=low, 2.5-3.49=moderate, 3.5-4.49=high, ≥ 4.5 =very high.

As Table 4 item 1 indicates, respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels on the implementation of strategy through which teachers can acquire teaching method. Accordingly, teachers with ($x=2.20$, $SD=0.88$) and department heads with ($x=2.20$, $SD=1.10$) were disagreed on implementation of strategy through which teachers can acquire appropriate teaching methods. The overall mean 2.20 also shows the disagreement of the majority of respondents with the issue. The significant value (p-value) is 0.99 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the

two groups. Similarly, fifteen interviewers responded that principals were not implementing the strategy through which teachers can acquire appropriate teaching methods; because of most teachers had less interest to accept the strategy from principals and five of them agreed as the principals implement the strategy because of ignorance of teachers. FGD also responded that principals and teachers had no interest to implement the strategy. Thus, it can be said that teachers were not satisfied with effectiveness of principals in implementation of strategy through which teachers can acquire appropriate teaching methods. It is possible to conclude that acquiring of teaching method was not implemented properly in selected secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone. Supporting this idea, literature revealed that teachers need to have an adequate academic and professional knowledge and also they are required to apply appropriate teaching methods that help in teaching large and diversified class room (MoE,2007).

With regards to item 2 of table 4, one of the questions raised to respondents was whether or not principals encourage teachers to use continuous assessment to enhance students' performance. Teachers with ($x=2.65$, $SD=1.17$) were agreed moderately about encouragement of teachers to use continuous assessment and department heads with ($x=2.35$, $SD=1.38$) were disagreed about the issue. The overall mean 2.5 shows the majority of the respondents were agreed about the issue moderately. The significance value (p-value) is 0.30 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the two groups. Based on this idea the interviewers (principals) and focus group discussion gave their idea as there was no continuous assessment due to large class size. As responded by 17 interviewers and FGD teachers were not interested to use continuous assessment because of large number of students in class.

As the responses to item 3 of table 4 indicated, respondents were asked whether or not principals promote teachers training which enables them to have sufficient knowledge of subject matter. Teachers and department heads with ($x=2.42$, $SD =1.16$) and ($x=2.05$, $SD=1.34$) respectively disagreed with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.19 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups regarding promoting training. According to seventeen interviewers' (principals') and focus discussion (supervisors) idea they responded as it needs budget

and schools has no budget to train teachers. In this regard, Harris (2005) confirms that school leadership must build the capacity by developing the school as a learning environment. Katz (in Wossenu, 2006) also asserted that quality school leaders understand teaching learning and respected by their staff; and these persons are willing to hold themselves and others responsible for student learning and enhancing the capacity of teachers to meet this goal. Therefore, it is possible to conclude from the result that school leaders in secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone were not sufficiently promoting teachers training and this might affect the teaching learning because unless teachers develop their capacity they might not be competent enough and teach as expected.

Regarding the culture of public practice in teaching learning, on Table 4 item 4, teachers and department heads with the ($x=2.24$, $SD=1.14$) and ($x=2.20$, $SD=1.39$) respectively disagreed with the issue. The overall mean 2.22 also shows the disagreement of the majority of the respondents with the issue. From this one can conclude that the cultures of public practices were not practiced satisfactorily in teaching learning by school principals. The significance value (p-value) is 0.88 greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups.

Regarding to item 5 of table 4, respondents were asked to rate their agreement whether or not school principals treat diversity in school. Accordingly, teachers with the ($x=2.13$, $SD=1.28$) and department heads with the ($x=2.25$, $SD=1.25$) were disagreed with the issue that principals tree diversity in school. The overall mean 2.14 shows the disagreement of the majority of respondents with the issue. From this one can conclude that principals were not treating diversity in school. The significance value (p-value is 0.70 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups.

In the six item of table 4, respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels whether or not school principals create favorable working environment with ($x=2.13$, $SD=1.15$) and department heads with ($x=2.35$, $SD=1.46$) were disagreed with the issue. The overall mean 2.25 shows the disagreement of the majority of respondents with the issue. Regarding this idea literature revealed that effective schools share a set of characteristics

that add up to an environment that raises students' achievement. By setting goals to improve a school's environment, principals, teachers, school councils, parents and other community members can make their schools more effective places in which to learn (EIC, 2000). The significance value (p-value) is 0.45 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups regarding creation of favorable working environment.

With regard to item 7 of table 4, respondents were asked to rate their agreement whether or not school principals had relation with school community. Accordingly, teachers with ($x=2.19$, $SD=1.25$) and department heads with ($x=2.40$, $SD=1.50$) disagreed with the issue. The overall mean 2.30 shows the disagreement of the majority of the respondents with the issue. This shows that the relationship of principals with the school community was not satisfactory. The significance value (P-value) is 0.49 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups. Interviewers and focus group discussions gave their idea as the community has less interest to work with school and they replied as the community considered the mandate to support their children is in the hand of teachers and in the hand government.

With regard to item 8 of table 4, respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels on principals allocation of resources to support students and staff. The majority of teachers with ($x=2.16$, $SD=1.25$) and department heads with ($x=2.05$, $SD=1.05$) were disagreed with the issue. The overall mean 2.11 shows the majority of the respondents disagreed with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.70 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions the two groups. From this one can conclude that school principals were not allocating resources to support students and staff properly.

4.2.2. Extent of practices that affects teaching learning.

Table: 5. View of teachers and department heads on Extent of practices that affects teaching learning.

No	Items	Resp				Over all X	P-Value
		nts	No	X	SD		
2.1	Lack of school principals to take their time in improving the instruction	T	142	2.23	1.06	2.34	0.39
		D/H	20	2.45	1.39		
2.2	Lack school principals to work actively to ensure highest academic achievement of students?	T	142	2.67	1.15	2.24	0.002
		D/H	20	1.80	1.06		
2.3	Lack of school principals to make significant effort to enhance continuous professional development of teachers?	T	142	2.34	1.21	2.25	0.51
		D/H	20	2.15	0.98		
2.4	Lack of school principals in motivating teachers to evaluate curriculum.	T	142	3.18	1.20	2.74	0.003
		D/H	20	2.30	1.41		
2.5	Lack of treating cultural and linguistic diversity.	T	142	2.39	1.45	2.32	0.69
		D/H	20	2.25	1.25		
2.6	Lack of school principals' work to make the community active participant in problem solving of academic activities.	T	142	2.37	1.15	2.31	0.66
		D/H	20	2.26	1.11		
2.7	Lack of school principals to encourage participation of parents in the management of the school.	T	142	2.79	1.19	2.55	0.09
		D/H	20	2.30	1.21		
2.8	Lack of school principals to encourage parents to support the school with important resources.	T	142	2.62	1.01	2.24	0.002
		D/H	20	1.85	1.04		

Key: SD=standard deviation, X=mean, p-value at $\alpha=0.05$ and degree of freedom=96, T=teachers, D/H=department heads. Scales; ≤ 1.49 =very low, 1.5-2.49=low, 2.5-3.49=moderate, 3.5-4.49=high, ≥ 4.5 =very high.

