

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

**Major Managerial Problems of General
Secondary School Principals in SNNPRS**

BY

Seyoum Kinfu

June 2008

Addis Ababa University

Major Managerial Problems of *General Secondary*
School Principals in SNNPRS

A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate
Studies of Addis Ababa University

In partial fulfillment of the Requirements for
Master of Arts Degree in Educational Planning and
Management

Educational Policy and Planning

BY

Seyoum Kinfu

July 2008

Addis Ababa University

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Major Managerial Problems of General Secondary
School Principals in SNNPRS

BY

Seyoum Kinfe

Approval of Board of Examiners

Yekonoamlak Alemu, Ph.D

Chairman, Department

Graduate Committee

Yekonoamlak Alemu
Signature

Zenebe Baraki (PhD)

Advisor

Ayalew Shikeshi

Internal Examiner

Mentayehu Tadesse, PhD

External Examiner

21/07/08
Signature

Ayalew Shikeshi
Signature

Mentayehu Tadesse
Signature

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIES
PO BOX 1176
ADDIS ABABA ETHIOPIA

July 2008

Addis Ababa University

Dedication

This Thesis is dedicated to my daughter Tedillasilassie Seyoum, who was born during my study.

Acknowledgements

First of all, my praise is to God and Virgin Mary for helping me to start and finish not only this thesis in this manner but also for my being ness.

My greatest and heartfelt thanks go to my thesis advisor, Dr. Zenebe Baraki, for his unreserved scholarly comments and technical advice. His paternal approach, kindness and affectionate attitude towards assisting me are not only his remarkable characters but also show how a good advisor he is. Thus, without his hard work and dedication, this study would not have been a success.

I would also like to express my thanks to all respondents in general and those who assisted me in distributing and collecting the questionnaires in the study areas for their positive cooperation, the gathering of relevant and genuine information.

My sincere and profound gratitude goes to my wife W/o Amarech Kibru in assisting me in every situation in my stay in the study.

It is also with deepest earnestness that I would like to express my thanks to Tekeste Kinfu, Shimelis Tirbis and Tenalem Fikadu for their financial and moral support.

Table of Contents

Contents	Page
Acknowledgements.....	i
Table of Contents	ii
List of Tables	v
Abbreviations	vi
Abstract.....	vii
CHAPTER ONE	
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	3
1.3. Significance of the Study.....	4
1.4. Delimitation of the Study.....	5
1.5. Limitations of the Study.....	5
1.6. Research Design and Methodology.....	5
1.6.1. Method of the Study.....	5
1.6.2. Sources of the Data.....	6
1.6.3. Sample and Sampling Techniques.....	6
1.6.4. Procedure of Data Collection.....	7
1.6.5. Methods of Data Analysis.....	8
1.7. Definition of Key Terms	8
1.8. Organization of the Study.....	9
CHAPTER TWO	
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	10
2.1. The Concept of Management	10
2.2. Theories of Management – An overview	11
2.2.1. Classical School of Thought	11
2.2.2. The Behavioral Approach	14
2.2.3. Human Relations Management	15
2.2.4. The Contingency Approach	16
2.3. Management Process	19
2.3.1. Key Functions of Management.....	19

2.3.2. An Informal View of the Mangers' Job.....	25
2.3.3. Roles of Management	25
2.3.4. Management Skills.....	28
2.4. Educational Management at School.....	30
2.5. The Essence of Educational Management at Schools.....	31
2.6. Major Functions of Secondary School Principals.....	32
2.7. Qualities of Good Principals.....	34
2.8. Major Problems Facing Secondary School Principals.....	36
2.8.1. Autonomy and Support.....	37
2.8.2. Specific Management Issues	37
2.8.3. Relations with the Community.....	40
2.9. The Importance of Training for Performance of Secondary School Principals.....	40
2.10. Principalship in Ethiopian Context.....	42

CHAPTER THREE

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.....	44
3.1. Characteristics of the Study Population.....	44
3.2. Analysis of Respondents' Attitudes towards Principals.....	49
3.3. Analysis of Major Managerial Functions.....	52
3.4. Analysis of Management Skills.....	62
3.5. Major Managerial Problems.....	67
3.5.1 Qualification and Knowledge Related Problems.....	67
3.5.2. Problems Related with Interactions.....	71
3.5.3. Personal and Situational Factors.....	75

CHAPTER FOUR

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION.....	79
4.1. Summary.....	79
4.2. Conclusions	82
4.3. Recommendations.....	84

REFERENCES

APPENDICES

List of Tables

	Page
1. List of Sample Schools.....	7
2. Respondents by Sex and Responsibility.....	45
3. Respondents by Age, Education and Work experience.....	45
4. Respondents by Areas of Experience and Current Assignment	48
5. Interest and Achievement of Principals	49
6. Principals' Training and Their Ways of Appointment.....	51
7. Planning Functions of Management	53
8 Principals' Roles in Organizing Schools' Activities.....	56
9. Principals' Controlling Roles	58
10. Respondents' Response on Reporting and Motivating Functions	61
11. Views of Respondents towards GSSPs' Management Skills	63
12. Qualification and training of principals as perceived by respondents	66
13. Interaction problems of principals as perceived by the respondents	68
14. Attitudes of Respondents towards GSSPs' Interact ional Problems	72
15. Respondents' Views Related with Personal and Situational problems	76

Abbreviations

AAU	Addis Ababa University
CoE	College of Education
EdPM	Educational Planning and Management.
GSSPs	General Secondary School Principals
GSSs	General Secondary Schools
MoE	Ministry of Education
NGOs	Non-governmental Organizations
PTA	Parent Teachers Association
SNNPREB	Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples' Regional Education Bureau
SNNPRS	Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples' Regional State
WEO	Woreda Education Office
WEOWs	Woreda Education Office Workers

Abstract

This study was conducted to explore the major managerial problems encountered by general secondary school principals in SNNPRS and to forward possible recommendations. To this effect, descriptive research method was employed. Questionnaires were used as data gathering tool. The data were collected from two zones and one special woreda of the region using purposive sampling technique for they had more untrained principals than others. In the sample study areas, eight general secondary schools were selected by lottery sampling technique. A total of 151 teachers, 13 principals and 41 woreda education officers were included as subjects of the study using by availability sampling. The data tabulated were analyzed with the help of percentage, mean, weighted mean, chi-square test and t-test. The findings of the study revealed out that GSSPs in the study areas were not qualified. Besides, they did not have sufficient training to run the schools. Further more, they were assigned by WEO. Due to these, untrained principals faced many problems. For instance, management functions (planning, staffing, and reporting) were rarely practiced. More over, they lacked appropriate and relevant skills to carry out their day to day activities. Specifically, teachers were not interested by management styles of principals; parents, NGOs and employers were not motivated to participate in the school activities; and the attention given by those principals to professional development was minimal. Thus, various interventions are important to save the endangered school management. Accordingly, the appointment of school principals should be on the basis of profession and principals should be trained and qualified before they become principals.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

Schools are institutions where citizens acquire knowledge and skills formally which help them solve their day- to-day problems. (Ayalew, 1991:11).For citizens to acquire knowledge and necessary skills, schools in general secondary schools in particular need efficient and effective principals (Sharma, 2005:34).This is because the administration of secondary schools today is different from the past and there are different and complex roles that principals play (Fuance, 1955and Joseph and Jo, 1994,63).

Efficient and effective principals are mainly the result of education and training. Among other variables, educational background and training enable principals to be more effective and efficient in achieving their goals (Dereje, 2007:1).The ability to lead efficiently and effectively depends on the ability to understand the desires of others(Naftalys,1986:1).To understand the desires of others, training and relevant educational background in the area of the profession is mandatory. In this respect, Buckley and Stayan(1988:1) stated that schools need to be managed and senior staffs should receive management training.

The grounds for essence of training are many. Training enables principals to find practical solutions to day- to-day tasks of pedagogical and personnel management, to improve curricula, to optimize organizational and administrative processes (IIZ/DVV, 2006:88).

Besides, principals have a lot to accomplish managerial functions. The principals' task can be described in terms of basic functions that are performed in order for the secondary schools to achieve their purposes. Kast

and Rosenzweig (1988:401) and Swindle(2004:25) identified the following major functions that principals carry out:

- Identifying organizational goals
- Developing an overall strategy
- Organizing school activities
- Solving school problems
- Establishing and implementing activities
- Measuring and evaluating school performance, and so on.

According to Ethiopian Ministry of Education (MoE,2001,:33),there are about twenty-two major managerial tasks that principals should perform. Therefore, since managing general secondary school is a complex process, principals should have the necessary administrative skills: conceptual, human and technical skills (Donelan, 1993:419 and Kast and Rosenweig, 1998: 401).

Different scholars agree that managerial skills are important to accomplish the schools' goals and principals should be trained to be more effective leaders on the basis of competence assessment and skill development (Law and Glover, 2000:15). Generally speaking, Zenebe (1992:133) suggests:

Specific training in school administration helps principals to become more sympathetic towards staff development and morale and thereby become more supportive and understanding particularly in time of stress and work constraints which militate against high performance and school improvement attempts.

Lack of appropriate, relevant and specific training make general secondary school principals face challenges which negatively influence the major function of the schools i.e, teaching and learning process (Feseha, 2005:71).In Ethiopian situations, assigning training professionals (educational managers) in principalship position seems to be given little consideration; and as result, problems of serious nature are reported (MoE, 2005:21 and SNNPR, 2007:22).

Scholars in the area strongly argue that competent educational leaders who are based on sound management principles and techniques enable the school and education system to accomplish their role effectively and efficiently (Okumbe, 1998:25; Maurie, 1989:1 and Misganaw, 1993:26). In view of such competent problems, the student researcher is initiated to identify the major managerial problems of principals in secondary schools of Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples' Regional State.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

It is obvious that qualified, trained, skillful for development and successful citizens are mainly the result of schools. Schools generally provide to a given society with necessary manpower to assure its existence the changing environment. Hence, schools do have responsibility in enhancing sustainable development. To do this, they need effective and efficient principals (Adesina, 1990:39 and Brundrett and others, 2003:15).

For principals to gain managerial skills, training contributes much. Educational managers can be trained to more effective leaders largely on the basis of competence assessment and skill development (Law and Glove, 2000:15). Moreover, according to Dubale (1997:3), a trained principal contributes much in improving his/her school by solving routine problems and by applying management functions well.

In a nutshell, appointing principals with relevant principles and theories of management is a requisite factor to create strong and committed school leadership. Strong leadership is a characteristic of instructionally effective schools (Demoze, 2007:1).

However, this modern assumption seems to be interpreted paradoxically in Ethiopian situations and rules and regulations have been made to appoint untrained principals in principalship position which is not policy

option(SNNPR,2004:1).This in turn highly affected the general aim of education system though there is a new attempt to change the trend(Dereje2007:1 and MoE,2007:30).Due to this practice, most of the general secondary schools in the Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples' Regional State are now led by teachers who have little or no leadership training(SNNPR,2007:4).As result, problems are reported which indicate that the school achievement is not as expected(SNNPR,2005:51). Thus, this study will be aiming at identifying the major problems of the general secondary school principals in SNNPRS. In order to study the problem, an attempt will be made to answer the following basic questions.

1. To what extent do the general secondary school principals accomplish the major functions of management?
2. To what extent do general secondary school principals apply the appropriate managerial skills to promote staff performance?
3. What are the major managerial problems that the principals encounter when they manage their schools?

1.3. Significance of the Study

This study is assumed to be important since it is expected to help the following groups:

1. Principals in the general secondary schools may get some ideas on how training of school leadership helps improve management functions.
2. Educational authorities in regional, zonal and woreda offices may appreciate the problems and change the trend of assigning untrained principals in principalship positions.
3. Other researchers may use this study as a reference material.
4. This study may initiate researchers to make further investigation in the area.

1.4. Delimitation of the Study

The main purpose of this study was to assess the major managerial problem of general secondary school principals in SNNPRS-Guraghe, Siltie and Yem. But the result of the study would have been more reliable, had it been conducted in the whole region or national level.

As a matter of fact, involving all this was difficult due to high requirements of money, time, human resource and energy. Therefore, the study was geographically confined to Guraghe Zone, Siltie Zone and Yem Special Woreda where relatively more number of untrained principals are found (SNNPREB 2007:6). It is also narrowed to management functions and skills of principals because these are important management process where principals need to develop awareness.

1.5. Limitations of the study

It is clear that research work could not be totally free from drawbacks. Due to this fact, lack of cooperation from some woreda education offices, hesitation of some principals and teachers to fill in and return the questionnaire as planned were the major ones. Besides, some teachers' positive or negative attitudes towards their principals might have had subjectivity problem in responding the items as suspected by the student researcher.

1.6. Research Design and Methodology

1.6.1. Method of the Study

This study was carried out using descriptive research method. This method was employed because the intention was to assess the current existing problems of school principalship performance. Thus the method mentioned was appropriate to carefully identify the problems and to describe what is currently going on as far as principalship is concerned.

1.6.2. The Sources of Data

The sources of data for the study were principals of general secondary schools, teachers who were working with principals and woreda education officers where the sample schools were available. The ground for selecting these groups as source was that they would be more helpful to have relevant information. The groups of the sources of data were three which comprised of 13 principals, 41 WEOWs and 151 teaching staffs which all make a total of 205.

1.6.3. Sample and Sampling Techniques

There are 13 zones and 8 special woredas in SNNPRS with a total of 84 general secondary schools (SNNPRS, 2007:223). Most of the zones and the special woredas are widely distributed through out the region. To make the study manageable, Guraghe Zone with 18 untrained principals (which is the largest number in the region), Siltie Zone and Yem Spcial Woreda were under the study. In Guraghe, Siltie and Yem respectively there were 15, 8 and 2 totally 25 general secondary schools most of which were led by untrained principals or principals with little training (SNNPRS, 2007, 10).

Hence, a total of eight general secondary schools or 33% of the total number of schools in the sample areas were selected for this was supposed to represent the population. The number of schools to be included in each study area (Guraghe, Siltie and Yem) was determined by stratified random sampling. That is, the number of schools to be included were 4,3 and 1 in Guraghe, Siltie and Yem respectively. Once this was accomplished, particular sample schools were selected on the basis of lottery sampling method. Before doing so, all the schools had been listed down in their respective zone/ special woreda. Then, the lottery method was applied which school or schools to include in the study as the number predetermined by stratified technique.

In order to get reliable information about the performance of principals in the sample schools, all the principals (including the vices), teachers and woreda education officers were included in the data using availability sampling technique. Besides, the total numbers of the respondents were likely to be manageable. Table one below shows the sample schools in the study areas.

Table 1: List of Sample Schools

No	Zones/special woreda	Woreda	Schools	Total teaching staff	Number of principals
1	Guraghe	Ezha	Kotter Gedra	15	1
			Yedege	8	1
		Gumer	Jemborow	14	2
		Cheha	Aba Francua	22	2
2	Siltie	Alichowuriro	Kuterie	16	2
		Hulbarag	Hulbarag	12	1
		Silti	Silti	40	2
3	Yem	Yem	Fofa	35	2
Total				162	13

Source: respective zones/ especial woreda educational department/office.

1.6.4. Procedure of Data Collection

1. Data gathering tools

Questionnaires were employed for the three groups of data sources, i.e, for principals, teachers and woreda education officers. Most of the items were almost similar for the three groups. The similarity is chosen to identify the attitudinal differences among or between the groups. Besides, some questions were addressed only to the one or the two groups. This was done due to the assumption of that particular group or groups might have better and consistent understanding on the issue. Open ended items designed helped to encompass the untouched ideas of the respondents.

2. Pilot test

In order to make necessary corrections and maintain validity of the instrument, the instrument of data collection was piloted. That is, the questionnaires developed on the basis of basic questions were given to the three groups of respondents in Ezha Woreda to check to what extent the items were clear and understood. Accordingly, totally 125 items were dispatched to 14 teachers, 7 WEOWs and one principal. And responses were examined. Based on that, ambiguity on 5 items was improved. Finally, the improved ones were distributed to all the respondents in the study area.