As Table 5 item 1 indicates, respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels on whether or not school principals take their time in improving the instruction. Consequently, teachers and department heads with the ($x=2.23$, $SD=1.060$) and ($x=2.45$, $SD=1.39$) respectively were disagreed with the issue. The overall mean 2.34 also shows the disagreement of the majority of respondents with the issue. The significance value (p -value) is 0.39 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups. Similarly, focus group discussion responded with the issue that, principals take majority of their time on political issue rather than academic issue. Principals also replied as there was a problem of principals to take their time in instruction due to work load, political influence of woreda education bureau, unrelated qualification which made them less confidence. Thus, regarding this idea, literature revealed that a school principal is the pivotal point within the school that affects quality of individual teachers' instruction (Maushbach and Mooney, 2008). Therefore, as the finding revealed, school principals of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone were performed at low levels in implementing teaching and learning domain.

As indicated in item 2 of the table 5, teachers and department heads were asked whether or not school principals work actively to ensure highest academic achievement of students with ($x=2.67$, $SD=1.15$) of teachers were no sure about the issue and department heads with ($x=1.80$, $SD=1.06$) were disagreed with the issue. The significance value (p -value) is 0.002 is less than 0.05 shows there is significance difference between the opinions of the two groups. Regarding this idea, literature revealed that effective school principals use analysis of best practice in education that to be responsive and proactive in changing schools to prepare students for the future in which they live and they focus on students' achievement and measure success in terms of positive students out comes (Chance as cited in Tigistu, 2012).

As it can be observed from table 5 item 3, respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels on effort of school principals to enhance continuous professional development. Accordingly, teachers with ($x= 2.34$, $SD=1.21$) and department heads ($x=2.15$, $SD=0.98$) were disagreed with the issue that the effort of principals to enhance continuous professional development of teachers. The overall mean 2.25 also shows the

disagreement of the majority of the respondents with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.51 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups. Regarding professional development, Hopkins et al, (in Harris, 2002) explained that an essential component of successful school improvement interventions is the quality of professional development and learning.

With regard to item 4 of table 5, question raised for respondents to rate whether or not school principals motivate teachers to evaluate curriculum. Teachers with ($x=3.18$, $SD=1.20$) were not sure about the issue and department heads with ($x=2.30$, $SD=1.41$) were disagreed with the issue. The overall mean 2.74 shows the uncertainty of the majority of the respondents with the issue. Regarding this idea, literature revealed that teachers should understand the curriculum and use additional materials in the class room to improve student learning. One of the key responsibilities of teachers is to study the curriculum and develop supplementary materials for use in the class room and it is important for schools to provide the time and support that teachers need to develop these supplementary materials (MoE, 2007). The significance value (p-value) is 0.003 is less than 0.05 shows there is significance difference between the opinions of the two groups.

With regard to item 5 of table 5 above, question raised for respondents to rate their agreement whether or not school principals treat cultural and linguistic diversity. Accordingly, teachers with ($x=2.39$, $SD=1.45$) and department heads with ($x=2.25$, $SD=1.25$) were disagreed with the issue. The overall mean 2.32 also shows the disagreement of the majority of the respondents with the issue that school principals treat cultural and linguist diversity. The significance value (p-value) is 0.69 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups.

As shown in item 6 of table 5, respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels on school principals' work to make the community active participant in problem solving of academic activities. Accordingly, teachers with ($x=2.37$, $SD=1.15$) and department heads with ($x=2.26$, $SD=1.11$) were disagreed on school principals' work to make the community active participant in problem solving of academic activities. The overall mean 2.31 also shows the disagreement of the majority of the respondents with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.66 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance

difference between the opinions of the two groups. From this one can conclude that school principals in Horo Guduru Wollega Zone were not working with community.

As shown in item 7 of table 5, respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels whether or not school principal participate parents in the management of the school. Accordingly, teachers with ($x=2.79$, $SD=1.19$) were not sure about the issue and department heads with ($x=2.30$, $SD=1.21$) were disagreed with the issue. The overall mean 2.55 shows that the uncertainty of the majority of the respondents with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.09 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups.

With regard to item 8 of table 5, one of the questions raised to respondents was whether or not principals encourage parents to support the school with important resources. Teachers with ($x=2.62$, $SD=1.01$) were responded moderately with the issue and department heads with (1.85, $SD=1.14$) were disagreed with the issue. The overall mean 2.24 shows the disagreement of the majority of the respondents with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.002 is less than 0.05 shows there is significance difference between the opinions of the two groups. Regarding this idea, literature revealed that communities need to play important roles in all aspects of education from raising resources to managing schools (MoE, 2005). MoE (2006) also revealed that schools cannot succeed without the support of the parents and community.

4.2.3. Extent of school principals to create a positive teaching learning environment.

Table: 6. View of teachers and department heads on Extent of school principals to create a positive teaching learning environment.

No	Items	Respo ndents				Over all X	P- Value
			No	X	SD		
3.1	The extent to which school principals work to ensure security of the school for the students' learning	T	142	2.25	1.47	2.18	0.66
		D/H	20	2.10	1.33		
3.2	The extent to which school principals give attention to students safety	T	142	2.21	1.43	2.16	0.74
		D/H	20	2.10	0.96		
3.3	To what extent school principals help students in giving sustainable counseling services?	T	142	1.96	1.22	1.88	0.58
		D/H	20	1.80	0.89		
3.4	To what extent school principals create suitable Classrooms for student learning?	T	142	2.69	1.12	2.47	0.12
		D/H	20	2.25	1.41		
3.5	The extent to which school principals encourage collegial relationship among staff	T	142	2.23	1.35	2.22	0.96
		D/H	20	2.25	1.21		
3.6	To what extent school principals provide adequate school facilities that enable to facilitate teaching and learning process?	T	142	2.87	1.21	2.41	0.002
		D/H	20	1.95	1.19		
3.7	The extent to which school principals work to improve students disciplinary problems in school	T	142	2.82	0.89	2.51	0.007
		D/H	20	2.20	1.32		
3.8	The extent to which school principals are capable of creating good communication with the staff.	T	142	2.52	1.06	2.69	0.010
		D/H	20	1.85	1.23		

Key: SD=standard deviation, X=mean, p-value at $\alpha=0.05$ and degree of freedom=96, T=teachers, D/H=department heads. Scales; ≤ 1.49 =very low, 1.5-2.49=low, 2.5-3.49=moderate, 3.5-4.49=high, ≥ 4.5 =very high.

Regarding item 1 of table 6, respondents were asked to rate their agreement whether or not principals work to ensure security of the school for the students' learning. Teachers with ($x=2.25$, $SD=1.47$) and department heads with ($x=2.10$, $SD=1.33$) were disagreed with the issue. The overall mean 2.18 also shows the disagreement of the majority of the respondents with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.66 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups.

Regarding item 2 of table 6, respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels whether or not school principals give attention to students' safety. Teachers with ($x=2.21$, $SD=1.43$) and department heads with ($x=2.10$, $SD=0.96$) were disagreed with the issue. The overall mean 2.16 also disagreement of respondents with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.74 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups. Regarding this issue focus discussion responded that school principals give less attention and they ignore as it is not their duty about students safety. In addition to this the majority of the interviewers also support that safety of student is not only concern principals but also teachers, parents and all communities. Therefore, they ignore to keep students safety. In relation to this idea, literature revealed that effective schools share the following characteristics. These are: a clear and focused vision, a safe and orderly environment, a climate of high expectations for students' success, a focus on high levels of students' achievement that emphasizes activities related to learning (EIC, 2000). Hence from the result one can conclude that school leaders of secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone performed below average in giving attention to students' safety.

Regarding item 3 of table 6, respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels whether or not principals help students in giving suitable counseling services. Teachers with ($x=1.96$, $SD=1.22$) and department heads with ($x=1.80$, $SD=0.89$) were disagreed with the issue. The overall mean 1.88 also shows the disagreement of the majority of the respondents with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.58 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups. Therefore, it is possible to conclude from the result that principals of selected secondary

schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone were not effective in giving sustainable counseling services for students.

As indicated in item 4 of table 6, respondents were asked whether or not school principals create suitable class rooms for students learning. Accordingly, Teachers with ($x=2.69$, $SD=1.12$) were rated moderately and department heads with ($x=2.25$, $SD=1.41$) were disagreed with the issue that school principals create suitable class room for students learning. The overall mean 2.47 shows the disagreement of the majority of the respondents with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.12 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups.

As indicated in item 5 of table 6, respondents were asked to rate their agreement whether or not school principals encourage collegial relationship among staff. Accordingly, Teachers with ($x=2.23$, $SD=1.35$) and department heads with ($x=2.20$, $SD=1.20$) were disagreed with the issue. The overall mean 2.22 also shows the disagreement of the majority of the respondents with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.96 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups.

As indicated in item 6 of table 6, respondents were asked whether or not school principals provide adequate school facilities. Accordingly, Teachers with ($x=2.87$, $SD=1.125$) were rated moderately and department heads with ($x=1.95$, $SD=1.19$) were disagreed with the issue that school principals provide adequate school facilities. The overall mean 2.41 shows the disagreement of the majority of the respondents with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.002 is less than 0.05 shows there is significance difference between the opinions of the two groups.

As indicated in item 7 of table 6, respondents were asked whether or not school principals work to improve students' disciplinary problems in school. Accordingly, Teachers with ($x=2.82$, $SD=0.89$) were rated their agreement moderately and department heads with ($x=2.20$, $SD=1.32$) were disagreed with the issue. The overall mean 2.51 shows the majority of the respondents rated their agreement moderately with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.007 is less than 0.05 shows there is significance

difference between the opinions of the two groups. Therefore, as one could conclude from the result, school leaders of secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone fairly did in improving students' disciplinary problems. Thus, as the finding revealed, the performance level of school leaders of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone in implementing safe and healthy school environment domain was at medium or average level.

As indicated in item 8 of table 6, respondents were asked whether or not school principals had capable of creating good communication with the staff. Accordingly, Teachers with ($\bar{x}=2.52$, $SD=1.06$) were rated their agreement moderately and department heads with ($\bar{x}=1.85$, $SD=1.23$) were disagreed with the issue. The overall mean 2.19 shows the disagreement of the majority of the respondents with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.01 is less than 0.05 shows there is significance difference between the opinions of the two groups. Concerning this idea, literature revealed that, meaningful engagement and dialogue with staff in their day to day working lives facilitate effective communication (Duignan, 2006). Therefore, it is possible to conclude that secondary school principals of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone were in challenging as a result of insufficient communication among school leaders and the staff.

4.2.4. School principals' activities in relation to supervision.

Table: 7. View of teachers and department heads on School principals' supervision of class room.

No	Items	Respondents	No	X	SD	Overall X	P-Value
4.1	Arrangement of pre-classroom observation program with teachers	T	142	2.59	1.21	2.42	0.24
		D/H	20	2.25	1.16		
4.2	Duration of principals stay in classrooms for supervision	T	142	2.25	1.16	2.47	0.51
		D/H	20	2.68	1.12		
4.3	Provision of professionally useful comments after supervision	T	142	2.50	1.31	2.53	0.87
		D/H	20	2.56	1.06		
4.4	Frequency of principals supervisory visits	T	142	2.43	0.99	2.49	0.62
		D/H	20	2.55	1.19		
4.5	Encouragement of teachers to supervise each other/peer supervision/	T	142	2.45	1.15	2.38	0.59
		D/H	20	2.30	1.34		

Key: SD=standard deviation, X=mean, p-value at $\alpha=0.05$ and degree of freedom=96, T=teachers, D/H=department heads. Scales; ≤ 1.49 =very low, 1.5-2.49=low, 2.5-3.49=moderate, 3.5-4.49=high, ≥ 4.5 =very high.