1.6.5. Methods of Data Analysis

To determine the major managerial problems of secondary school principals, appropriate statistical tools such as percentage, mean and weighted mean were employed. These were used to determine the proportion of the respondents towards responding the specific item.

Besides, chi-square and t-tests at the significance level α (alpha) =0.05 employed with respective degree of freedom to find whether there is a significant difference between the groups of respondents as per the basic questions raised. In some cases, Welch Satterthwaite Solution was computed for average degree of freedom when the ordinal application fails.

1.7. Definition of Key Terms

Principal: The administrative head and professional leader in charge of secondary school (Good, 1973:436).

Planning function: is an activity which involves decisions about ends, organizational aims, means, policies and results (Rue and Byars, 2003:5).

Short term orientation: is a kind of awareness creation program helps to aware of some factors in the school as rules, tradition and

educational offerings only for short period of time (adapted from Good, 1973:402).

Untrained principal: A person assigned as a principal with out having training or qualification in school administration.

General secondary school: The school division following the elementary school, comprising grades 9 -10(MoE, 1994

General secondary school principal: Is a person or a manager in charge of general secondary school performance.

Managerial problems: are those problems happened due to management process; for example, unable to plan or organize.

Management Skills: are the three skills namely technical, human and conceptual which enable managers to do their job effectively.

1.8. Organization of the Study

This thesis consists of four chapters. The first chapter deals with problem and its approach, and research method. The review of the related literature is prepared in chapter two. Then in chapter three, the data gathered is statistically manipulated and analyzed so as to make objective judgments. Finally chapter four summarizes the investigation upon bringing forth the findings obtained, the conclusions drawn and the recommendations made.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of the Related Literature

This chapter attempts to review some main theoretical aspects of management in general and school management in particular based on different scholars' views in different time. Management concept, theories and functions are presented by relating with educational management. Besides, educational management and its major pitfalls in the secondary schools are also included. Then principals in Ethiopian context, qualities of good principals and the importance of training for performance of secondary school principals are highlighted.

2.1. The Concept of Management

Management is a profession; and is getting jobs done with or through people. It has an organized body of knowledge (Schoderbek and others, 1991:5). However; it is conceptualized differently by different people (Cole, 2000:1). For instance, Atchison and Hill (in Ayalew1991:1) defined as a common set of activities that are designed to promote and direct purposeful work. In order to have purposeful work, the so-called managerial activities such as planning, organizing, controlling, staffing and... etc. are considered essentials (Cole, 2000:4; Otto and Sanders, 1964:387). Similarly, other scholars also present their definitions. According to Robbins and others (2000:7), it is the process of coordinating and integrating work activities.

Whether management is an art or a science is another debating issue as far as concept of management is concerned. However, there seems to be reached general agreement that a good part of management is both art and science (Schodarbek and others, 1991:8). According to schoderbek and others, the term 'science' refers to any body of knowledge that has been systemized and formulated with reference to the establishment of general laws. The existing

management knowledge clearly qualifies the field as a science. On the other hand, the term “art” is synonymous with skill when it pertains to the systematic application of knowledge. The scholars further discuss that there is little question that some people possess more skill than other in managing organization.

2.2. Theories of Management – An overview

Awareness about management began many years ago. In its long run, it developed organized body of knowledge. The classical school of management thought is one.

2.2.1. Classical School of Thought

Based on writings of Schoderbek and others (1991:39) and kinard (1988:31), the following are the major branches of classical school of management thought. The classical or traditional school of thought at first focused on scientific principles of management (Kinard, 1988:31).

Scientific Management Thought

Kinard explains that scientific management is systematic and analytical study of work and its objective was to find the most efficient method for performing any task and to train the workers in that method. It looked at management from the perspective of improving productivity and efficiency of operative personnel and it describes the use of the scientific method to define one best way for a job to be done (Robbins and others, 2000:42).

The most important contributors to scientific management were Frederick W.Taylor (Who is called the father of scientific management), Henry Gantt, Frank and Lillian Gilbreth, and Harrington Emerson (Kinard 1988:32). According to Robbins and others (2000:7) Frederick Taylor proposed four principles of scientific management.

- a) Developing science for each element of an individual's work
- b) Scientifically selecting and training workers
- c) Cooperating with workers, and
- d) Allocating responsibility to both management and workers.

Besides, the scholars further indicate that Gilbreths (Frank and Lillian) were best known for their study of work arrangement to eliminate wasteful hand – and–body motions and their design of proper tools and equipment for optimizing work performance.

Though scientific management had more acceptances at its evolution, later it failed due to the following drawbacks (Cole, 2000:20 and Jibril, 2006:5).

1. The theory failed to consider complex nature of human being (social, Psychological, spiritual, etc) and considered man as oiled machine; not reactive.
2. It reduced the worker's role to that of a rigid adherence to methods and procedures over which he had no discretion.
3. It put the planning and control of work place activities exclusively in the hands of the management, and etc.

Bureaucracy

Bureaucracy is one of the classical management theories which refer to system of management characterized by rules and regulations, hierarchy, division of labor and procedures (Jibril 2006:2). According to Schoderbek and others (1991:42), the classical writers sought to correct inefficiencies in the rapidly growing organizations. To improve the functioning of this organization, Max Weber proposed the ideal bureaucracy which had five features. The scholars mentioned the features as follow:

Well- defined hierarchy of authority

1. A comprehensive system of rules and procedures
2. A clear division of labor based on functional duties

3. Impersonal employer- employee relationships
4. Promotions and selections based on technical competence

Based on the writings of Stoner and Freeman in Jibril (2006:2) and Schoderbek 1991:43), bureaucracy is a system of administration by means of departments or bureaus each headed by a chief. They further explain that through long use, bureaucracy tends to imply excessive or complicated official routine, red tape and long chain of work unlike Weberian meaning. Though bureaucracy has the advantages of efficiency, impersonality and predictability, its negative effects are rigid rules, slow decision making and incompatibility with values (Jibril 2006:3).

Administrative Management

The other branch of classical theory is Administration management (General principles of management). This was mainly developed by Henri. Fayol. Fayol was the first person to identify the five components of management functions which still define the Job of the manager (Schoderbek and others, 1991:41).

According to Robbins and others (2000:47), the time when Fayol wrote his theory was at the same time as Taylor. However, Taylor was concerned with management at a supervisory level and used the scientific method; Fayol's attention was directed at the activities of all managers. Besides the managerial functions, Schoderbek and others (1991:42) stated that Fayol proposed 14 Fayol's principles of management. Among the most important were:

1. Authority
2. Unity of command
3. Subordination of individual interest to the general in there
4. Scalar chain of command
5. Equity

Schoderbek and others also revealed that Fayol was the first to.

1. Identify the universality of management across all organizations.
2. Offer a comprehensive theory of management, and
3. Identify the need to teach management in schools and colleges.

2.2.2. The Behavioral Approach

The Behavioral Approach is the other main branch of management thought. This theory mainly criticized the previous thought classical management thought. Schoderbek and others (1991:44) wrote that

Although classical management theory certainly did not ignore the human element in the work place, it did emphasize the nature and structure of work itself and the techniques of management. However, some early management writers argued that the individual was the key element in any organization and developed theories of management based on human behavior that became known as the behavioral approach.

Mary Parker Follet, Chester Barnard and Hugo Munsterburg studied the behavioral approach. According to Schoderbek and others (1991:44), Mary parker Follett emphasized the importance of motivation in the organization. She emphasized that managers need to coordinate and harmonize group efforts. She stated that authority is effective only if it is accepted by those who are being managed.

Elton Mayo was another contributor to the behavioral approach. Professor Mayo and his associates reported that the Hawthorne Studies conducted at the Western Electric plant in Cicero, Illinois. The studies represent “the transition from scientific management to the early human relations movement.” Mayo and his groups tested that if improved lighting would improve productivity at the Hawthorne plant. In their test/study what was clearly shown was that the importance of informal human elements within an organization including the increment of production with its lighting.

Chester Barnard was also another remarkable theorist as long as behavior approach is concerned. Barnard who is considered as the father of behavioral approach by many management scholars felt two responsibilities of executives; which laid foundation for many contemporary approaches to management. These were

- (1) Establishing and maintaining communication system by hiring, training and rewarding the best people available, and
- (2) To formulate objectives and purposes of the organization (Schoderbek and others, 1991:45).

The pioneer and father of industrial psychology, Hugo Munsterberg was another contributor to the behavioral approach. According to George in Schoderbek and others (1991:46), Munsterberg proposed that the role of psychologists in industry should be:

1. To help find the men best fitted for the work
2. To determine under what psychological conditions the greatest output per man could be achieved, and
3. To produce the influences on the human mind desired in the interest of management.

2.2.3. Human Relations Management

Human Relations management movement is another main branch of management thought. According to Jibril (2000:6), the main concept of human relation school is 'men are first'. Jibril further explains that the members of human relations movement advocate that as the manager gets activities done with and through people. The study of management must be centered on the workers and their interpersonal relationship.

Robbins and others (2000: 54) on the other hand believed in the importance of employees' satisfaction. Satisfied worker was believed to be a productive worker.

Robbins and his colleagues/ associates for the most with this movement; Dale, Carnegie, Abraham Maslow and Douglas Mc Gregor-were individuals whose views were shaped more by their personal philosophies than by substantive research evidence.

2.2.4. The Contingency Approach

Other than the previous theories, there are other theories that emerged in modern times. Kinard (1988: 48) Points out that many new theories explaining the behaviors of managers and organization have emerged in recent years. He further mentions that contingency theory, system theory and Theory Z are more recent theories. On the other hand, Robbins and others (2000:57) list the three recent approaches: process, system and contingency approaches.

Ayalew (1991:20) also stated that recently systems and contingency approaches are emerged. Though these approaches are considered as a separate approach, Cole (2000:78) indicates the distinction between the two approaches is not clear. He further explains that the systems approach developed out of the findings of the contingency approach. Besides, a systems approach highlights the Complexity of the interdependent components of organizations within equally complex environments. A contingency approach builds on the diagnostic organizational design and management style for a given set of circumstances. More details about the two recent theories namely contingency and system theories are presented below based on the idea of various scholars.

A system view of organization

According to Schoderbek and others (1991: 48), most contemporary writers in organization or management theory implicitly or explicitly advocate system approach to the management of complex organizations. The writers define the systems approach as a philosophy or a view point that conceives of an

Robbins and his colleagues/ associates for the most with this movement: Dale, Carnegie, Abraham Maslow and Douglas Mc Gregor-were individuals whose views were shaped more by their personal philosophies than by substantive research evidence.

2.2.4. The Contingency Approach

Other than the previous theories, there are other theories that emerged in modern times. Kinard (1988: 48) Points out that many new theories explaining the behaviors of managers and organization have emerged in recent years. He further mentions that contingency theory, system theory and Theory Z are more recent theories. On the other hand, Robbins and others (2000:57) list the three recent approaches: process, system and contingency approaches.

Ayalew (1991:20) also stated that recently systems and contingency approaches are emerged. Though these approaches are considered as a separate approach, Cole (2000:78) indicates the distinction between the two approaches is not clear. He further explains that the systems approach developed out of the findings of the contingency approach. Besides, a systems approach highlights the Complexity of the interdependent components of organizations within equally complex environments. A contingency approach builds on the diagnostic organizational design and management style for a given set of circumstances. More details about the two recent theories namely contingency and system theories are presented below based on the idea of various scholars.

A system view of organization

According to Schoderbek and others (1991: 48), most contemporary writers in organization or management theory implicitly or explicitly advocate system approach to the management of complex organizations. The writers define the systems approach as a philosophy or a view point that conceives of an

enterprise as a system—a set of objects with a given set of relationships between the objects and their attributes, connected or related to each other and to their environment in such a way as to form a whole or entirely.

Kast and Rosenzweig (1981:98) have also defined the system as an organized, unitary whole composed of two or more interdependent, components or subsystems and delineated by identifiable boundaries from its environmental supra systems. According to Ayalew (1991:21), the definition of a system contains the following significant points.

- a) Systems contain sets of components which interact with each other.
- b) Systems have an identifiable boundary
- c) Systems draw inputs from the environment, transform them some how, deposit outputs back in to the environment.
- d) Systems are designed to accomplish a purpose purposes).
- e) System is made up of several subsystems and they are a larger aggregation of systems called supra system.

The aim of this approach is to develop a method or technique that allows researchers from a variety of disciplines to study different phenomena whether these phenomena are physical or social (Schoderbek and others 1988: 49). Schoderbek and his colleagues elaborate that the systems view point emphasized the relationship between the organization and its external environment. They also believe that managing this relationship requires the identification of the main inputs, processes, outputs, and feedback.

Systems may be closed or open. Cole (2000:70) defined closed systems as those which for all purposes are completely self supporting, and thus do not interact with their environment. Open systems are those which do interact with their environment, on which they rely for obtaining essential inputs and for the discharge of their system output.

Silver (1983:52) states an open system as a one with a highly permeable which imports information, energy and materials at a higher rate from its environment and makes use of these inputs for the interaction among components in the production of diverse output. Whereas closed system is one with a relatively impermeable boundary. The boundaries are very tight and only few elements from the environment penetrate it.

The fact that theories and practices are changing constantly, authorities identified the limitations of systems approach. Brown and Moberg (in Ayalew, 1991:31) mentioned some of the problems and limitations of systems approach.

1. Systems notions are very abstract. The concern for the totality of a system may not be translated into meaningful specifics for problem analysis.
2. There are problems with notion of interdependencies. When one considers that everything else depends on everything else, it is difficult to determine precisely what to do to affect the system in particular way.
3. The systems approach may underestimate the importance of people in the system. Systems specialists are at times guilty of treating human and social factors simply as manipulatable mechanical elements in the system.

Due to these reasons, another kind of approach known as the contiguity approach was emerged.

Contingency Approach

This approach proposes that management is not based on simplistic principles. The approach has become influential in recent years in replacing the simplistic principles of management that were suggested earlier by scholars (Robbins and others 2000:58)

Based on the writings of Kast and Rosenzweig (1981:15), the contingency view of organizations and management suggests that an organization is a system composed of subsystems and delineated by identifiable bound areas from its environmental supra-system. The authorities further explain that the contingency view seeks to understand the pattern interrelationships within and among sub systems as well as between the organizational and its environment and to define relationships or configuration of variables (Robbins and others 2000:58). Besides, the contingency approaches are ultimately directed toward suggesting the organization designs and managerial actions most appropriate for specific situations.

To end the idea of contingency, Cole (2000:79) suggests that unlike the ideas of classical and human relation approaches, the contingency approach does not seek to produce universal prescription or principles of behavior. The scholar further elaborates that the approach deals in relativities, not absolute. It is a situational approach to management and adapts the earlier approaches accordingly (Kinard, 1988:48).

2.3. Management Process

Rue and Byars (2003:5) suggested that there are several ways to examine how management works. One way is dividing the tasks managers perform in to categories. A second way is to look at the roles managers play, and the third way is looking at the skills managers need to do their jobs. They further propose that these ways of thinking help to understand the management process. On the basis of the aforementioned scholars, an attempt is made to present the management processes as follows.

2.3.1. Key Functions of Management

The French industrialist, Henri Fayol, was the first person to mention managerial functions (Robbins and others, 2000:10). According to Fayol managers plan, organize, command, coordinate and control. Other scholars

after Fayol also came up with other functions of management (Ayalaw, 1991:14). For instance, according to Gulic and Uric (1950), managers plan, organize, staff, direct, coordinate, report and budget. Robbins and others (2000) mentioned planning, organizing, leading and controlling. Recently, Rue and Byars (2003) listed planning, organizing, staffing, leading and controlling. However, the basic managerial functions are highly interdependent (Kast and Rosenzweig, 1988:405). They are typically not carried out in a simple step by step fashion.