In table 7 (item 1), respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement of pre- class room observation program with teachers. Thus, teachers with ($x=2.59$, $SD=1.21$) were rated their agreement moderately and department heads with ($x=2.25$, $SD=1.16$) were disagreed with the issue that principals arrange pre-class room observation with teachers. The overall mean 2.42 shows the disagreement of the majority of respondents with principals' arrangement of pre-class room observation program with teachers. The significance value (p-value) is 0.24 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups. The result of the study illustrated that principals were not made much effort arrangement of pre-classroom observation program with teachers.

In table 7 (item 2), respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement levels regarding duration of principals stay in class rooms for supervision. Thus, teachers with ($x=2.25$, $SD=1.16$) were disagreed with the issue and department heads with ($x=2.68$,

SD=1.12) were rated their agreement moderately with the issue. The overall mean 2.47 shows the disagreement of the majority of respondents with principals' arrangement of pre-class room observation program with teachers. The significance value (p-value) is 0.51 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups.

In table 7 (item 3), respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement levels regarding provision of professionally useful comments after supervision. Accordingly, teachers with ($x=2.50$, $SD=1.31$) and department heads with ($x=2.56$, $SD=1.06$) were rated their agreement moderately with the issue. The overall mean 2.53 also shows the majority of the respondents rated their agreement moderately. The significance value (p-value) is 0.87 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups. Therefore, based on the majority of the respondents, it can be concluded that principals provide professionally useful comments after supervision moderately (averagely).

In table 7 (item 4), respondents were asked whether or not principals supervise teachers frequently. Thus, teachers with ($x=2.43$, $SD=0.99$) were disagreed with the issue and department heads with ($x=2.55$, $SD=1.19$) were rated their agreement moderately with the issue. The overall mean 2.49 shows the disagreement of the majority of respondents with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.62 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups.

As indicated in item 5 of table 7, respondents were asked to rate their agreement whether or not school principals encourage teachers to supervise each other. Accordingly, Teachers with ($x=2.45$, $SD=1.15$) and department heads with ($x=2.30$, $SD=1.34$) were disagreed with the issue. The overall mean 2.38 also shows the disagreement of the majority of the respondents with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.59 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups.

4.2.5. School principals' evaluation of instructional activities.

Table: 8. View of teachers and department heads on School principals' evaluation of instructional activities.

No	Items	Respo ndents	No	X	SD	Overall X	P- Value
5.1	The principal observe teachers for professional development instead of evaluation	T D/H	142 20	2.43 2.15	1.09 1.34	2.29	0.30
5.2	The principal organize seminars with teachers to share their experience after supervision	T D/H	142 20	2.35 2.35	1.04 1.49	2.35	0.99
5.3	To what extent school principals motivate teachers for best performances?	T D/H	142 20	2.38 2.05	1.06 1.36	2.22	0.21
5.4	The extent to which school principals use feedback from stakeholders to motivate students for their best academic performance	T D/H	142 20	2.14 2.15	1.07 1.14	2.15	0.97
5.5	To what extent school principals facilitate provision of instructional materials for teachers?	T D/H	142 20	2.06 2.15	1.02 1.23	2.12	0.71
5.6	The extent to which school principals implement a strategy through which teachers can acquire appropriate teaching methods	T D/H	142 20	1.88 2.50	0.71 1.23	2.19	0.01
5.7	The extent to which school principals encourage teachers to understand the curriculum	T D/H	142 20	2.10 2.10	1.16 1.44	2.1	0.99

Key: SD=standard deviation, X=mean, p-value at $\alpha=0.05$ and degree of freedom=96, T=teachers, D/H=department heads. Scales; <1.49=very low, 1.5-2.49=low, 2.5-3.49=moderate, 3.5-4.49=high, ≤ 4.5 =very high.

With regard to item 1 of table 8, respondents were asked to rate their agreement whether or not school principals observe teachers for professional development instead of evaluation. Accordingly, Teachers with ($x=2.43$, $SD=1.09$) and department heads with ($x=2.15$, $SD=1.34$) were disagreed with the issue. The overall mean 2.29 also shows the disagreement of the majority of the respondents with the issue. The significance value (p-

value) is 0.30 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups.

As depicted in table 8 (item 2), teachers and department heads were asked to whether principals organize seminars with teachers to share their experience after supervision or not. Accordingly, Teachers with ($x=2.35$, $SD=1.04$) and department heads with ($x=2.35$, $SD=1.49$) were disagreed with the issue that principals organize seminars with teachers to share their experience after supervision. The overall mean 2.35 also shows the disagreement of the majority of the respondents with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.99 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups.

In table 8 item 3 above indicated that teachers and department heads were asked whether or not principals motivate teachers for best performance or not. Accordingly, Teachers with ($x=2.38$, $SD=1.06$) and department heads with ($x=2.05$, $SD=1.36$) were disagreed with the issue. The overall mean 2.22 also shows the disagreement of the majority of the respondents with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.21 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups of respondents. Supporting this idea, Sergiovanni (cited in Temesgen, 2011) explained that effective school leaders provide motivation and encouragement that lead to success and manage effectively in a changing educational environment. Therefore, as the result revealed, secondary school principals of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone were not sufficiently motivating teachers and this may affect the teaching learning.

In table 8 item 4 above indicated that teachers and department heads were asked whether or not principals use feedback from stakeholders to motivate students for their best academic performance. Accordingly, Teachers with ($x=2.14$, $SD=1.07$) and department heads with ($x=2.15$, $SD=1.14$) were disagreed with the issue. The overall mean 2.15 also shows the disagreement of the majority of the respondents with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.97 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups of respondents. Regarding this idea, (MoE, 2006) revealed that the school should communicate regularly with the community, and should receive positive and negative feedback at regular intervals.

In table 8 (item 5), respondents were asked whether or not school principals facilitate provision of instructional materials for teachers. Accordingly, Teachers with ($x=2.06$, $SD=1.02$) and department heads with ($x=2.15$, $SD=1.23$) were disagreed with the issue that school principals facilitate provision of instructional materials for teachers. The overall mean 2.12 also shows the disagreement of the majority of the respondents with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.71 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups of respondents.

In table 8 (item 6), respondents were asked whether or not school principals implement a strategy through which teacher can acquire appropriate teaching methods. Accordingly, Teachers with ($x=1.88$, $SD=0.71$) were disagreed with the issue and department heads with ($x=2.50$, $SD=1.23$) were rated their agreement moderately with the issue that school principals implement a strategy through which teachers can acquire appropriate teaching methods. The overall mean 2.19 also shows the disagreement of the majority of the respondents with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.01 is less than 0.05 shows there is significance difference between the opinions of the two groups of respondents. Supporting this idea, literature revealed that teachers need to have an adequate academic and professional knowledge and also they are required to apply appropriate teaching methods that help in teaching large and diversified classroom (MoE,2007).