One of the functions also overlaps to another (Rue and Byars 2003:6). Besides, they are interrelated, intertwined and interfused that they are going on simultaneously (Robbins and others, 2000:10). This could be a reason for why scholars came up with lists of different managerial functions.

No matter how the managerial functions are listed, formally or informally, managers are ultimately responsible for carrying out the basic managerial functions that are the means to achieving organizational performance and for ensuring a continuing capability to do so (Kast and Rosenlwcigh 1988:405). In spite of the differences in the kinds of managerial functions, the following are the basics as proposed by Cole (2000:9), Rue and Byars (2003:5) and Kinard (1988:7).

Planning Function

Cole (2000:9) and Rue and Byars (2003:5) defined Planning function as an activity which involves decisions about ends, organizational aims (objectives), means (plans), conduct (policies) and results. Planning decides what objectives to pursue during a future period and what to do to achieve those objectives. It also provides a framework for integrity decision making through out the organization and time, and a means for managers and organization to cope with challenges. It is a primary management function and is the

formation of future courses of action. Plans and objectives on which they are based give purpose and direction to the organization (Jibril, 2006: 6).

Planning does not occur in a vacuum. It is done in light of budgetary constraints, personal requirements and other factors; and it encompasses determining specific objectives and how to accomplish them (Kinard, 1988:7)

According to Cole (2000:9), planning takes place with serious analysis of:

- a) The organization's external environment, and
- b) The organization's internal strengths and weaknesses.

Kast and Rosenzweig (1988:44) write that planning involves developing an overall strategy and general policies plus specific programs and procedures. Planning can be classified as long-term or short-term on the basis of time. Long term plan usually implies a time horizon of about five years to twenty years. Short-term plan can be any period from immediate future up to one year (Cole, 2000:9).

Organizing

Organizing is the other area of focus in management functions. Many scholars consider organizing as a basic element in management (Cole, 2000:8, kinard 1988:8 and Jibril, 2006:6).

Organization is grouping and assigning activities and providing the authority necessary to carry out the activities. According to Rue and Byars (2003:6), a manager groups related activities together and assigns employees to perform them. The plans prepared have to be put in to practice. This involves organization and coordination of tasks (Cole, 2000:9). Cole added that with formal communication and human and material resources, organizing helps achieve the goal. It is through organizing that a manager develops a system in

which people can perform tasks that lead to the desired results. According to Kinard (1988: 8), the following are the major important points in organizing.

- a) Creating job positions with defined duties, responsibilities, requirements and salary ranges based on job requirements.
- b) Arranging positions into a hierarchy by establishing authority-reporting relationships.
- c) Determining the number of subordinates each manager should have reporting to him/her; the number of hierarchical levels in the organization and the most appropriate way to set up departments.

Structural considerations such as the chain of command, division of labor, and assignment of responsibility are part of organizing function (Jibril, 2006:6). According to Rue and Byars (2003:6) and Jibril (2006:6), careful organizing helps ensure the efficient use of human resource, well defined roles and coordination. Thus, each position in the organization will be accountable for identifiable tasks that contribute to its overall purpose.

Controlling

Controlling is one of the basic management functions which can be technically defined as measuring performance against objectives, determining the causes of deviations, and taking corrective actions where necessary (Rue and Byars, 2003:6). Measuring and evaluating organization's results are necessary to assess the organizational performance and determine how well management has carried out its tasks.

According to Cole (2000:8), the basic functions of control are:

- a) To establish standards of performance.
- b) To measure actual performance, and
- c) To take corrective actions where needed.

Normally, results are different from the desired results because our desires are many. However, there are requirements that need most attention in controlling process are product quality, worker performance and cost (Kinard 1988:10). Therefore, control is required when employees fail to meet the desired performance standards. Employees' performance standards are formulated through experience, judgment and observation. Cost also needs attention in controlling. Cost control involves comparing expenditures with budget funds. Actual costs are compared with standards set before actual production for such items as materials, labor and overhead. Variations from the standards help managers' find problem areas and can lead to cost-reduction program. (Kinard, 1988:10).

According to Kast and Rosenzweig (1988:405), controlling is intertwined with and dependent on planning. Planning provides the framework against which the control process works.

Leading

Leading is the other function of management. Kinard (1988:9) considers leadership as heart and soul of management and Kinard reveals that leading is the one area where most managers are weakest.

Rue and Byars (2003:6) defined leading as directing and changing human behavior toward the accomplishment of objectives. Leading involves developing a climate of individual integrity, corporate, honesty and high productivity (Kinard 1988:9).

Effective leadership is built on a foundation of mutual trust and respect. To be effective leader, a manager must do a number of things. Kinard (1988:9) mentioned the following instances.

... he/she must make certain that everyone in the unit knows exactly what is expected in terms of performance. Objectives must be identifiable, measurable and individually attainable.

The manager also must recognize and reward outstanding performance... managers also must surround themselves with competent employees and ask their advice when making decisions that affect them.

Moreover, managers become inspiring leaders by serving as role models, command respect and followership (Jibril 2006:7). Therefore, managers should adapt their style of management on the basis of the situation in which they are in. They should provide guidance employees need to perform their tasks which ensure the organization's goals are met (Rue and Byars, 2003:6).

To lead the organization effectively, the role of communication must not be ignored. Communication in management functions in general, specifically in leading plays a great role for healthy management. Thus, managers must develop relationships that ensure adequate communication with their subordinates (Kinard 1988:9). Rue and Byars (2003:6) tell that a manager leads by keeping the lines of communication open.

Staffing

It is the people who run organizations; and the fate of the organization is dependent up on them. In other words, organizations are only as good as the people in them (Jibril 2006:6). That is why staffing is one of the manager's most important duty.

Staffing involves the recruitment, selection, development and retention of employees with appropriate qualifications for positions created by the manager (Kinard, 2988:9). And, it also determines human resource needs, and training and development. A manager in an organization decides how many and what kind of people the organization needs to meet its goals and then recruits, selects and training the right people (Rue and Byars, 2003:6). The fact that organizations are only as good as their employees, managers must choose their employees very carefully.

Kinard (1988:9) mentioned the following activities of staffing.

- Human resource planning
- Announcing and advertising vacant positions
- Receiving applications
- Preliminary and final interviewing
- Testing
- Medical examination
- Final selection and orientation

2.3.2. An Informal View of the Managers' Job

In above sections, an attempt was made to present managerial functions. As mentioned earlier, the managerial functions are different from author to author. More over, managers do much more complicated jobs. The list made lack comprehensiveness to include all activities carried out by managers (Kinard 1988:11). As a result, Professor Mumford (1993:9) categorized the managerial functions on the basis of management thought. According to Mumford, five stages are presented under which different activities are stated. The stages are the generalization stage, the scientific stage, the management by objective stage, the contingency realistic stage and the competency stage.

For example, in generalization stage, managers forecast and plan, organize, motivate, coordinate and control. In scientific stage, the functions are not necessarily agreed or integrated. Instead, they are found through research and theory. Kinard (1988:11) and Schoderbek, (1991:12) listed complex and different jobs that managers do.

2.3.3. Roles of Management

Management roles could be the second way which helps to examine managers' work. According to Robbins and others (200:11), management roles refer to specific categories of managerial behaviour. Managers have power/ authority in their organization and they use their power in many

ways. To use this effectively, they play different roles (Rue and Byars, 2003:6). It was in late 1960s when Mintzberg studied detailly the roles of manager. According to Robbins and others (2000:11), Mintzberg concluded that managers perform ten different but highly interrelated roles. Other authors including Robbins and his colleagues also reflect the same ideas on the roles of management (Schoderbek and others, 1991:12; Rue and Byars, 2003:6). Accordingly, the ten interrelated management roles are categorized in to three main groups: interpersonal roles, information related roles and decision-making roles.

Interpersonal Roles

Intrapersonal roles include a manager relationship with people. Robbins and others (2000:13) and Rue and Byars, (2003:6) indicate that all managers are required to perform duties that involve people (Subordinates and person outside the organization) and other duties that are ceremonial and symbolic in nature. These are interpersonal roles.

Interpersonal roles include figurehead, leader and liaison. Figurehead is a symbolic head, obliged to perform a number of routine duties of a legal or social nature. A leader is responsible for the motivation and activation of subordinates and responsible for staffing, training and information. And, a liaison maintains self developed networks of outside contacts and informers who provide favors and information.

Informational Roles

Robbins and others (2000:13) state that all managers, to some degree, have informational roles: receiving, collecting and disseminating information. The manager's informational roles are monitor, disseminator and spokesperson.

Schoderbek and others (1991:16) explain the three informational roles in the following ways. The monitor role allows the managers to keep abreast of what

is going on both internally and externally. Information is acquired through formal or informal meeting; and managers share the information they have to their subordinates. Managers disseminate or distribute information to their subordinates daily. The fact that a manager is a nerve center implies that he or she has information that others need but do not have. This is disseminator role.

Decisional Roles

Finally, four decisional roles are identified by Mintezberg for the first time. These are entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resource allocator and negotiator. The entrepreneur is often characterized as being a person who is his or her own boss. To guarantee organizational survival, entrepreneurs must provide a product or initiate a service that is wanted by consumers.

The decisional role of the resource allocator refers to a decision which involves who gets what and who will do what tasks. Various types of resources (money, equipment, and people) are distributed via the decision process (Rue and Byars, 2003:7).

A disturbance occurs when something is not working as planned. It could be as simple as an interdepartmental conflict or as complex as a major plant malfunction. These disturbances arise at all managerial levels and require the same degree of attention from the disturbance handler.

The fourth decisional role is that of a negotiator. Managers negotiate with supplies, customers, unions, individual employees, the government and other groups. Decisional making roles are those a manager plays when making changes in policies, resolving conflicts, or deciding how best to use resources (Rue and Byars, 2003:7).

2.3.4. Management Skills

According to Rue and Byars (2003:7), a third way of looking at the management process is by examining the kinds of skills required to perform a particular job. Management skills answer the question why some managers succeed and others fail (Schoderbek and others 1991:27). It is obvious that effective managers are essential to the performance of all organizations. Whether managers have the ability to plan, organize, staff, lead and control organization, operations effectively can determine its ultimate success or failure. But, more important, good management practices can be learned and applied. Management success depends on both on a fundamental understanding of the principle of management and on the application of technical, human and conceptual skills (Kinard, 1988:15, Robbins and others, 2000: 15, Schoderberk and others, 1991:28).

According to Robbins and his colleges (2000:15), Katz during the early 1970s found that the relative importance of these skills varied according to the manager's level with in the organization. Katz in Ayelew Shibeshi (1991:4) also suggested that the skills are essential at all hierarchical positions and their relative importance seems to vary with the level of administrative responsibility (level of management).

The level of management includes top management, middle level and lower-level management (Ayalew, 1991:16). The skills are also used relatively by these levels of management.

Technical Skills

Szilagyi in Ayalew (1991:3) and Robbins and others, (2000:15) indicate that technical skill refers to the ability to use tools, techniques, or approaches in a specialized manner. Technical skill implies an understanding of proficiency in a specific kind of activity particularly on involving methods, processes, procedures or techniques.

Katz in Robbins and others (2000:16) also proposed that technical skills become less important as a manager move into higher levels of management, but even top managers need some proficiency in the organization's specialty.

Interpersonal Skills

Interpersonal skill sometimes called human skill which represents the ability to work well with and understand others, to build cooperative effort within a team (that is to lead to motivate) (Robbins and others, 2000:16).

Other authors like Sergioivanni and Carver in Ayalew (1991:3) explained that human skills as the executive's ability to work effectively as a group member and to build cooperative effort with in the team he heads. Ayalew further elaborates that a technical skill calls for the ability to select, motivate, work with and lead employees either individually or in groups. Skill is primarily concerned with things (processes or physical objects), and human skill mainly focuses on people.

According to Robbins and others (2000:16) interpersonal skills are important for managers at all levels. The scholars added that managers need to be aware to their own attitudes, assumptions and beliefs as well as being sensitive to their subordinates' perceptions, needs and motivations.

Rue and Byars (2003:7) on their parts suggested that interviewing job applicants, forming partnership with other organizations (groups), and resolving conflicts all require good human relations skills. Thus, human interpersonal skill is part and parcel of managerial skills which enables to run organizations in the way the situation dictates.

Conceptual skills

Ayalew (1991:3) relates conceptual skills to the ability to integrate and coordinate the organization activities. Conceptual skills refer to the ability to see the organization or the problem as a whole. They require an

understanding of how the various functions of the organizations are coordinated-of how the parts depend on each other.(Schderbeck and others, 1991:29).

Due to these views, conceptual skills are needed by all managers at all levels. However, Katz in Robbins and others (2000:16) proposed that these skills become more important in top management positions. They reasoned out that upper level managers often deal with abstract ideas, which need conceptual skills where as lower level managers normally spend more time dealing with observable objects and processes. Decision making, planning, and organizing are specific managerial activities that require conceptual skills (Rue and Byars, 2003:7).

All management levels require skills. However, the degree of the requirement may be varying from level to level. For example, top management, or at the top, conceptual skills become most important (Ayalew 1991:4).

2.4. Educational Management at School

Sharma (2005:36) indicates that educational administration is developed later than related fields, such as business administration and public administration. Sharma further explains that many of the concepts relevant for educational administration are originated from these fields and from basic disciplines such as political science, psychology and sociology. However, educational organization and management is increasingly recognized as a vital instrument in enabling the teaching learning process to take place meaningfully (Ayalew 1991:1 and Sharma 2005:31). Ayalew further elaborates that for educational organizations to meet student needs, parents and employee expectations, effective management and organization is essential.

It is not only late discipline and field of study but also its significance was argumentative. That means its significance was debate able Burdett and others (2003) ensure that

The early years of twenty-first century have been a lively debate about the relative significance of leadership and management for education. But it is now all ideas are accepted that educational leaders and managers need specific preparation if they are to be successful in leading schools.

Bezzina (1998:245) also suggests that indeed in the light of research literature which supports the ideas of principalship are essential factors in determining school effectiveness (Whetten and Cameron, 1991:3).

2.5. The Essence of Educational Management at Schools

It is obvious that schools in general secondary schools in particular become complex organizations nowadays. The ideas of Hannay and Ross (1997:597) and Holmes (1993:9) indicate that secondary schools are complex organizations with powerful enduring cultures. Consequently, the change process experienced in these schools is complex and difficult. The essence of management at school could be seen from this perspective, i.e. effective principals who can handle the situations (complexity and difficulty) are needed.

In talking about school effectiveness and related issues of school educational management in management, school management in particular takes the front-line positions. To understand clearly the essence of management at school, it is better to see the responsibilities, roles and jobs principals shoulder on, because these duties are not accomplished as easily as we expect. Therefore, in the following sections, an attempt will be made to show what principals do and their responsibilities.

In the discussion part of World Bank (1990:4) and Brunderett and Ian (2000:13) about improving educational effectiveness, one of the worth

mentioned point is strengthening educational management. Under the issue, organizational restructuring, strengthening information system and developing managerial competence are the strategies set to improve educational effectiveness. World Bank further reveals that weaknesses in institutional management have been in almost developing countries. The absence of effective managers is also evident at intermediate and school levels.

At school level, principals are selected from the ranks of teachers on the basis of seniority, and they receive little, if any, systematic training. As a result, effectiveness is low (World Bank, 1990: 32).

Other scholars named Holmes (1993:19) and Mary B. Anderson (1992:37) identified administration and management as one of the nine building blocks for effective education. The nine building blocks for effective education mentioned were place, time, learner, teacher, parents and community, curriculum, pedagogy, administration and management and financial support.

To introduce acceptable innovations in education in schools, the role of school managers or principals is valuable. Managers of the schools facilitate the new accepted changes. For instance, to practise decentralization in Ethiopian context, successful principals with new skills of management and leadership is required (World Bank, 2005).

2.6. Major Functions of Secondary School Principals

As indicated in previous attempts, secondary school principals are accountable for the overall operations of the school. According to Peter and others (2001:40) the job of principals of a school is the most crucial in the education system. They run the educational and administrative functions. Because of these facts, they do a number of tasks.