With regard to item 7 of table 8, the question raised for respondents were whether or not school principals encourage teachers to understand the curriculum. Teachers with ($x=2.10$, $SD=1.16$) were disagreed with the issue and department heads with ($x=2.50$, $SD=1.23$) were rated their agreement moderately with the issue that principals encourage teachers to understand the curriculum. The overall mean 2.10 shows the disagreement of the majority of the respondents with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.99 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups of respondents. Regarding this idea, literature revealed that teachers should understand the curriculum, develop and use additional materials in the classroom to improve students' learning. One of the key responsibilities of teachers is to study the curriculum and develop supplementary materials for use in the classroom and it

is important for schools to provide the time and support that teachers need to develop these supplementary materials (MoE, 2007). Generally, as stated by interviewers and focus group discussion, there were many problems which hinder principals to facilitate teaching learning especially qualification of principals, political influence of government, lack of budget and less interest of community participation.

4.2.6. Major challenges that affects the practices of principals in facilitating teaching learning.

Table: 9. Major challenges in facilitating teaching learning.

No	Items	Respondents				Over all X	P-Value
			No	X	SD		
6.1	Lack of Principals skill in developing school goals	T	142	3.56	1.09	3.53	0.82
		D/H	20	3.50	1.25		
6.2	Incapable of principals in setting direction towards the achievement of anticipated goals.	T	142	2.13	1.24	2.44	0.06
		D/H	20	2.75	1.51		
6.3	Having unrelated qualification with school leadership.	T	142	2.23	1.20	2.19	0.78
		D/H	20	2.15	1.22		
6.4	Lack of effective communication.	T	142	2.83	1.32	2.69	0.37
		D/H	20	2.55	1.19		
6.5	Not being visionary leader	T	142	2.33	1.18	2.19	0.32
		D/H	20	2.05	1.09		
6.6	Pressures of work load.	T	142	3.13	1.24	2.89	0.11
		D/H	20	2.65	1.30		

Key: SD=standard deviation, X=mean, p-value at $\alpha=0.05$ and degree of freedom=96, T=teachers, D/H=department heads. Scales; <1.49=very low, 1.5-2.49=low, 2.5-3.49=moderate, 3.5-4.49=high, ≤ 4.5 =very high.

In table 9 item 1, respondents were asked to check whether or not there is lack of principals skill in developing school goals with teachers ($x=3.56$, $SD=1.09$) and department heads with ($x=3.50$, $SD=1.25$) shows the agreement of teachers and department heads very high with the issue that there is lack of school principals' skill in developing school goals. The overall mean 3.53 also shows the agreement of the respondents with the issue very high. The significance level ($p=0.82$) is greater than 0.05,

this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of teachers and department heads.

In table 9 item 2, respondents were asked whether or not there is incapability of principals in setting direction towards the achievement of anticipated goals. Accordingly, teachers with ($x=2.13$, $SD=1.24$) were disagreed with there is incapability of school principals in setting direction towards the achievement of anticipated goals and department heads with ($x=2.75$, $SD=1.51$) shows the agreement of the majority of the respondents with the issue that there is incapability of principals in setting direction towards the achievement of anticipated goals. The overall mean 2.44 shows the disagreement of the respondents with the issue. The significance level ($p=0.06$) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of teachers and department heads.

With regard to item 3 of table 9, respondents were asked whether or not school principals have unrelated qualification with school leadership. Teachers with ($x=3.64$, $SD=1.42$) and department heads with ($x=3.50$, $SD=1.45$) were agreed with the issue very high that principals have unrelated qualification with school leadership. The overall mean 3.57 also shows the agreement of the respondents with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.78 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups of respondents.

With regard to item 4 of table 9, respondents were asked whether or not school principals lack effective communication. Teachers with ($x=2.83$, $SD=1.32$) and department heads with ($x=2.55$, $SD=1.19$) were agreed moderately with the issue school principals lack effective communication. The overall mean 2.69 also shows the agreement of the respondents moderately with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.37 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups of respondents.

In table 9 item 5 above indicated that teachers and department heads were asked whether or not principals were not visionary leader. Accordingly, Teachers with ($x=2.33$, $SD=1.18$) and department heads with ($x=2.05$, $SD=1.09$) were disagreed with the issue

that school leaders were not visionary. The overall mean 2.19 also shows the disagreement of the majority of the respondents with the issue. The significance value (p-value) is 0.32 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups of respondents. Similarly, as stated by focus group discussion and interviewees, mentioned major challenges of effectiveness of principals as: work load, political influence, unrelated qualification of principals with leadership might affect effectiveness of principals.

Chapter Five

5. Summary, Conclusions and recommendations

This part of the study deals with the summary of the majority findings, general conclusion drawn on the bases of the findings and recommendations which were assumed to be useful to enhance the effectiveness of principals to facilitate teaching learning in government secondary schools of Horro Guduru Wollega Zone.

5.1. Summary of the findings

The main objective of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of school principals in facilitating the teaching learning in secondary schools of Horro Guduru Wollega Zone. To achieve this aim the following research questions were raised.

1. What are the leadership practices in facilitating teaching learning in secondary schools of Horro Guduru Wollega Zone?
2. To what extent do school principals create a positive teaching learning environment?
3. How do school principals supervise and evaluate instructional activities?
4. What are the major challenges that affect the leadership practices of principals in facilitating teaching learning?

To this effect, the study was conducted in ten secondary schools. Consequently, 149 teachers, 40 department heads, 20 principals and 5 supervisors were selected as a sample by the simple random sampling and availability respectively. For the study, primary sources of data were employed. The data was gathered through both quantitative and qualitative tools. Accordingly, 149 copies for teachers, 40 copies for department heads were distributed and 182 (96.3%) returned for analysis. On the other hand, to obtain qualitative data, interview sessions were conducted with 20 principals and 5 supervisors were participated in focus group discussion.

The quantitative data gathered through questionnaires were analyzed in frequency, percentage, mean scores and standard deviation. The chi-square test was also utilized to

check the statistical significance where there is difference or not between the opinions of the respondents assisted by a computer SPSS program version 16.0. Whereas, the qualitative data gathered through the interview and focus group discussion were analyzed by narration. Hence, the findings of the study were summarized as follows.