According to the MOE (2007:50) Amharic version secondary school principals are required to coordinate in and outside the school's community to fulfill the school's requirements; plan the school improvement and implement it successfully, improve the students' ethics and inculcate the spirit of self confidence and get them motivated to earn good results, assure the quality of education in the school, increase the participation of female students, and create learning atmosphere.

In technical terms, the most important functions of principals are also supervision, goal clarification, and staff development, provision of educational materials, research, evaluation and creating conducive climate (Mintzberg, 1989:101; MOE, 2007:50; Adesina, 1990:53; Bennet and Anderson, 2003:115).

Bezzina (1998:244) and Otto and Sanders (1964:346) listed the roles and responsibilities of principals as proper management of the staff, the organization of the school, the maintenance of discipline, orderliness and cleanliness with in the school, the up keep of the school plant, the keeping of up-to-date records of pupils, staff and other relevant documents, information concerning the school, the timely requisitioning school's utilities requirements, the proper management of school's stores and other material resources, liaison with parents, staff and officials at head office, carrying out any duties compatible with the job, setting vision and purpose, being goal-oriented, curriculum design and development, staff development, school planning, evaluation, budget and finance.

Analysis made in seven Asian countries by Kandesamy and Blaton (2004:62) mention the main functions of head teachers which fall under the following categories:

1. personnel management
2. student management

3. finance management
4. administrative management
5. general management
6. curriculum management
7. teaching responsibilities
8. logistic

According to the authors, each function listed above has functions under it. There are a number of functions that principle performs. For example, personnel management function by itself requires the principal to evaluate, recruit, select, plan and support to teachers. In the same token, other categories constitute other functions under them.

As it has already been mentioned in previous section, the basic functions of management are categorized under five points. However, it does not mean that managers only practice such points. There are many tasks that they do. Similarly, in few words, the functions of educational management can be categorized under five basic functions of management.

In line with this idea, Adesina (1990:8) states

I often like to remember the basic functions of management by the word posed (plan, organize, staff, evaluate and develop). In other words, to save my self from remerging either 356 functions of the president or 77 functions of the vice-chancellor, I would like to remember only five basic functions of any manager in any situation... all other functions would come under these five major categories.

2.7. Qualities of Good principals

To accomplish the complex and major functions of the schools, secondary school principals need to have some qualities. The qualities successful managers or principals own are reflected in identifying the needs and preferences of their teachers and students (Ayalew, 2000). According to Donelan (1993: 49) high quality leadership is based upon a dedication to

higher or successful principals which helps to continuously elevate a leader's vision.

Brundrett and others (2003:16) identify four interrelated components of key qualities for leadership.

1. Educational values. These include:

- Learning centered
- Innovation
- Lifelong learning
- Service orientation
- Equity and fairness
- Whole person development

These values serve as fundamental principles on which to develop and design schools and to provide constancy across all aspects of their leadership. Shukla (1983:147) analyzed that through these qualities objectives of teaching learning can be effectively achieved.

2. Professional Knowledge: This body of knowledge relates to the roles identified earlier, or expressed in a different way to each of the following.

- Strategic direction and policy environment
- Teaching, learning and curriculum
- Leader and teacher growth and development
- Staff and resource management
- External communication and connection

A school leader/ Principal should have professional knowledge which is a quality of good principal. This would help the principal to handle the complex and difficult activities of the school. In line with this idea MOE (2007:6) the Amharic version states that principals should have the quality of professional knowledge.

3. Skills- In previous sections, an attempt was made to show the importance of the three skills (namely human, conceptual and technical) in management. According to Brundrett and others, the achievement of the skills distinguishes effective leaders.

4. Attributes- In the context of school- based management and school improvement program, certain attributes seem to assume prime importance. According to the scholars mentioned above, the following are the quality of attributes.

- Adaptability and responsiveness
- Courage of conviction with regard to their values, principles and actions and resilience in times of adversity and opposition
- Self confidence
- Tough- mindedness
- Collaboration
- Integrity

2.8. Major problems Facing Secondary School Principals

These days, organizations are growing complex and complex. As a result, the modern managers face many problems. Educational administrators as well as people in management positions in the school system have often argued that the problems of their institution and systems are so different from those of all other institutions that they do not require the application of general principles of management (Adesina, 1990:39).

The problems that were of little concern in earlier decades also merit great attention today (Schoderbek and others, 1991:9). In this regard, educational leadership as a field of study and practice is currently undergoing serious challenges from the school reform movement and the accountability establishment (Burnett 2004:18).

The challenges facing instructional leaders vary from author to author as well as place to place. In the research made on the analysis of seven Asian countries Kandasamy and Blaton, (2004:133) explains three core problems.

2.8.1. Autonomy and Support

One of the first complaints by head teachers in all countries, irrespective of their development, concerns their lack of autonomy in certain areas which they consider to be crucial to their autonomy, and also the need for more support, especially from the local administration (Adesina1990:39).

The authors further explain that the effectiveness of head teachers is limited by the fact they are not involved in curriculum development or syllabus modification. Lockheed, Verspoor and associates (1991:134) indicate that granting authority to principals must be coupled with giving them adequate and appropriate training and resources. They also explain that authority helps principals to manage the schools effectively. To do so, they require a high degree of control over matters such as allocating instructional time and etc.

2.8.2 Specific Management Issues

The researchers indicate that the management of the profession of head teacher remains of a rather traditional nature and this is raising more and more problems. The recruitments of principals profile stresses qualification and teaching experience than management and human relation skills. This might not necessarily make the best school leader. This idea does not suggest that qualification and experience are of no importance, but that the recruitment process could use a wider range of selection criteria. There are very few induction programmes and in-service training programmes are seldom focused on their specific training.

The Effect of Training in Principalship

Training helps managers or principals to carry out their activities. According to IIV/DVV (2006:88) news letter, training enables people to find practical solutions to the day-to-day tasks of pedagogical and personnel management, to improve curricula, optimize organizational and administrative processes. Managers are also obligated to come to their positions equipped with skills and values acquired through both management training and academic service (Lawrance and Jones, 1985:60) Wossenu (2002:126) indicates that training and development programs are the methods of improving principal's knowledge, skills and abilities. If training is properly carried out, it provides organization with several advantages. Leap and Crino in Wossenu (2002: 127) identified the advantages of training which includes the improvement of services, increase principals morale and commitment.

The training provided to principals must be systematic and must ensure the future success of the principals. In this regard, Lockheed and associates (1991:135) state that training must be linked to clear, long term strategies for school development. The authors also suggest that to maintain managerial competence, countries must develop specialized institutes for training educational managers at all levels. All school managers should have the training to do their job effectively.

Training topics to school principals are identified by the aforementioned scholars including educational policy and practice, managing human, financial, material and information resources; setting objectives and strategies; motivating, training, counseling and developing the careers of staff, supervising and controlling the unit's work and evaluating its results, managing financial systems and procedures; defining the nature of accountability, delegation, communication and decision making. These topics enable them carryout their job, and create awareness in their management functions.

In answering the question “who should be secondary school principal?”, scholars consider training in general, pre- induction training in particular as the main and the most important ingredient.

The process of selecting school manager should be more systematic. Selection should be improved by establishing a larger pool of candidates than the current needs. Candidates would be teachers who combine seniority and a record of achievement. Finally candidates could then be chosen based on their performance in an intensive pre induction training program (Lockheed and Others, 1991:136).

The Effect of Experience in Principalship

According to Ayalew (1991:9), the training and experience of managers and most staff in schools is usually similar. Their qualifications too are more or less equal. Dubale, (1997:38) also states that the two ideas namely training and experience of leadership are closely related. He further explains that most training programs try to relate and reflect the experience of others in integrated and easily digested form.

Fiedler and Chemers (1983:90) believe that with out adequate training and experience, principal's task structuring ability will be lower. The scholars further point out those principals' should possess long period of experience to cope with problems before they come to principalship positions.

Principals' Educational Background

It is clear that formal educational background is the very determinant factor to run an organization like school since individuals acquire basic knowledge, skill and attitude through educations (Dubale 1997:39). Individuals can easily understand, if not, recognize what their organization needs and how it operates if they earn relevant educational background. In line to this idea, Silver (1983:41) remarks that the major professional obligation of all school administrator and other educator is to obtain and use the necessary

educational background that are knowledge and skills required to maximize the school outcomes.

For secondary school management the relevant educational background is suitable including that ingredient which helps them run secondary schools properly. One of the greatest problems of the seven Asian countries was that considering merely qualification and experience with out taking in to consideration of relevancy as well. As a result problems happened (Kandasany and Blaton, 2004:135). Once, this idea was quiet related to our country's situation. Principals are selected on the basis of qualification with out considering the relevancy (SNNPR, 2004:5; Dereje, 2007:21; Misganaw 1993:26). But this circular seems to be substituted by the new one which appreciates educational management qualification for principalship position for secondary school (MOE, 2007:30).

2.8.3. Relations with the Community

Relations with the community do not always work. Problems are perceived while interacting with parents. The election of mangers of secondary school appears to be not with out problems, as political and personal influence is used to get appointed.

2.9. The Importance of Training for performance of Secondary School Principals.

It is obvious that training has great significance for individuals who engage themselves in a certain job. The significance has been discussed in previous attempts. Once again the importance of training will be presented in brief in the following section.

To begin with, Henary Mintzberg (1989:104) defined training as the use of formal instructional programs to establish and standardize in people the requisite skills and knowledge to do particular job in organization. Mintzberg

field were made to manage secondary schools. Later, Addis Ababa University, Department of Educational Administration now called educational planning and management was doing its best in training graduates for secondary school principalship and for other areas of requirement in the country. (Dubale, 1997:4).

However, things were changed for a while. According to Ahmed (2006:23), qualification and professionalism and or training in the secondary principalship were given little attention. And a new thought which says any degree graduates can manage the schools came to stage (SNNPR, 2004:5). In this regard, educational management was not considered as professional (Fessiha, 2005:27). Nevertheless, recently professionals in the area of educational management are invited to be a principal of secondary schools (MOE, 2007:30).

CHAPTER THREE

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter deals with two parts. The first part presents the characteristics of the study groups and the second part deals with the analysis of issues related with management of secondary schools in four sections.

3.1. Characteristics of the Study Participants

In order to get relevant and reliable information on the issue, three different and appropriate categories of respondents were involved in the study. The categories included school principals, general secondary schools teachers and woreda education office experts and supervisors. The respondents were targeted in responding to the questionnaires.

The respondents included in this study were believed to be relevant and key actors directly or indirectly by the virtue of their qualifications and their responsibilities in the issues of general secondary school management.

Accordingly, 223 copies of questionnaires were prepared and distributed to 13 general secondary school principals, 162 teaching staff in the mentioned grade level and to 48 WEOWs where the sampled general secondary schools were selected in the SNNPR State. However, the anticipated number of questionnaire was not filled in and returned to the researcher for the respondents' various reasons. The rate of return was 91.9 percent which was 205. Of these, 41 Woreda education officials comprised of 20 percent and 151 teaching staff and 13 principals respectively comprised of 73.7 percent and 6.3 percent (Table 3 page 45).

Table 2: Respondents by Sex and Responsibilities

Responsibility/ position	Sex				Grant Total	
	Male		Female			
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Principals	13	100	-	-	13	6.3
Teachers	136	90.1	15	9.9	151	73.7
WEOs	39	95.1	2	4.9	41	20
Grant Total	188	91.7	17	8.3	205	100

Regarding the sex of the respondents, Table 2 above shows that only about 8.3 percent were female out of the total respondents. What was not new here is none of the principals was female. The number of teachers and official female respondents also seemed minimal (8.3%) compared with male respondents (91.7%).

Table 3: Respondents by Age, Education and Work Experience

No	Characteristics	Respondents						Grant Total	
		Teachers		Principals		WEOs			
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Age (in years): Below 25	64	42.4	1	7.7	-	-	65	31.7
	25-30	48	31.8	7	53.8	5	12.2	60	29.3
	31-35	22	14.6	3	23.1	10	24.4	35	17.1
	Above 35	17	11.2	2	15.4	26	63.4	45	21.9
	Total	151	100	13	100	41	100	205	100
2	Educational level: BA/BSc/BEd	80	53	8	61.5	14	34.1	102	49.8
	Diploma	68	45	5	38.5	22	53.7	95	46.3
	TTI	-	-	-	-	5	12.2	5	2.4
	Unspecified	3	2	-	-	-	-	3	1.5
	Total	151	100	13	100	41	100	205	100
3	Field of specialization: Languages(English, Amharic)	29	19.2	3	23.1	7	17.1	39	19.0
	Natural sciences: (Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Math)	43	28.5	7	53.8	16	39	66	32.3
	Social sciences: Geography, History, Civics, HPE)	69	45.7	3	23.1	7	17.1	79	38.5
	Management: (EdPM & others)	-	-	-	-	5	12.2	5	2.4
	Others: (Law, IT, Accounting, etc.)	10	6.6	-	-	6	14.6	16	7.8
	Total	151	100	13	100	41	100	205	100
4	Total work experience (in years): 1-5	79	52.3	2	15.4	2	4.9	83	40.5
	6-10	33	21.9	2	15.4	2	4.9	37	18.0
	Above 10 years	39	25.8	9	69.2	37	90.2	85	41.5
	Total	151	100	13	100	41	100	205	100
5	Total work experience in teaching (in years): 1-5	-	-	1	7.7	2	4.9	3	5.6
	6-10	-	-	5	38.5	19	46.3	24	44.4
	Above 10 years	-	-	7	53.8	20	48.8	27	50.0
	Total	-	-	13	100	41	100	54	100

As can be noted from Table 3 item 1 page 45, 47.4% of the teachers were below the age of 25 years. 31.8% of them were from the year range 25-30 years. Other teachers ranged from the age of 31 to 35 and above 35 years were 14.6% and 11.2% respectively.

The same item on page 45 Table 3 also depicts the age of principals and WEOWs. Likewise, only 7.7% of the principals were below the age of 25 years. Among the respondents, 53.8% and 23.1 percent of the principals were in the age ranges 25-30 and 31-35 years. The rest 15.4% of the principals were above the age of 35. Others aged from 25 to 30 were 12.2% of the woreda education officers; and 24.4% and 63.4% were in the age ranges from 31-35 and above respectively.

From the table, one can observe that relatively more number of the teachers was below the age of 25 years. This implies that they were youngsters with qualification of medium or above medium standards. Therefore, they were advanced enough to fill in the questionnaire.

Generally, regarding the age of principals and WEOWs, they were found to be right for the purpose.

In item 2 page 45 Table 3, 53% of the teachers, 61.5% of the principals and 34.1% of the WEOWs were first degree holders which all made a percentage of 49.8% out of the total respondents. Other 45% of teachers, 38.45% principals and 53.7% of WEOWs were diploma graduates. Besides 12.2% of the WEOWs obtained TTI certificates. The rest 2% remained unspecified their educational level. However most of the respondents (95.93) had above TTI qualification. This indicates that the respondents were likely to have capability of providing the researcher with the required information.

According to item 3 of page 45 Table 3, 93% of teachers, 100% of principals and 73.2% of the WEOWs specialized in school subject areas. The rest only 12.2% of the WEOWs specialized in management (EdPM and developmental management) while the 21.2% specialized in other fields all made 7.8% out of the total.

From the item, it is seen that only 12.2% of the WEOWs were management (EdPM) graduates. This indicates that officials running the education system were not graduates from the field. Besides, none of the principals who are running the general secondary schools is a graduate from the field. This implies that schools did not gain what they need to gain through relevant skilled manpower.

As can be seen from item 4 page 45 Table3, 52.3% of the teachers, 15.4% of principals and 4.9% of WEOWs totally 40.5% of the respondents had been working for 1 to 5 years. 21.9% of teaching staff, 15.4% of principals and 4.9% of WEOWs served for 6-10 years while 25.8%, 69.2% and 90.2% of teachers, principals and WEOWs respectively had above ten years' experience.