Results revealed regarding of school principals' practices to facilitate teaching learning in secondary schools of Horro Guduru Wollega Zone.

- Concerning the practices of dimensions effectiveness of secondary school principals were insufficient and low with their overall mean and standard deviations: implementation of strategy through which leaders can acquire appropriate teaching methods ($X=2.20$, $SD=0.99$), encouraging teachers to use continuous assessment ($X=2.50$, $SD=1.38$), promoting teachers training ($X=2.24$, $SD=1.25$), culture of public practice ($X=2.22$, $SD=1.27$), treating diversity equally ($X=2.14$, $SD=1.27$), creating of favorable working environment($X=2.24$, $SD=1.31$), community relation ($X=2.30$, $SD=0.38$), and allocation of resources ($X=2.11$, $SD=1.15$) shows unsatisfactory. Similarly, as information gathered from focus group discussion and interviewers; principals were performed below average regarding dimensions of effectiveness of principals in teaching learning.

Results revealed regarding the extent of secondary school principals practices that affects teaching learning.

- Concerning extent of principals' practices that affect teaching learning in secondary schools of Horro Guduru Wollega Zone were below average with their overall mean and standard deviations in: taking time in improving the instruction with ($X=2.34$, $SD=1.23$), having commitment with ($X=2.24$, $SD=1.11$), motivating teachers with ($X=2.25$, $SD=1.10$), treating culture with ($X=2.32$, $SD=1.35$) and linguistic diversity with ($X=2.31$, $SD=1.13$), actively mobilizing of community with ($X=2.24$, $SD=1.03$) and average performance in motivation of teachers with ($X=2.74$, $SD=1.31$).
- As revealed from interviewers, having unrelated qualification with leadership made them to be ineffective.

- As revealed from focus group discussion, principals take less time to improve the instruction rather they prefer to take their time outside school community especially they prefer to stay with politicians of the woreda.

Results revealed regarding the extent of principals to create a positive teaching learning environment.

- Regarding extent of school principals to create a positive teaching learning environment were unsatisfactory with their overall mean and standard deviations in: ensuring security of students with ($X=2.18$, $SD=1.40$), students safety with ($X=2.16$, $SD=1.20$), giving counseling services ($X=1.88$, $SD=1.06$), providing suitable class rooms with ($X=2.47$, $SD=1.27$), creating collegial relationship among staff with ($X=2.22$, $SD=1.28$), providing adequate school facilities with ($X=2.41$, $SD=1.20$), and average in improving students and staff disciplinary problems with ($X=2.51$, $SD=1.11$) and creating good communication with staff with ($X=2.69$, $SD=1.15$).

Results revealed regarding school principals supervision and evaluation of instructional activities.

- Regarding school principals' role in supervising and evaluation of instructional activities were unsatisfactory. Moreover, their weighted mean and standard deviation in organize pre-classroom observation with ($X=2.42$, $SD=1.19$), provision of professionally useful comments with ($X=2.47$, $SD=1.14$), preparation of seminars with teachers with ($X=2.49$, $SD=1.09$) and provision of instructional materials with ($X=2.38$, $SD=1.25$), and average performance in encouraging peer supervision with ($X=2.53$, $SD=1.19$).
- School principals lacked enough skills and knowledge of supervision.

Results revealed regarding major challenges that hamper the effectiveness of principals in facilitating teaching learning.

- ✚ Major challenges that affects the practices of principals in facilitating teaching learning includes: setting direction towards achievement of goals ($X=2.44$,

SD=1.17), having unrelated qualification with leadership (X=2.19, SD=1.21), and having vision (X=2.19, SD=1.14), were unsatisfactory.

- ✚ The result shown medium on in developing goals with overall mean (X=3.53, SD=1.17), effective communication (X=2.69, SD=1.26), and work load (X=2.89, SD=1.27), in selected secondary schools.

5.2. Conclusion

The main purpose of having principal is for creating a better learning condition for students. Principal has to create a positive teaching learning environment, supervise and evaluate instructional activities and increase community participation. The findings of this study demonstrated that, majority of the activities of practices of principals' were not effectively implemented by secondary school principals. Particularly, as the findings of the study revealed, principals of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone were low performance in: motivating teachers, guiding teachers to implement appropriate teaching methods, using continuous assessment, allocating resources, promoting teachers training, community participation, instructional supervision and class room supervision. This intend may bring: less attractiveness of the schools for teaching learning, carelessness of teachers for instructional activities, turnover of teachers, un appropriate use of teaching learning methods and teachers may not update themselves.

Similarly, from the findings, the major challenges that affect practices of principals in facilitating teaching learning in secondary schools of Horro Guduru Wollega Zone were: lack of principals' skill in developing school goals, incapability of principals in setting direction to achieve goals, having unrelated qualification with school leadership, lack of effective communication, not being visionary leader, were highly affecting teaching leaning. This also intends to bring: schools without vision, conflict which affects instruction.

5.3 .Recommendations

In the light of findings and conclusions, the following recommendations were forwarded.

- ✓ Principals should have to motivate teachers, know and support teachers to use different teaching methods by class room supervision and giving contractive ideas, encourage teachers to use continuous assessment, train teachers, treat diversity equally, and allocate resources appropriately.
- ✓ The secondary school principals of Horro Guduru Wollega Zone were created a positive teaching learning environment in low level. It is advisable that school principals need to create a positive teaching learning environment by ensuring the security of the school, giving attention to students safety in and out of the school compound by working in collaboration with the community, giving sustainable counseling services for students and staff by forming counseling clubs in schools , providing suitable class rooms by searching sources of funds and providing available class rooms, creating collegial relationship among staff, providing school facilities by collaborate working with woreda and zonal offices, improve students disciplinary problems and by having good communication with the staff.
- ✓ As the result revealed, secondary school principals were low in supervision and evaluating instructional activities. Therefore, it is advisable that secondary school principals of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone should promote class room supervision by arranging peer supervision among teachers to teacher within department and principals, organize seminars with teachers to share experience, motivate teachers, provide and supervise instructional materials for teachers and encourage teachers to understand the curriculum.
- ✓ The findings of the study revealed that school principals were not efficient in reducing challenges that affect the practices in facilitating teaching learning. Therefore, it is advisable that secondary school principals of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone should develop their skills in developing school goals, set direction towards the achievement of anticipated goals, try to have related qualification with school leadership and better to have better communication.

Generally, the school principals were able to contribute in some ways towards creating conducive teaching learning environment. The woreda and Zonal education offices should support efforts made by principals to contribute to more effective teaching learning.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed H. (2006) Applicability of Transformational Leadership Models in Ethiopian Context. Pre request Dissertation and Thesis, AAU unpublished.
- Aina, S. (2011): Rudiment of Educational Management: 2nd edition, fountain training consult,
- Arikewuyo, M. O.,(2009). Training of secondary school principals in Nigeria: A neglected area in the educational training. *Florida Journal of Educational administration & policy*
- Ayalew, Shibeshi. (2000). Theories of Educational management: (EDAD 611). Addis Ababa University.(unpublished teaching material)..
- Best, j. and Kahn, J.V. (2003), *Research in Education (7th Ed.)*. New Delhi: Prentice, Hall of India.
- Creswell, J.W. (2005), *Educational Research: planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. New Jersey: Pearson Merrill prentice Hall.
- Davis S.et al (2005): “*School Leadership Study: Developing Successful Principals*” Stanford: Stanford Educational Institute.
- Edmonds, R.(1979a), *Some schools work and more than social policy*: Education.
- Ferrance, E. (2000). *Action research*. Providence, RI: LAB at Brown University.
- Findley, B., & Findley D. (1992): Effective schools: The role of the principal. *Contemporary Education*, 63(2), 102-104.
- Flath, B. (1989). The principal as instructional leader: *ATA Magazines*, 69 (3), 19-22.
- Glanz, Jeffery. (2006) what Every Principal should know About Instructional Leadership. Thousand oaks’: California.
- Habtamu Gezahegn (2012). *National monthly refereed journal of research in arts and education*: www.abhinavjournal.com

- Hoy, A and Hoy, W. (2003), *Instructional Leadership: A learning centre guide*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hoy, A. & Hoy, W. (2003). *Instructional leadership: A learning-centered guide*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- ICDR (1999): *The teacher education Hand Book*: Addis Ababa: EMPDA.
- Jenkins (1991), *Successful school Leadership*, Oxford; Basil Black well Ltd.
- Katz D. and Kahn R.L (2000:4). *Skill of an effective administration in school administration*: Jarri: Brown company publisher. Lagos–Nigeria
- Leithwood K.A and Riehl C. (2003): *What we know about successful leadership*. Philadelphia, PA: Library of student success, Temple University.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005) A review of transformational school leadership research
- McGhee, M. W., and Lew, C. (2007), *Leadership and writing: How principals Knowledge, beliefs, and interventions affect writing in elementary and secondary schools*: Educational administration quarterly.
- McGhee, M.W. & Lew, C. (2007). Leadership and writing: How principals’ knowledge, beliefs, and interventions affect writing instruction in elementary and secondary schools. Educational Administration Quarterly,
- Ministry of Education (2005): *Education Sector Development*: Addis Ababa.
- Ministry of Education (2009): *CPD for primary and secondary school teachers, leaders and supervisors in Ethiopia: The practical toolkit* (Addis Ababa).
Retrieved from <http://info.moe.gov.et/cpdocs/fwk>.
- Ministry of Education (2011): *Excellence in Ethiopian schools: Improving performance through self-assessment. Handbook for guidance on self-assessment and school improvement planning*: Addis Ababa (Unpublished).
- MOE (1994): *Education and Training policy of Ethiopia*. Addis Ababa, EMPDA.
- MOE (1994): *Education and training policy*. Addis Ababa.

- MOE (1999), *Education Administration, community participation, & Finance*: Addis Ababa
- MoE (2005): *Educational Sector Development Program II*. Addis Ababa:
- MoE (2002): *Education Sector Development Program II*. Addis Ababa, Ministry of
- Nwanko, John L. (1982), *Educational Administration theory and practice*, New Delhi: Vikas publishing House.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development/OECD (2005): *Teachers Matter: Attracting, developing, and retaining effective teachers*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Peter G. Northouse (2010). *Leadership: Theory and Practice -5th*: Western Michigan University.
- Peterson. D (2002): “The professional Development of Principals: Innovation & Opportunities”. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Volume 38, number 2, pp. 34 -65.
- Robbins P. (2001). *Organizational Behavior 9th ed*, New Delhi, prentice-Hall plc.
- Sheppard, B. (1996): Exploring the transformational nature of instructional leadership. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 42(4), 325-344.
- Sindhvad, S.P. (2009). *School principals as instructional leaders* (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Minnesota): Retrieved from <http://conservancy.umn.edu/bistream>.
- Smith, W. F. and Andrews, R.L. (1989), *Instructional Leadership: How principals make a difference*. Alexandria, VA: Association for supervision and curriculum development.
- Thomas, H. and Martin, J.(2003), *Managing resources for school improvement*. London: Hywel Thomas and Jane Martin.
- Transitional Government of Ethiopia [TGE]: (1994) *the New Education and Training Policy*: Addis Ababa, EMPEDA.
- Udey, F.U, Ebuara, V.o and Ekpoh, U.I and Edet, A.O. (2009): *Management and administration of Nigeria education system: Problems, challenges and the way forward*

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

Appendix-A

Questionnaire to be filled by secondary school teachers and department heads

The major purpose of this questionnaire is to gather essential information on the effectiveness of principals in facilitating teaching and learning in secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone, Oromiya National Regional State. The information collected through this questionnaire will be used only for academic purpose and it will not affect any one in any way. Rather, the results of the study is believed to be used as an input to improve the effectiveness of principals in facilitating teaching and learning in secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega zone.

Therefore, your genuine and timely response is very important for the success of this study. Thus, I kindly request your cooperation in completing the questionnaire honestly and responsibly.

General direction:

- It is not necessary to write your name.
- For questions with alternative choices put an ‘x’ mark inside the box.
- Write your opinion briefly for open ended questions on the space provided.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation!