According to the table, more number of the respondents were grouped in the first and third ranges. This means they are less experienced and more experienced. However, it was not believed that these groups could not give relevant information for the purpose because a year may be sufficient to consider the way a principal acts.

In item 5 Table 3 of page 45, the two groups of respondents (WEOWs and GSSPs) were asked if they had experience in teaching. Accordingly, all the principals and officers were relatively experienced in teaching. This indicates that there is a tendency of assigning principals and WEOWs from the schools. This may also imply two things. One may be principals, supervisors and /or experts were serving without having relevant knowledge for the positions. The

second, outstanding teachers may be initiated to serve in office rather than helping students.

Table4: Respondents' Areas of Experience and Current Assignment

No	Item	Respondents					
		Teachers		Principals		WEOW	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
1	previous or current post other than teaching						
	Principal	-	-	5	38.5		
	Unit leader	17	11.3	1	7.7		
	Department head	32	21.2	5	38.5		
	Committee's /club's head	76	50.3	2	15.4		
	Unspecified	26	17.2	-	-		
	Total	151	100	13	100		
2	Current job assignment						
	WEO head					5	12.2
	Education program head					7	17.1
	Supervisor					8	19.5
	Expert					16	39.0
	Unspecified					5	12.2
	Total					41	100

As can be seen from Table 4 item 1 above, 38.5% of the principal respondents were principals in the same or another school before they had been principal of the same school. The same percentage of the principals (38.5%) had been serving as a department head before. The other 7.69% and 15.39% of them had experience as a unit leader or committee's /club's head respectively.

Teachers' current posts other than teaching are listed in Table 4 of item 1 above. The table shows 11.3% and 21.2% of the teachers were unit leaders and department heads respectively. Others (50.3%) have been serving as committee's/club's heads though 17.22% remained unspecifieding their current assignment. Such positions probably help teachers to practice management. As result, teachers would have a better understanding in the completion of the questionnaire.

In item 2 Table 4 page 48, 39.0% of the WEOWs were experts while 19.5% were assigned as supervisors. Other 12.2% and 17.1% were the education

offices head and education program heads. All the WEOWs were in good positions to have an idea in the way general secondary schools in the woreda function.

3.2. Analysis of Respondents' Attitudes towards Principals' Interest, Success and Training

Table 5: Interests and Achievement of the Principals

No	Items	Responses						
		Responses	Teachers		WEOWs		principals	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Did you (the principal) want to be a principal?	Yes	-		13	31.7	4	30.7
		No			10	24.4	9	69.3
		I don't know			18	43.9	-	-
		Total			41	100	13	100
2	Is the principal (you) interested in managing the school now?	Yes	93	61.6	23	56.1	10	76.9
		No	30	19.9	18	43.9	3	23.1
		I don't know	28	18.5	-	-	-	-
		Total	151	100	41	100	13	100
3	Are teachers interested in the management style of you (the principals)	Yes	30	19.9	9	21.9	9	69.2
		No	80	52.0	32	78.1	4	30.8
		To some extent	29	19.1	-	-	-	-
		I don't know	12	8.0	-	-	-	-
		Total	151	100	41	100	13	100
4	Are you (the principals) successful in your (their) management	yes	23	15.2	10	24.4	7	53.8
		No	83	55.0	28	68.3	6	46.2
		To some extent	30	19.9	-	-	-	-
		I don't know	15	10	3	7.3	-	-
		Total	151	100	41	100	13	100

As can be seen from Table 5 item 1 above, 69.2% of the principal respondents revealed that they had not had interest before they came to principalship positions. And, the rest 30.8% indicated that they were interested to be a principal. However, 43.9% of the WEOWs said they did not know about their interest while 31.7% and 24.4% respectively suggested "yes" and "no" for principals' earlier interests. This item was accompanied by an open ended question which sought a reason for why principals did hate or like to be a principal. Accordingly, about 63.1% of the principals suggested that they had disliked that because of small amount of salary paid, lack of concepts of management, its criticism and not to suffer much were mentioned. The rest

few reasoned out that they liked to serve their society with fair management. From the item, it is understood that the principals and the other respondents were not interested to be principals. This implies that leadership is not considered as a profession.

In item 2 Table 5 page 49, respondents were asked if GSSPs were interested in managing/running the schools nowadays. 61.6% of teachers, 56.1% of WEOWs and 76.9% of the principals assured that principals were interested in managing the schools. The rest 19.9%, 43.9% and 23.1% teachers, WEOWs and GSSPs respectively responded negatively while 18.5% of the teachers expressed their unknowingness in the matter. The responses indicate that most principals developed interest after their assignment in principalship positions. From this, one may note that interests may be developed when one starts exercising the act, which needs further investigation.

Item 3 Table 5 page 49 shows the attitude of respondents towards teachers' interest on the management style of the principal in the schools. On the basis of this, 19.9% of the teaching staff and 22% of the WEOWs answered positively. This response was assured by 69.2% of the principals. However, 53% of teachers, 78.1% of WEOWs and 30.8% of the principals indicated that they were not interested by principals' management styles. Besides, this item required principals to indicate the reason why teachers were not interested in their management if they were not really interested. The reasons written were due to conflicts created, teachers' vast needs and interests are difficult to satisfy; and some also cited lack of management skill and experience.

Moreover, to see the significant difference among the responses of the respondents' opinion, chi-square statistical tool was employed. Accordingly X^2 calculated was 36.67. This shows significance difference at $\alpha = 0.05$. (Appendix D).

In item 4 of Table 5 page 49, 15.2% of the teachers and 24.4% of the WEOWs believed that principals were successful. Teachers and WEOWs ideas were supported by 53.9% of the GSSPs. However 55% of the teachers and 68.3% of the WEOWs and 46.2% of principals reacted negatively. They believed that principals were not successful in their management. According to the majority groups of the respondents (Teachers and WEOWs), the GSSPs were not successful.

The chi-square test was used to check the significance difference between the two groups of the respondents. That is $X^2 (3, n=205) = 27.01, P < 0.05$. This means the calculated X^2 is greater than the table value (Appendix D). This indicates that there is a significant difference.

Table 6: Principals Training and Ways of Appointment

No	Items	Responses	Principals	
			N	%
1	How were you assigned in this position?	By competition	2	15.4
		Being a member of that particular society	2	15.4
		By higher authority	6	46.2
		Unspecified	3	23.0
		Total	13	100
2	Are you trained as a principal?	Yes	2	15.4
		No	11	84.6
		Total	13	100
3	If your answer above is "no", have you had short term orientation?	Yes	7	63.6
		No	4	36.4
		Total	11	100

As can be noted from Table 6 above, 46.2% of the principals were selected or assigned by higher authority. 15.4% each were appointed on the basis of merit (their proficiency) and by the fact that they were born or they were a member of that particular society. From this one may infer that more number of GSSPs is assigned by higher authority which may have subjectivity and/or political implication. In this regard, appropriate and fit able applicants may not get a chance of being employed which in turn may harm the general

purpose of teaching learning process. This is because identifying as well as developing effective leadership is a crucial and salient concern (Somech and Wenderow, 2006:747).

Item 2 of Table 6 above depicts whether principals got training or not. Accordingly, most (84.6%) of the principals were not trained as a principalship to manage GSSs. However, in item 3, more (63.6%) of the principals responded that they had short-term orientation while the 36.4% of the principals had neither training nor short-term orientation. In this respect, the schools efficiency may be affected negatively due to the principals' minimal training or orientation. This is true of Melesew's finding(2005:92).

3.3. Analysis of Major Managerial Functions

The major managerial functions: planning, organizing, controlling, staffing, directing and etc. are still considered as the modern ways of rendering responsibility of employees though they were evolved from traditional school of thought with meaning difference. In line with idea, Kerzner (2002:224) confirmed practitioners' tendency towards the application of such functions in modern management system. According to Jeilu (2006:105), management staffs need to be enabled to carry out management tasks in areas of planning, program preparation, implementation and monitoring. There fore, the functions of managements presented below are believed to reflect the performance of GSSPs. To see to what extent GSSPs practice them, the frequency indicators always=3, sometimes=2, and 1=never were used. For analysis simplicity purpose, the ranges of the weighted means are categorized as follows:

- 1.00-1.7 Never (low level of performance)
- 1.8-2.3 Sometimes (medium level of performance)
- 2.4-3.0 Always (frequent level of performance)

The responses given by the respondents on the management functions of principals were analyzed accordingly as follows.

1. Analysis of Planning Function of Management

Planning is one of the front line management function through which all the other functions are carried out. The need for planning to GSSPs is unquestionable. This is why professionals in the field strongly recommend to have qualified planners in addition to administrators (Eshiwani 1989:122). It is also considered as a management pitfall (Kerenz, 2002:262), Holmes, 1993:19). The following table illustrates briefly to what extent GSSPs carry out planning and its related activities.

Table: 7 Planning functions of Principals

No	Planning functions	Responses	Respondents					
			Principals		WEOWs		Teachers	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
1	The principal identifies the weakness and strengths of the school before planning	3	9	69.2	18	43.9	48	31.8
		2	4	30.8	21	51.2	75	49.7
		1	-	-	2	4.9	28	18.5
		Total	13	100	41	100	151	100
2	The principal prepares a plan according to national and regional goals	3	12	92.3	23	56.1	89	58.9
		2	1	7.7	16	39.0	34	22.5
		1	-	-	2	4.9	28	18.6
		Total	13	100	41	100	151	100
3	The plan is made known by every member of the school clearly and made to accomplish.	3	8	61.5	18	43.9	50	33.1
		2	5	38.5	20	48.8	71	47.0
		1	-	-	3	7.3	30	19.9
		Total	13	100	41	100	151	100
4	The plan is shared to each department concerned body to accomplish	3	9	69.2	21	51.2	74	49.0
		2	4	30.8	18	43.9	48	31.8
		1	-	-	2	4.9	29	19.2
		Total	13	100	41	100	151	100

Key: 3=Always 2= Sometimes 1=Never

As can be seen from Table 7 item 1 above, 69.2% of the principals indicated that they always identified weaknesses and strengths of the school as a situation analysis before they started to plan. The rest 30.8% indicated that

The responses given by the respondents on the management functions of principals were analyzed accordingly as follows.

1. Analysis of Planning Function of Management

Planning is one of the front line management function through which all the other functions are carried out. The need for planning to GSSPs is unquestionable. This is why professionals in the field strongly recommend to have qualified planners in addition to administrators (Eshiwani 1989:122). It is also considered as a management pitfall (Kerenz, 2002:262), Holmes, 1993:19). The following table illustrates briefly to what extent GSSPs carry out planning and its related activities.

Table: 7 Planning functions of Principals

No	Planning functions	Responses	Respondents					
			Principals		WEOWs		Teachers	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
1	The principal identifies the weakness and strengths of the school before planning	3	9	69.2	18	43.9	48	31.8
		2	4	30.8	21	51.2	75	49.7
		1	-	-	2	4.9	28	18.5
		Total	13	100	41	100	151	100
2	The principal prepares a plan according to national and regional goals	3	12	92.3	23	56.1	89	58.9
		2	1	7.7	16	39.0	34	22.5
		1	-	-	2	4.9	28	18.6
		Total	13	100	41	100	151	100
3	The plan is made known by every member of the school clearly and made to accomplish.	3	8	61.5	18	43.9	50	33.1
		2	5	38.5	20	48.8	71	47.0
		1	-	-	3	7.3	30	19.9
		Total	13	100	41	100	151	100
4	The plan is shared to each department concerned body to accomplish	3	9	69.2	21	51.2	74	49.0
		2	4	30.8	18	43.9	48	31.8
		1	-	-	2	4.9	29	19.2
		Total	13	100	41	100	151	100

Key: 3=Always 2= Sometimes 1=Never

As can be seen from Table 7 item 1 above, 69.2% of the principals indicated that they always identified weaknesses and strengths of the school as a situation analysis before they started to plan. The rest 30.8% indicated that

they some times identify the weaknesses and strengths before planning was taking place. WEOs and teachers' responses support the idea of the principals who rated sometimes and below. That is 56.1% of the WEOs and more number of the teachers (68.2%) replied sometimes and below. Although 43.9% of the WEOs and 31.8% of the teachers agreed with always, inconsiderable number of the principals and 18.5% of the teachers responded that principals never accomplish the activity. From this, it is understood that the respondents either did not have equal understanding or there was subjectivity in responding the item.

To see the significance difference between the respondents' attitude, χ^2 statistical tool is used. The calculated chi square-test for independent variables with degree of freedom four is 9.86 at $\alpha=0.05$. The table value is 9.488. This shows that respondents showed significance difference concerning the item involving situation analysis $\chi^2 (4, n=205)=9.86, p < 0.05$.

Further more, weighted mean was employed to confirm the tendency of the respondents to which direction or side their opinion categorized. The tool shows 2.2 (Appendix D). That is, their opinion is some where between usually and sometimes. What is vivid here is that principals did not carry out situation analysis always. In line with this idea, Kemmerer (1994:12) stated that situation analysis should be taking place all the time before planning.

Item 2 Table 7 page 53 depicts that most (92.3%) of the principals, 56.1% of the WEOs and 58.9% of the teaching staff all together assured that the plan prepared was on the basis of national and regional goals for the academic year. On the other hand, some respondents did not hesitate to indicate that the plan was sometimes prepared according to the national and regional goals. Considerable number of teachers (13.9%) and WEOs (2.4%) also indicated 'never'. This implies that principals did have good understanding to which areas the plan should focus.

Nowadays, due to the introduction of the result oriented performance plan, objectives of the school are objectives of the region and the nation which should be drawn from the mission and vision of the nation strategic plan. It would be this ideology and practice or principle that leads the respondents to the same agreement (SNNPEB, 2004:9).

In item 3 page 53 Table 7, 61.5% the principals, 43.9% WEOs and 33.1% of the teaching staff agreed that the school plan was always made known by the school members in the school. Nevertheless, 38.5% of the principals, 48.8% of the WEOs and 47.0% of the teachers indicated that the plan is sometimes made known by the members of the school and had clarity. The rest 18.5% of teacher forwarded that the plan was never made clear and known by the school members. In the item, it is observed that more number of the principals positively replied the item while the teachers and officials reacted negatively. This could be due to misunderstanding or subjectivity. However, the \bar{x}_w (2.21) shows sometimes.

To see the variation among the respondents opinion χ^2 (chi-square) statistics was used. The calculated $\chi^2= 17.05$ (Appendix D) is greater than to that of the table value at alpha level= 0.05 which assures significant difference among the responses. The difference tells us that school plan is not made clear to the member of the schools. This may imply that teachers know little about what they should do in the school and simultaneously, the principals' commitment in doing so seems minimal. As result, the schools' objectives were not to be executed. However, respondents were asked how often they shared the plan in the following item. The responses obtained were discussed as follow.

In item 4 Table 7 page 53 69.2% of the principals, 51.2% of the WEOs and 49.0% of the teachers answered 'often' to indicate that the school plan is shared to each concerned body accordingly while 30.8% of principals, 43.9%

of WEOW and 31.8% of teachers responded 'sometime' in reacting the item. This item seems to be applied due to the newly introduced result oriented performance plan principle. As introduced earlier, one of its principles states that plans should be shared to each member (SNNPREB, 2004: 9).

2. Organizing school activities

Organization is another important element in school management which help to identify activities that will bring out the results desired. In this function, the principal decides and affects what jobs would have to be filled and the duties and responsibilities attached to each one (Adesina, 1990:11; and Pounder and others, 1995:565).The following table (Table 8) shows principals' practice of organization.

Table 8: Principals' Participations in Organizing School Activities

No	Functions of organizations	Responses	Respondents					
			Teachers		Principals		WEOWs	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
1	The principal specifies the school plan for easy accomplishment	3	47	31.1	10	76.9		
		2	78	51.7	1	7.7		
		1	26	17.2	2	15.4		
		Total	151	100	13	100		
2	Staff members have clear understanding to whom to report and work with	3	79	52.3	13	100		
		2	53	35.1	-	-		
		1	19	12.4	-	-		
		Total	151	100	13	100		
3	The principal arranges experience sharing program and school level training with in or other school	3	22	14.6	6	46.2	8	19.5
		2	62	41.0	5	38.5	29	70.7
		1	67	44.4	2	15.3	4	9.8
		Total	151	100	13	100	41	100

Key: 3=Always 2= Sometimes 1=Never

Table 8 item 1 above presents that principals who accounted for 76.9% and 31.1% of teachers felt that principals always specify the activities of the school for ease performance. However, more of the teachers (51.7%) and less of the principals (7.7%) reported that principals sometimes specify the activities for ease performance. Others, 17.2% teachers and 15.4% of the

principals responded that the principals never specify plans in the way staff members perform them easily. The weighted mean, \bar{x}_w (2.17) shows that the performance was above sometimes. On top, the chi-square reveals that the presence of significant difference (Appendix D).

In item 2 Table 8, the two groups were requested to what extent staff members know to whom to report and to work with. Consequently, 52.3% of the teacher and all the principals (100%) indicated their confidence that staff members always know to whom to report and work with where as 35.1% and 12.4% of the teachers respectively replied that staff members never know to whom to report and work with. Regarding to this majority response, it may be possible to say one means of communication is practical in the schools which may cause success (Kerzner, 2002: 265).

According to item 3 Table 8 page 56, more number of all the groups of the respondents replied that experience sharing or school level training programs with in or other school were not always held. 38.5%, 70.7% and 41.0% of principals, WEOWs and teachers respectively assured that (i.e. principals sometimes arrange school level experience sharing programs. 44.4% of teachers, 9.8% of WEOWs and 15.3% of principals themselves also believed that the activity was never held at school level. This item was tested by statistical tools. The chi-square at $\chi^2(4, n=205)=25.75, p<0.05$ indicates that the respondents showed a significant difference on the question concerning experience sharing program at school level. The weighted mean also showed that the activity was performed below medium frequency. This implies that the ability or the commitment of principals in giving or arranging training and experience sharing program was small which has impact on the school's efficiency (pounder and Merrill, 2001:36). However, the agreed consensus is that principals perform a major role in the professional development of teachers (Addi-Raccah, 2006:291).

3. Controlling Function of Management

Controlling is a three step process of measuring progress towards educational objectives such as measuring, evaluating and correcting (Kerzner, 2002:224). These steps are widely applicable in education system. GSSPs also apply the steps to measure the performance of their subordinates. In the following table, an attempt is made to show to what extent GSSPs used them.

Table 9: Principals' Controlling Roles

No	Controlling functions	Res ponse s	Respondents					
			Principals		Teachers		WEOWs	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Clear standards for the performance of plans are set	3	8	61.5	56	37.1	15	36.6
		2	4	30.8	58	38.4	21	51.2
		1	1	7.7	37	24.5	5	12.2
		Total	151	100	13	100	41	100
2	Actual results performances are checked on the basis of agreed standards	3	9	69.2	57	37.8		
		2	3	23.1	54	35.8		
		1	1	7.7	40	26.4		
		Total	13	100	151	100		
3	Corrective actions and feedback are given after the accomplishment of a plan/task	3	9	69.2	42	27.8		
		2	4	30.8	63	41.7		
		1			46	30.5		
		Total	13	100	151	100		
4	Climate of honesty and integrity is created in the work environment.	3	8	61.5	63	41.7		
		2	4	30.8	53	35.1		
		1	1	7.7	35	23.2		
		Total	13	100	151	100		
5	There are step by step procedures to control school members.	3					18	43.9
		2					20	48.8
		1					3	7.3
		Total					41	100

Key: 3=Always 2= Sometimes 1=Never

According to Table 9 item 1 above, 61.5% of the principals reported that the principals always set standards for the performance of plans. However, <always> was chosen by only 37.1% of teachers and 36.6% of WEOWs to indicate the frequency of setting standards. More number of WEOWs (51.2%), 38.4% teachers and 30.8% of principals agreed that clear standards were set sometimes/occasionally. From the responses, it is noticed that among the

controlling mechanisms the so called preparing or setting standards found to be less. This widens the chance for less controlling system because the work done is measured against the standards or objectives established (Stoner and Freeman, 1989).

In item 2 of Table 9 Page 58, more number of principals (69.2%) and 37.8% of teachers responded that they always check/measure the actual performance of teachers on the basis agreed standards set. However, 35.8% teachers and 23.1% of principals indicated sometimes while 26.4% of teachers and 7.7% of principals replied 'never'.

In this item, chi-square χ^2 (2, n=164)=7.45, $p < 0.05$ indicates the significant difference. This means that checking teachers' performance actually was not as expected. This may imply that either principals did not share the plan clearly or they may have ignored how much of the plan they should achieve. This may also be a source of conflict between teachers and principals during performance appraisal due to the ambiguity they have on the amount /quantity of accomplishment.

Item 3 of Table 9 page 58 reports that 69.2% of principals gave corrective action and feedback after the accomplishment of a certain plan. Nevertheless, more number the teacher respondents (41.7%) and 30.8% of the principals supported that sometimes principals gave correction and feedback while 30.5% of the teachers responded never.

Item 4 in Table 9 page 58 shows how frequently principals created a climate of honesty and integrity in the working environment. 61.5% of the principals and more number of teachers (41.7%) responded that they always create the atmosphere while 30.8% of principals and 35.1% of the teaching staff answered sometimes for the item. The rest, 7.7% of the principals and 23.2%

of the teaching staffs replied principals in the selected GSSs never created honesty and integrity in working environment.

A Chi-square used in this item indicated that there is significant difference. In this regard GSSPs' ability/commitment to create conducive working environment in the way respondents understood was small; which is essential element for controlling school management (Rinehart and others, 1998:633).

The last item in Table 9 page 58 was answered by WEOs to indicate their opinions as far as the presence of step by step procedures were concerned.

Accordingly, 43.9% of the WEOs reported that there were always step by step procedures for successful control while more (48.8%) of the WEOs indicated their 'sometimes' presence. The rest responded never. The statistical tool, mean (2.2) assures the situation that principals prepare working procedures is some times (Appendix D).

In the blue print of school improvement program, the item is set as an activity to be done every day not sometimes (MOE 2007:17).Therefore, the GSSPs in the sample study areas had a problem of preparing or making clear procedures of work accomplishment.

Generally, Table 9 illustrates that the performance of GSSPs with weighted mean ranging from 2.00-2.22, which is below the expected.

4. Reporting and Motivating Functions of Management

Reporting and motivating are the other elements of management unction through which GSSPs get jobs done (SNNPREB 2004:3). As result, selected items distributed to respondents were presented in the following table.

Table 10: Respondents' Responses on Reporting and Motivation

No	Item	Responses	Respondents			
			Teachers		WEOWs	
			N	%	N	%
1	The principal initiates stakeholders (community, NGOs and WEO) to accomplish their activities in the cognizance of the school's objectives.	3	58	38.4	14	34.1
		2	66	43.7	25	61.0
		1	27	17.9	2	4.9
		Total	151	100	41	100
2	Actual results performances are checked on the basis of agreed standards	3			13	31.7
		2			24	58.5
		1			4	9.8
		Total			41	100

Key: 3=Always 2= Sometimes 1=Never

As can be seen from Table 10 item 1 above, more number of WEOWs (61.0%) and teaching staffs (43.7) responded that the GSSPs sometimes initiated stakeholders (community, NGOs and WEO) to accomplish their respective concern in the cognizance of schools objectives. However, 38.4% of teachers and 34.1% of the WEOWs believed that GSSPs often initiate stakeholders to accomplish their activities. Others, 17.9% of teachers and 9.78% WEOWs never thought principals initiate the stakeholders mentioned. Totally, about 60% of the teachers and 65% of the WEOWs said that principals initiated the stakeholders below sometimes scale value. The χ^2 and weighted mean used proved the situation (Appendix D). That is the accomplishment of the item was below sometimes. This implies the role GSSPs play to motivate stakeholders is minimal. However, literature reveals that this should be practiced regularly (Datnow and Castellano, 2002:221; MoE, 2007:17).

According to item 2 of Table 10 page 68, 31.7% of the WEOW selected usually and 58.5% responded sometimes while each 9.8% replied never to indicate the extent of reporting from school to woreda was clear, complete and timely. From this, it could be understood that WEOWs were not satisfied by their reporting style and in turn this may indicate their low performance, too.

3.4. Analysis on Management Skills

According to Davis (1998:66) and Datnow and Castellano (2001:221), because of the complex nature of principals' roles, they require appropriate skills which may rescue them from doing evilly. They must be capable of inquiring into the problem they face (Larson, 1997:348). The management skills namely conceptual, technical and interpersonal help principals accomplish their job appropriately. Therefore, the respondents' views towards the skills of GSSPs were categorized of in to 5 scales, namely, 5= strongly agree, 4= agree 3= undecided, 2= disagree and 1= strongly disagree. Table 11 shows to what extent principals use these major skills following their analysis. Although the degree is not the same (among agreements), the first and the last two indicate nearly the same opinion. Therefore, for the sake of convenience, and to avoid confusion, frequencies of responses given to the first and last two scales are combined. By so doing, most of the rating scales are minimized in to 3 i.e. Agree, Medium and Disagree for percentage interpretation and the weighted means are scaled as;

0.5-1.5=Strongly Disagree

1.6-2.5=Disagree

2.6-3.5= Medium (undecided)

3.6-4.5= Agree

4.6-5-5.00 =Strongly Agree

Table 11: Views of Respondents towards GSSPs Management Skills

No	Managerial skills	Respondents	Responses										Total	
			5		4		3		2		1			
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	No	%	N	%
1	Conducting frequent classroom observation and giving relevant feedback	A	7	53.9	4	30.8	1	7.7	1	7.7	-	-	13	100
		C	23	15.2	59	39.1	21	13.9	27	17.9	21	13.9	151	100
2	Creating conducive climate for teaching and learning/ school's objectives	A	6	46.0	6	46.0	1	8.0					13	100
		B	8	19.5	20	48.8	7	17.1	4	9.8	2	4.9	41	100
		C	40	26.5	60	39.7	15	9.9	21	13.9	15	9.9	151	100
3	Cooperating well with other members of the staff and WEO	A	8	61.5	4	30.8	1	7.7					13	100
		B	15	36.6	17	41.4	4	9.8	4	9.8	1	2.4	41	100
		C	32	21.2	66	43.7	20	13.2	15	9.9	18	11.9	151	100
4	Involving PTA and concerned bodies in the school improvement program	A	9	69.2	3	23.1	1	7.7					13	100
		B	13	31.7	17	41.5	6	14.7	4	9.8	1	2.4	41	100
		C	38	25.2	65	43.1	21	13.9	17	11.3	10	6.6	151	100
5	Checking the lesson with real life situation of student	C	32	21.2	46	30.5	30	19.8	22	14.6	21	13.9	151	100
6	Encouraging teachers to conduct research	C	30	19.9	52	34.4	28	18.5	22	14.6	19	12.6	151	100
7	Looking for a mechanism to develop the profession of teachers	C	22	14.6	52	34.44	28	18.5	22	14.6	27	17.9	151	100
8	Communicating the school's rules and policy to the stakeholders clearly and regularly	C	37	24.5	55	36.4	23	15.2	22	14.6	14	9.3	151	100
9	Considering the opinion of students as a vital input in evaluating the school plan	C	36	23.8	55	36.4	28	18.5	21	13.9	11	7.3	151	100

Key:A= Principals, B= WEOWs, C= Teachers

As can be seen from Table 11 item 1 page 63, 53.9% of the principals and 15.2% of the teachers strongly agreed (believed) that principals frequently conduct classroom observation and give relevant feedback after observation. Others, 30.8% of the principals and 39.1% of the teachers agreed on that principals frequently conducted classroom observation and give relevant feedback while 13.9% of teaching staff and 7.7% of the principals unable to decide on the condition. The rest 13.9% of the teachers strongly disagreed on the act of frequent classroom observation. Regarding to this item, it seems that principals perform the activity in a better way which may result good learning-teaching conditions. Besides, t-test is applied to check the significance difference at $\alpha=0.05$ with average degree of freedom 19.

The calculated t-value 0.12 is less than the table value 2.093 which means no significance difference is observed.

In item 2 table 11 page 63, 46.15% of the principals, 19.5% of WEOWs and 26.5% of teachers strongly agreed that principals create conducive atmosphere for teaching and learning process; and 46.0%, 48.8% and 39.7% of principals, WEOW and TS respectively answered 'agree'. Others, considerable percentage of Teachers (13.9) and 9.8% of WEOWs and 9.93% of TSs and 4.9% of WEOWs respectively responded disagree and 'strongly disagree'. From the item it is seen that more number of the principals' responses lean towards positive side comparing to other respondents' responses i.e., the percentages of the principals who selected (5) and WEOWs who selected (5) were vary largely. This may indicate there is no clear consensus among the respondents. Any how, the weighted mean (3.66) confirms that the conducive climate created was above the medium. This implies that GSSPs in the sample GSSs attempted (if not succeeded) to make the environment attractive for quality education to students. This is one of the profiles that principals should fulfill (MoE, 2004:32).

According to item 3 Table 11page 63, 61.5% GSSPs, 36.6%WEOWs and 21.2% of Teachers strongly believed that principals cooperate well with other staff members and WEO too. Moreover, relatively more percentages of WEOWs and Teachers (41.4% & 43.7% respectively) and 30.8% of the principals selected “agree”. However, a few of the respondents replied (2) and (1) to indicate their disagreement and strong disagreement. Generally, principals had good cooperation and relation with staff members and WEOWs though the extent of respondents’ belief on this matter is different.

In item 4 Table 11page 63, 69.2% of principals, 31.7% WEOWs and 25.2% of Teachers strongly agreed that principals involve Parent Teachers Association in school improvement program. Besides, 23.1%, 41.5% and 43.7% of principals, WEOWs and Teachers respectively said ‘agree’ with the idea. Others 13.9% of Teachers and 14.6% of WEOWs remained undecided the situation. The rest few of the respondents indicated their disagreement. Though the respondents’ attitude in this specific item seems positive or above medium (3.79 in weighted mean measurement),scholars believe that the activity should be practiced regularly and principals often must spend increased time promoting the school’s image and working more closely with parents, teachers, school boards and other external agents (MOE, 2004:32; Datnow and Castellano, 2001:222).

In item 5 Table 11page 63, only Teachers were asked to what extent they agree that principals check whether the lesson of the students relate with real life situation. The assumption giving the items only to the group was that they might have better understanding. Accordingly, 21.2%, 30.5%, 19.8%, 14.6%, and 12.6% of the Teachers respondents answered (5), (4), (3), (2), and (1) respectively. Though more of the Teachers indicated (4), further statistical tool was used. Consequently, the mean (3.16) indicates the agreement is

around the medium scale or undecided zone. This reflects that the performance was not as expected.

Likewise, in items 6, 7, 8 and 9 Table 11 page 63, similar scenario is observed as item 5. The responses are distributed randomly among the scales without showing a clear tendency of respondents' emotion about the issues raised.

The statistical tool used shows the attitudes respondents had on the particular issue was around medium scale or undecided zone. In these items, it may be concluded that the respondents' views on the issue seems a constituent of ambiguity.

Table 12: Responses of Respondents about Management Skills

No	Item	Respondent	Responses										Total	
			5		4		3		2		1		No	%
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%		
	The plan is accomplished With harmony at school	B	8	19.5	24	58.5	4	9.8	3	7.3	2	4.9	41	100
		A	8	61.5	4	30.8	1	7.7	-	-	-	-	13	100
	The principal comes with innovative ideas	B	5	12.2	23	56.0	7	17.1	4	9.8	2	4.9	41	100

Key:A= Principals, B= WEOs, C= Teachers

As Table 12 item 1 above depicts, 19.5% of the WEOs and 61.5% of the principals strongly agreed that there is harmony in accomplishing objectives while 58.5% and 30.8% of WEOs and principals respectively answered 'agree'. Considerable numbers of the respondents remained undecided or disagreed with the issue.