Part I. General Information

Personal Background Information

1.1. Name of the School _____

1.2. Name of the Woreda _____

1.3. Sex: Male Female

1.4. Age in years: 21-25 26-30 31-35

36-40 41-45 over 45

1.5. Qualification

MA/MED/MSC BA/BED/BSC Diploma any other

1.6. Work Experience in years

A. For teachers

1-5 11-15 21-25

6-10 16-20 26-30 31& over

B. For department heads

1-5 11-15 21-25

6-10 16-20 26 and over

Major _____ Minor _____

Others _____

Part II: Effectiveness of Principals in Facilitating Teaching and Learning

Direction: Kindly indicate the level of degree of your opinion to the issues presented by putting “X” mark in the space provided corresponding to each item under scales that represent your opinion. Against each item, there are rating options ranging from 1 to 5, where 5 stands for=Very high, 4=High, 3=Moderate, 2=Low, 1=Very Low

1. School principals’ practices in facilitating teaching learning.

No	Items	Scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
1.1	Implementation of strategy through which teachers can acquire appropriate teaching methods					
1.2	Encouraging teachers to use continuous assessment to enhance students’ performance					
1.3	Promoting teachers’ training which enables them to have sufficient knowledge of subject matter.					
1.4	Culture of public practice in teaching learning					
1.5	Treating diversity in school equally					
1.6	Creating of favorable working environment					
1.7	Principals in relation to school community					
1.8	Allocation of resources to support student and staff learning.					

1.9. If there are any other school principals practices to facilitate teaching learning, please list them on the space provided bellow.

2. Extent of the practices that affects teaching learning.

No	Items	Scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
2.1	Lack of school principals to take their time in improving the instruction					
2.2	Lack school principals to work actively to ensure highest academic achievement of students?					
2.3	Lack of school principals to make significant effort to enhance continuous professional development of teachers?					
2.4	Lack of school principals in motivating teachers to evaluate curriculum.					
2.5	Lack of treating cultural and linguistic diversity.					
2.6	Lack of school principals' work to make the community active participant in problem solving of academic activities.					
2.7	Lack of school principals to encourage participation of parents in the management of the school.					
2.8	Lack of school principals to encourage parents to support the school with important resources.					

3. The extent of school principals to create a positive teaching learning environment.

No	Items	Scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
3.1	The extent to which school leaders work to ensure security of the school for the students' learning					
3.2	The extent to which school leaders give attention to students safety					
3.3	To what extent school leaders help students in giving sustainable counseling services?					
3.4	To what extent school leaders create suitable Classrooms for student learning?					
3.5	The extent to which school leaders encourage collegial relationship among staff					
3.6	To what extent school leaders provide adequate school facilities that enable to facilitate teaching and learning process?					
3.7	The extent to which school leaders work to improve students disciplinary problems in school					
3.8	The extent to which school principals are capable of creating good communication with the staff.					

3.9. What are the main activities in which principals are engaged in order to create positive school environment?

3.10. List some of the factors that prevent principals from creating conducive learning environment. _____

3.11. List some of the factors that help principals create conducive learning environment.

4. School principals' supervision and evaluation of instructional activities.

No	Items	Scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
4.1	Arrangement of pre-classroom observation program with teachers					
4.2	Duration of principals stay in classrooms for supervision					
4.3	Provision of professionally useful comments after supervision					
4.4	Frequency of principals supervisory visits					
4.5	Encouragement of teachers to supervise each other/peer supervision/					
4.6	The principal observe teachers for professional development instead of evaluation					
4.7	The principal organize seminars with teachers to share their experience after supervision					
4.8	To what extent school principals motivate teachers for best performances?					
4.9	The extent to which school principals use feedback from stakeholders to motivate students for their best academic performance					
4.10	To what extent school principals facilitate provision of instructional materials for teachers?					
4.11	The extent to which school principals implement a strategy through which teachers					

	can acquire appropriate teaching methods					
4.12	The extent to which school principals encourage teachers to understand the curriculum					

4.13. What do you think are the major factors that hinder principals from providing adequate levels of supervisory support for teachers in your school?

4.14. What do you think are the major factors that help principals to provide adequate levels of supervisory support for teachers in your school?

5. Major challenges that affects the practices of principals in facilitating teaching learning process.

No	Items	Scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
5.1	Lack of Principals skill in developing school goals					
5.2	Incapable of principals in setting direction towards the achievement of anticipated goals.					
5.3	Having unrelated qualification with school leadership.					
5.4	Lack of effective communication.					
5.5	Not being visionary leader					
5.6	Pressures of work load.					

5.8. If there are any other challenges that affects the practices of principals in facilitating teaching learning process, please list them on the space provided bellow.

5.9. What are the possible solutions do you suggest to overcome these challenges?

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Appendix-B

Interview Guide for Secondary School Principals

The purpose of this interview is to collect relevant data on the effectiveness of principals in facilitating teaching and learning in secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone. The information that you provide determines the quality of the study. Rest assured that the information provided will be used only for academic purposes.

Part-I: Background Information

1.1. Name of the woreda_____

1.2. Name of the school_____

1.3. Sex_____1.4 Age_____

1.5. Number of years of experience _____

1.6. Highest academic degree held (qualification) _____

1.7. Area of specialization

Major_____

Manor_____

Other_____

Part II- Questions related to practices of Principals in facilitating Teaching and Learning

1/What are school principals' practices to facilitate the teaching learning in your school?

2/How practices affect teaching learning practices in your school?

3. What are the major challenges that affect the practices of principals in facilitating teaching learning process in your school?

3.1. What are the possible solutions do you suggest to overcome these challenges?

4. How can school principals create a positive teaching-learning environment?

4.1. What are the main activities in which principals are engaged in order to create positive school environment?

4.2 List some of the factors that prevent principals from creating conducive learning environment.

4.3 List some of the factors that help principals create conducive learning environment.

5/How school principals supervise and evaluate teaching learning environment?

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Appendix-C

Focus Group Discussion

Questions for Discussion with Supervisors

The purpose of this discussion is to collect relevant data on the practices of principals in facilitating teaching and learning in secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone. The information that you provide determines the quality of the study. Rest assured that the information provided will be used only for academic purposes.

Questions related to practices of Principals in facilitating Teaching and Learning

- 1/What are the school principals' practices to facilitate the teaching learning in your school?
3. What are the major challenges that affect the practices of principals in facilitating teaching learning process in your school?
 - 3.1. What are the possible solutions do you suggest to overcome these challenges?
4. How can school principals create a positive teaching-learning environment?
 - 4.1. What are the main activities in which principals are engaged in order to create positive school environment?
 - 4.2 List some of the factors that prevent principals from creating conducive learning environment.
 - 4.3 List some of the factors that help principals create conducive learning environment.
- 5/How school principals supervise and evaluate teaching learning environment?