The t-test at $\alpha=0.05$; $df=30$, confirms that the majority of the respondents answered positively in responding the item. In item 2 page 66 table 12 more percentages (56.0%) of the WEOWs agreed that principals come with innovative ideas. The table generally shows that principals in one or another way may accomplish the objectives. However, the responses are distributed along the scales.

3.5. Major Managerial Problems

In the situation where appropriate education and training are limited, it is obvious that problems in management are likely to occur. This is true in American education, too (Pounder and Merrill, 2001:27). In our situation, the problem seems serious due to lack of proper education and qualification in the field. Therefore, in the following sections, an attempt was made to analyze the common problems GSSPs face based on the attitudes of the respondents turn by turn using the same scale as the previous section.

3.5.1. Qualification and Knowledge Related Problems

Educational background or qualification can be one of the determinants which help principals to discharge their responsibility. Experience, training and qualification all increase our understanding to the way objectives achieved (Dubale, 1997:39). Accordingly, in Table 15 respondents' attitudes were presented and analyzed to show to what extent qualification and knowledge related problems (qualification, knowledge, experience and training) influenced principals to carry out their duty.

Table 13: Qualification and Training of Principals as perceived by Respondents

No	problems	Respondent	Responses											
			5		4		3		2		1		Total	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Lack of proper training	A	6	46.1	4	30.8	1	7.7	2	15.4	-	-	13	100
		B	13	31.7	11	26.8	5	12.2	7	17.1	5	12.2	41	100
		C	43	28.5	61	40.4	11	7.3	26	17.2	10	6.6	151	100
2	Lack of basic knowledge of educational mgt.	A	7	53.8	4	30.8	-	-	2	15.4	-	-	13	100
		B	10	24.4	18	43.9	3	7.3	7	17.1	3	7.3	41	100
		C	30	19.9	52	34.4	19	12.6	31	20.5	19	12.6	151	100
3	Lack of clear understanding of educational policy	A	2	15.4	2	15.4	-	-	6	46.2	3	23.0	13	100
		B	9	21.9	5	12.2	7	17.0	12	29.3	8	19.5	41	100
		C	21	13.9	44	29.1	18	11.9	43	28.5	25	16.6	151	100
4	Absence of experience to tackle challenges	A	1	7.7	8	61.5	2	15.4	1	7.7	1	7.7	13	100
		B	9	21.9	21	51.2	3	7.3	4	9.78	4	9.8	41	100
		C	30	19.9	48	31.8	23	15.2	32	21.2	18	11.2	151	100
5	Unable to give convincing comments after the accomplishment of a plan	C	21	13.9	33	21.9	23	15.2	45	29.8	29	19.2	151	100

Key:A= Principals, B= WEOWs, C= Teachers

According to Table 13, item 1 page 68, totally about 77% of the principals, 57% of WEOWs and 68% of the Teachers indicated their agreement that the GSSPs have a problem of proper training that impede their duties to perform/ accomplish. Among the respondents, in the particular issue 7.69% of principals, 12.2% of WEOWs and 7.3% of the Teachers remained undecided. The rest, 15.4%, 29.3% and 23.8% of GSSPs, WEOWs and TS respectively answered that principals of general secondary schools in the zones and special woreda did not lack training. However, according to the majority of the respondents, GSSPs lack training. The responses of the respondents were proved by weighted mean (3.66) which means above the medium (strongly agree zone)(Appendix D). This situation was proved by Hassen (2005:82 and Melesew,2005:92) which says majority of the principals were not trained in school administration. However, Lockheed and others (1991:134) recommended that managers at various levels should have the training to do their jobs effectively.

Principals' main problem is not only lack of proper training but also lack of basic knowledge of management. As can be seen from item 2 of table 13 page 68, about 84% of the GSSPs themselves, 68% of the WEOWs and 54% of the Teachers all together agreed (if not strongly agreed) that the leaders of the GSSPs lack basic knowledge of management. The weighted statistical mean (3.41) also confirms the situation (Appendix D). From this, it might be possible to say that the GSSPs who were working in the schools used their experience or their short term orientation to run the school. Nevertheless, the impact created on the school improvement program and students' result in general would be damaged (World Bank, 1990:32).

In item 3 of table 13 page 68, respondents were asked if knowledge of educational policy was a problem of GSSPs in the zones and special woreda in sample GSSs. As result, 30.8% of the principals, 34% of WEOWs and 43% of

the Teachers agreed that principals' knowledge of educational policy was limited while 69.2% of the GSSPs, 48.8% of WEOWs and 45% of the teaching staff where the selected principals were working with disagreed with specific matter.

It is seen that more of the respondents were to disagreement position. This means that principals did not have a problem of educational policy understanding. Further more, the weighted mean (2.91) assures the disagreement position. The respondents might have considered that principals understood the policy because of the exposures they had or there had been some ways that crate awareness to GSSPs.

According to item 4 of table 13 page 68, about 69.2%, 73.2% and 51.7% of the principals, WEOWs and teachers all agree that principals were not well experienced to solve the problem that faced the school or them.15.4% of principals,7.3% of WEOWs and 15.2% of the teachers on the other hand remained undecided while about 15.4% of principals, 19.5% of WEOWs and 33.1% of teachers responded negatively. From the responses of this item, principals were not experienced enough for principalship positions. This is perhaps most of the general secondary schools are nowadays established in the remote areas of the zones. In developing countries, like ours, the great majority of educational managers lack experience and training they need to fulfill their professionals' roles effectively (Lockheed and others, 1991:135).

The last item in Table 13 of table 13 page 68, depicts that the views of teachers towards convincing comments given by GSSPs after the implementation of a plan. In this respect 35.8% of them agreed that principals were unable to give convincing comments after teachers accomplished their respective objectives while 49.0% of them responded disagree. The rest 15.2% of the teaching staffs remained undecided. The

calculated mean also shows that the accomplishment is below medium (2.81). Therefore, it can be said that principals had problems in this area. This indicates that the presence of problem on planning functions. Regarding to this idea, Stephen H. Davis concluded that one of the reasons for the failure of principals is poor planning and decision making (Davis, 1998:65).

3.5.2. Principals' International Problems

It has been stated that principals do in collaboration with stakeholders (teachers, employers, parents, students and non-governmental organizations) in previous sections. In the day-to-day interactions, principals need interpersonal skills which may be acquired through training though it can be acquired by natural (Davis, 1998:66). In the following table, it was tried to present interactions related problems following analysis.

Table 14: International Problems of Principals as Perceived by the Respondents

No	problems	Respondent	Responses											
			5		4		3		2		1		Total	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Principals lack autonomy to make decisions	A	-	-	3	23.1	3	23.1	3	23.1	4	30.7	13	100
2	Unnecessary interface of woreda education officers	A	3	23.1	5	38.5	1	7.7	4	30.8	-	-	13	100
3	The society is not cooperative in the school activities	A	1	7.7	1	7.7	1	7.7	6	46.1	4	30.8	13	100
4	Communication from WEO to school is slow and vice versa	A	4	30.8	3	23.1	-	-	3	23.1	3	23.1	13	100
		B	7	17.1	17	41.5	5	12.2	8	19.5	4	9.8	41	100
5	Lack of support from WEO	A	4	30.8	4	30.8	-	-	4	30.8	1	7.6	13	100
6	Unable to create good relation with stakeholders(teachers, parents, WEOWs)	B	10	24.4	16	39.0	5	12.2	9	22.0	1	2.4	41	100
		C	25	26.6	28	18.5	24	15.9	46	30.5	28	18.5	151	100
7	Lack of acceptance by stakeholders(NGOs,employers, parents)	B	5	12.2	10	24.4	7	17.1	13	31.7	6	14.6	41	100

Key:A= Principals, B= WEOWs, C= Teachers

As can be seen from item 1 Table 14 page 72, principals did not believe that they had problem on autonomous. Only 23.1% of them agreed that they lack autonomy while about 53.8% of them disagreed with the idea. The rest 23.1% remained undecided due to their own reason. However, the problem does not seem serious. The arithmetic means ($\bar{x} = 2.38$) proves that below the medium, which means more number of the respondents disagree with the idea. However, in item 2 Table 14 page 72, 23.1% and 38.5% of the principals respectively responded strongly agree and agree in replaying the unnecessary interference of woreda education office. The agreement side makes a total of 61.5%. The rest 30.8% showed their disagreement while 7.7% remained undecided. The arithmetic mean ($\bar{x} = 3.54$) also shows that above the medium. Principals believed that there has been unnecessary interference of woreda education officers in the school management. But items 1 and 2, in Table 14 page 72, seem contradicting with each other. This may be because principals did not understand the item. If principals did have interference problem, it is difficult to say they are autonomous. Ⓢ

According to Dimmock and Walker (1998:58), principals are powerful and are seen as a chief executive of autonomous units in some countries and others loose this autonomous in other countries. In Ethiopian situation, it is clearly stated that principals are given autonomous (MOE, 2002:33). However, the responses show the 'autonomy' is only on paper.

Item 3 Table 14 page 72 presents that the attitudes of principals towards the society they served in relation to cooperation in the sample zones and special woreda in the region. The principals (76.9%) indicated that they disagreed (if not strongly disagreed) with the idea. That is, the society was cooperative. Others, 15.4% and 7.7% of the principals agreed and remained undecided respectively. According to the majority of views, society is cooperative. This implies that principals have good conditions to run the school smoothly; and

it also shows that the society is used to having a spirit of ownership unlike to that of Melesew's finding (Melesew, 2005)

According to item 4 Table 14 page 72, 53.8% of the principals and 58.5% of the WEOs indicated that communication from school to woreda was slow. Besides, the t-test at $\alpha=0.05$ and average degree of freedom by Welch Satterthwaite Solution is 12 and $t\text{-test}= 0.34$. Therefore the calculated t-test is less than the table value 2.179. This implies that there is no significant difference with the hypothesis communication from WEO to school or from school to woreda is slow.

Principals, in item 5 Table 14 page 72 were also requested to show their agreement on the extent of support they got from WEO. Accordingly, 61.6% of the principals agreed that the support from the WEO was not enough. Others 30.8% and 7.7% forwarded their disagreement to the contrary. Generally, from the responses the support seems low. This implies the professionals' relation between the two organizations is loose. Following the support principals got from the WEO, respondents were asked to suggest their relation.

Hence, totally 63.4% of the WEOs and 45.1% of Teachers responded 'agree', while about 24% and 49% of WEO and teachers respectively responded negatively. Thus, more number of WEOs and TS respectively responded positively and negatively. From this it is observed that respondents either reflected subjectivity or teachers may not have clear understand to what extent the action was taking place. However, the t-test (3.5) shows that there is significance difference at $\alpha=0.05$ and 100 degree of freedom with the idea proposed.

According to the last item of Table 14 page 72, WEOs were asked if stakeholders did not accept the GSSPs with their own various reasons. Thus, 36.6% of them responded that stakeholders did not accept principals. About 46% of them disagreed. The $\bar{x}=2.88$ assures that their less acceptance. This may be due to the interactions principals had with stakeholders.

3.5.3. Personal and Situational Problems of Principals

The cause for poor instructional leadership may not always be the qualification of the principals he/she acquired but also the character of the principal itself and some situational factors. Showing commitment, interest; or the availability of all kinds of resources are examples of such kinds (Griffith in Dubale: 1997:41). Likewise, respondents were requested to comment on principals' personal and situational problems.

Table 15: Respondents' Views Related with Personal and Situational Problems

No	problems	Respondent	Responses											
			5		4		3		2		1		Total	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Lack of commitment	B	7	17.1	14	34.2	6	14.6	11	26.8	3	7.3	41	100
		C	29	18.2	37	24.5	16	10.6	42	27.8	27	18.0	151	100
2	Unable to utilize resources properly	C	32	21.2	44	29.2	10	6.6	34	22.5	31	20.5	151	100
3	Unable to create fund creating mechanism	A	5	38.5	7	53.8	1	7.7	-	-	-	-	13	100
		C	34	22.5	49	32.4	17	11.3	34	22.5	17	11.3	151	100
4	Lack of interest in principalship position	B	6	14.6	9	22.0	8	19.5	11	26.8	7	17.1	41	100
		C	16	10.6	30	19.8	35	23.2	35	23.2	35	23.2	151	100
5	The decisions made are not on the basis of factual information	B	8	19.5	14	34.2	5	12.2	14	34.1	-	-	41	100
		C	26	17.2	54	35.8	17	11.3	40	26.5	14	9.3	151	100
6	Great number of students to manage	A	5	38.4	2	15.4	2	15.4	2	15.4	2	15.4	13	100

Key:A= Principals, B= WEOWs, C= TSs

According to item 1 Table 15 page 76, about more than half of the WEOWs and 42% of the Teachers indicated their agreement that the GSSPs in the selected schools lack commitment. On the other hand, about 34% of WEOWs and 45% of the Teachers did not think principals lack commitment. The t-test ($t_{cal}=1.22$ and $t_{table} = 1.988$) show no significance difference, i.e. the tool proves lack of commitment.

According to item 2 Table 15 page 76, about 50% of the teaching staff said principals were not able to utilize resources properly while 43.0% disagreed with the idea. Thus, the response suggests that principals were unable to manage resources where their shortage has been alarmingly increased and created frustration (Grubb and Joseph, 2006:519).

In item 3 Table 15 page 76, the problem of fund raising mechanism was raised. Most (above 92%) of the principals and 54.9% of the Teachers responded that fund raising mechanism was not created due to their unknown reason or reasons. The item was also checked by t-test and does not show significant difference. This implies that the schools expected every thing from the external bodies to run each of their programs. (MOE. 2005:158).

As can be seen from item 4 Table 15 page 76, about 36% of the WEOWs and about 30% of the Teachers answered agree in responding their respective opinion about interest in principalship position. About 43.9% the WEOWs and 46.4% of TS forwarded their disagreement. However, the principals' interest was found to be low in previous discussion (Table 5).

As far as the decisions made by principals are concerned, item 5 Table 15 page 76 presents that about 53.7% of WEOWS and 53% of TS agreed that the decision made at school level by the school principals were without evidence while 34.1 of WEOWs and 35.7% of TS disagreed with the idea. The weighted mean indicates that the agreement is above the

medium (3.28). Therefore, it can be said that the decisions made did not create satisfaction by the Teachers in the school. Literatures in the areas of decision making appreciate shared decision making process which provides factual information (Devos and others, 1998:701).

In item 6 Table 15 page 76, 53.8% of the principals felt a problem of large number of students others equally, 15.4% selected (3), (2), and (1). From this, it is possible to say student size was another problem for more of the GSSPs in the sample study areas. Open ended questions presented to respondents were summarized in brief as follow.

Among the lists of the major managerial problems, political influence was reported. Under this, the points mentioned were principals' assignment on principalship position on the basis of political active participation rather than merit became a big problem. Due to this, principals could not run their engagement properly because they were not assigned by merit. The second big problem is principals were not staying at school to facilitate teaching and learning program. They are usually working for political issues. This coincides with the idea of Ethiopian Ministry of Education (MoE, 2005:158). Besides, work load and economic problems were worth noting problems mentioned.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1. Summary

The main purpose of this study was to look into the major managerial problems of general secondary school principals in SNNPR State and point out the prevailing problems and suggest possible solutions.

In order to achieve this purpose, the study attempted to answer the following three basic questions:

1. To what extent do the general secondary school principals accomplish the key functions of management well?
2. To what extent do general secondary school principals apply the appropriate managerial skills to promote staff performance?
3. What are the major managerial problems that the untrained GSSPs encounter when they lead their respective schools?

The study was carried out in SNNPRs in eight selected GSSs- Guraghe Zone, Siltie Zone and Yem Special Woreda. These were selected using purposive sampling technique followed by random sampling technique.

The necessary information from GSSPs, WEOWs and Teachers were collected using sets of questionnaires.

A total of 223 copies of questionnaire were distributed to 13 principals, 48 WEOWs, and 162 teachers. The returned were 205 (90.7%) which comprised of 13 principals, 41 WEOWs and 151 teachers. The data obtained were tabulated and analyzed using various statistical tools: percentage, mean, weighted mean, chi-square and t-test where they were appropriate. After a thorough analysis had been made on gathered data, the following main findings were brought to the fore.

1. Among the forty-one WEOWs, there were only two female supervisors in the eight WEOs. Similarly, no female principals in eight of the GSSs; and among the 151 GSS teachers, only 15 were female teachers.
2. None of the principals in the study areas was a graduate of relevant field for principalship position nor had relevant and ample training except 15.4%. Similarly, woreda education officers (experts, programmers) who were running the system in local level were not professionals for the positions except 5(12.2%).
3. In relation to principals' interests, before they became principals of the schools, majority (63.1%) of them were not interested due to lack of concepts of school management, its poor payment, and its criticism. However, all the groups of the respondents (61.6% of Teachers, 56.1% of WEOWs and 76.9% of GSSPs) indicated that principals became interested after they had been assigned in the positions.
4. As indicated by 78.1% of WEOWs and 53% of the TSs, teachers were not interested in the management or leadership style of the principals and 55% of Teachers and 68.3% of WEOWS thought principals were not successful in managing the school.
5. Majority (46.2%) of the principals were assigned by higher authority for principalship positions while others were assigned by other means.
6. As far as planning functions were concerned, majority of WEOWs (51.2%) and 49.7% of TSs responded that GSSPs sometimes analyzed the situation before planning was taking place. The weighted mean ($\bar{x} w=2.2$) as well as $\chi^2(4, n=205) = 9.86, p<0.05$ assures the significance difference (Table 7).
7. Concerning flow of objectives from national to local, 92.3% of GSSPs, 56.1% of WEOWs and 58.9% Teachers indicated that the

- plan was always prepared according to the national and regional goals.
8. As indicated by all the principals and 52.3% of Teachers, staff members knew to whom to report and work with.
 9. In relation to professional development programs in training and experience sharing activities in school level, majority of the respondents (85.43% of TSs, 53.8% principals and 80.5% the WEOWs) revealed that the activity of experience sharing and school level training programs were arranged below medium and medium frequency. The chi-square test $\chi^2 (4, n=205) = 25.75, P < 0.05$ proves the difference.
 10. According to the 61.6% of Teachers and 65.9% of WEOWs, principals sometimes initiated stakeholders to accomplish the schools' activities in the cognizance of schools' objectives (Table 10).
 11. As indicated by more number of WEOWs and Teachers, actual performance were sometimes checked against the agreed standards.
 12. The data finding revealed the problems of qualification, knowledge and training in educational management. Accordingly:
 - About 86% of GSSPs, 52% of WEOWs and 69% of Teachers indicated lack of training.
 - About 84% of principals, 68% of WEOWs and 54% of Teachers indicated that principals were not experienced.
 13. In relation to problems related from day to day interactions:
 - 61.5% of the principals pointed out that the unnecessary interference of WEO.
 - Most of the groups (principals and WEOWs) indicated that communication from woreda to school or vice-versa was a problem.

- Unabling to create good relation with stakeholders was also a problem as indicated by respondents.
14. As pointed out by the result of the study, the following are the major problems created due to personal and situational factors. According to:
- 51.2% of the WEOWs, principals lacked commitment.
 - 92.3% of principals and 55% of Teachers, principals were unable to create fund creating mechanisms
 - 53.7% of WEOWs and 53% of Teachers, principals decided without factual information on teachers' affairs.
 - 53.9% of the principals, great number of students became a problem for their leadership.
15. Respondents also explained the other major managerial problems through open-ended questions. Among the lists, assigning principals without their actual merit, principals' work load and lack of finance were setbacks for good management at school.

4.2. Conclusions

Based on the major findings presented above, the following conclusions were drawn.

1. As the data finding revealed, none of the principals and only 12.2% of WEOWs were graduates of related field from their appointment. Besides, it was only 15.4% of the principals who trained for principalship. From this, it is possible to conclude that education system in general secondary schools and in woreda level is led by persons with no or little training or qualification in the related field.
2. A good number of WEOWs (78.1%) and 53% of Teachers believed that neither teachers were interested in the leadership styles of principals nor were successful. This means that principals' interpersonal and technical skills were found to be low.

3. Assigning principals for principalship position by WEO with out clear criteria may have a tendency of subjectivity or emotion. This in turn harms the education system.
4. The majority of the respondents indicated that the weaknesses and strengthens of the schools were not identified before a plan is prepared for the next academic year. From this, it is possible to say that principals plan what is irrelevant or they strictly adopt the higher level plan or they plan that it seems relevant for them.
5. According to all groups of the majority respondents, experience sharing and training programs held at school level found to be minimal. This implies that principals had not capability of empowering teachers and every training was expected from higher level; and the attention given for professional development is inconsiderable.
6. In the finding, it was showed that principals rarely initiated stakeholders in the accomplishment of school activities in the cognizance of school's objectives. This implies that principals do not consider the role of stakeholders in achieving the school's goals or principals may consider themselves as the only person for the school.
7. Though agreed standards were set for the accomplishment of plans, the achievements were not checked/ measured against the standards set. From this, it is possible to state principals are not in the position to identify who perform what and to what extent.
8. According to all groups of the respondents, generally, principals have serious problems in the areas of profession, experience, interactions with concerned bodies, and situational and personal factor which include heavy work load, lack of financial resources and negative attitude towards principalship. From these, it could be concluded that GSSs are not producing what is exactly expected because the "engine" has got trouble.

4.3. Recommendations

Depending on the findings obtained and the conclusions drawn from the study, the following suggestions are forwarded to remedy the problem so that the management of general secondary schools in the study areas would be improved.

1. Educational management is a profession which has its own theories, principles and application. Logically, people who run the education system must be aware of these theories, principles and application. As a matter of fact, school principals should be trained and qualified in the field. Therefore, principals in general secondary schools and WEOs as well in the study areas should have relevant qualification and training when they come to their respective job positions. The qualification and/or training they acquired will help teachers to be interested by their leadership style and leaders can be successful. Two urgent and situationally appropriate options might help to do so. One would be introducing the existing principals with relevant training program through in-service training; or the second option is assigning professionally qualified principals for the positions.
2. Assigning principals for principalship positions by WEO might cause subjectivity and emotion. Therefore, the concerned bodies should have clear criteria on the basis of merit which can result effective leaders.
3. Situational analysis helps to assess the strong and weak sides of the organization. Plans should be prepared on the basis of this. However, the effort shown to do so was small. Therefore, GSSPs should have awareness about the significance of situation analysis; the way it is conducted and they should practice it.
4. The attempt made to empower teachers at school level through experience sharing or training was small. Hence, principals should

- try to arrange peers learning, short term training and experience sharing program for their professional development at school level.
5. Stakeholders are concerned bodies in the school improvement program. It is the principal who plays a role in participating them. The principals' role in this matter was not much. Therefore, principals' have to initiate all the stakeholders in the way they participate meaningfully by using their own mechanism.
 6. Principals' role in who performs what and to what extent was another problem. The agreed standards were not in use to measure the actual results. Therefore, principals ought to check or measure the actual performance against the standards.
 7. Generally, principals running GSSs had problems in many areas of management functions and skills. The main reason was qualification and/or training. Therefore, to minimize the problems, government should re facilitate situations for the appointment of GSSPs on the basis of merit and should provide them with necessary training which can equip them with necessary management skills.

References

- Addi-Raccah, A. (2006). Accessing Internal Leadership Positions at Schools. **Educational Administration Quarterly** vol. 41 no 1 California: Crowin press.
- Adesina, Segun (1990). **Educational Management**, Nigeria: Fourth Dimension Publishing
- Ahmed Abdulkadir(2006) A comparative Study of Managerial Effectiveness of Government and Private High School principals. A.A.U. MA unpublished Thesis.
- Anderson, B. (1992) **Education for All: the Goal**. New York: United Nations Children Fund Program publication.
- Ayalew Shibeshi (1991). Approaches to Educational Organization and Management. Part one Unpublished Text. AAU.
- _____ (2000).Theories of Educational Management. Addis Ababa University. Unpublished Material.
- Bennett, N. & Lesley Anderson (2003). **Rethinking Educational Leadership**. India: Athenaem Press.
- Bezzina, C. (1998) The Maltese Primary School Principals: **Journal of British Educational Management and Administration**. Vol. 26. No 3. London: SAGE Publication.
- Blase, J and J.R. Blase (1994). **Empowering Teachers: What Successful Principals do**. USA: Crown Press, Inc.
- Brundrett, M and et. Al (2003). **Leadership in Education**. Great Britain: Cromwell Press.
- Buckley, J. and David Styan (1990). **Managing for Learning**. Hong Kong: Macmillan Education.
- Burnett. J. (2004). The Future of Educational Leadership Preparation: **National Founm of Educational Administration Journal** Vol.21. No.1 Lousisana: Lake Charlers Co.Ltd.
- College of Education (2004). **Handbook for Students**. A.A.U. AAU Printing Press.

- Datnow, A and M.E Costellano (2001). Managing and Guiding School Reform: Leadership in Success for All Schools. **Educational Administration Quarterly**. Vol.37 no 2 California: Crowin press.
- Davis, H.S. (1998). The Most Frequent Reasons Why Principals Lose Their Jobs. **Educational Administration**. Vol.34 no1. California: Crowin press.
- Demoze Degefa(2007).The Current Practices of Instructional Leadership. AAU: Unpublished MA Thesis.
- Dereje Demissie (2007). A Study of Secondary Schools Teacher Turnover. Addis Ababa. University Unpublished M .A. Thesis.
- Devos, G. and others (1998). The Concept and Practice of School Based Management Contest: Integration of Leadership Development and Organization Learning. **Educational Administration Quarterly**. Vol. 34.supplemental. California: Crowin press.
- Dimoock and A. Walker (1998). Comparative Educational Administration. **Educational Administration**. Vol 34 no 4 California: Crowin press.
- Donelan, R. (1993). "African and African- American Voice of Education Leadership" **Educational Journal of Education Reform**, Vol.2 No.4. USA: Technomic Publishing Co, inc.
- Dubale Erget (1997). A Comparative Study of PrincipalShip Performance between Ed Ad and Subject area Degree Graduates. A.A.U. Unpublished M.A. Thesis.
- Eshiwani, S.G. (1988). **The World Bank Revisited: Comparative Education Review** vol. 33 No 1
<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=00104086%28198902%3A1%11%3ATWBOR%3EZ.O.CO%3BZ-Z> Retrived on Nov. 20/2007.
- Fesseha Haileselassie. (2005). Major Problems of Secondary School Principal in Educational Leadership AAU. Unpublished MA Thesis.

- Fidler, F. and M. Chermmer (1983). **Improving Leadership Effectiveness. The Leader Match Concept** (2nd ed.). New York: A will press.
- Fuance,R.(1955).**Secondary School Administration**. USA: Harpar and Brothers Publishers.
- Good, V. (1973) **Dictionary of Education**. New York: Mc Graw- Hill
- Grubb, N. and Joseph (2006). "A job too big for one": Multiple Principals and other Non traditional Approaches to School Leadership. **Educational Administration quarterly**. Vol. 42 no 1 California: Crowin press.
- Hannay, M. and J.A. Ross (1997). Initiating Secondary School **Educational Administration Quarterly. Vol. 33**, Supplemental. Californian: Crain Press.
- Hassen Hussen (2005) A Study of Primary Schools Problem. Unpublished MA. Thesis. A.A.U.
- Holmes, G. (1993) **Essential School Leadership**. Great Britain: Biddless Ltd.
- IIZ/DVV (2006). "Management Training for CSTC Coordinators" **Newsletter**. Vol. 18/19 Addis Ababa: Alpha Printers Plc.
- Jeilu Oumer (2006). Educational Policy and Decentralization Decision Making for Schools in Ethiopia. The case of Oromia and Addis Ababa. **Journal of Education for Development** vol. 1 AAU: AAU printing press.
- Jibril, A.(2007).Unpublished Teaching Material Prepared for the Course Foundation of Educational Management(EdPM-611) A.A.U.
- Joseph,B. and Jo Roberts(1994). **Empowering Teachers: What Successful Principals Do**. California:Crowin Press.
- Kandsamy, M. and Lia Blaton (2004). **School Principals: Core Actors in Educational Improvement**. Paris: IIEP's Print shop.
- Kast, F. and James E. Rosenzweig (1988) **Organization and Management: A System and Contingency Approach** (4th ed.) Singapore: B and Jo Enterprise PTE LTD.

- Kemmer, Frances (1994). **Utilizing Education and Human Resource**. France: UNESCO.
- Kerzner, H. (2002). **Project Management: a System Approach to Planning, Scheduling and Controlling (2nd ed)** Delhi:Goyal offset press.
- Kinard, J. (1988). **Management**. USA: D.C. Health and Company.
- Kochhar, S.K.(1991). **Secondary School Administration**.Delhi:Sterling Publisher.
- Larson, L.C (1997) A Socio-political Study of School Community Conflict. **Educational Administration Quarterly** vol 33. no 3 California: Crowin press.
- Lawrence, B. and Dennis Jones (1985). The Higher Educational Manager as a Professional. **Journal For Higher Educational Management**. Vol.1. No.1. New York: College Press Service.
- Laws, S. and D.Glove (2000).**Educational Leadership and Learning**. Great Britain:Biddles Ltd.
- Lockheed, M. and others (1991).**Improving Primary Education in Developing Countries**. USA: Oxford University Press.
- Mauriel,J.(1989).**Strategic Leadership for Schools**. Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Melesew Tefera (2005). An Assessment of Community Participation in the Management of Primary Schools of Wagmira Zone. A.A.U: unpublished M.A. Thesis.
- Ministry of Information (MOI) (2004). **Facts about Ethiopia**. Addis Ababa: Mega Printing Enterprise.
- Mintzberg, H. (1989). **Mintzberg on Management**. USA: Collier Macmillan Canada.
- Misganaw Alene. (1993). Comparative Study of Untrained and Trained Senior Secondary School Principals. AAU. Unpublished Senior Essay.
- MoE ,(1994). **Education and Training Policy**. Addis Ababa: EMPDA.

- MoE(2005). **Education Sector Development Program (ESDP-III)**. Addis Ababa:EMPDA.
- Mumford, Alan (1993). **How Managers Can Develop Managers**. England: Hampshire.
- Naftaly,S.(1986). **Evaluation Based Leadership: School Administration in Contemporary Perspective**.USA:State University of New York Press.
- Okumbe,J.A.(1998). **Educational Management**. Nairobi: Sunlitho Ltd.
- Otto,J. and D.C.Sanders (1964). **Elementary School Organization and Administration**. New York: university of Texas.
- Peter, N. and others (2001). Principals in Action: Analysis of School Leadership. **Research in Education #66**. Great Britain: Manchester University press.
- Pounder, G.D and R.J. Merrill (2001). Job Desireability of High School Principalship. **Educational Administration Quarterly**, vol. 37. No 1. California: Crowin Press.
- Pounder. G.D and Others (1995) Leadership as an Organization Wide Phenomena: Its Impact on School Performance **Educational Administration Quarterly**. Vol 31. No 4 California: crowin press.
- Quick T. (1991). **Training Managers: So they can Really Manage**. USA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rinehart, J.S and others (1998). Teacher Empowerment and Principal Leadership. **Educational Administration**, California: Crowin press.
- Robbins, S. and others (2000). **Management** (2nd ed). Australia: Mc Pherson's Printing Group.
- Rue, L. and L. Byars (2003). **Management: Skills and Application**. 10th ed. New York: Graw-Hill companies.
- Schoderbek, P. and others (1991). **Management**. (2nd ed) USA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Sharma, B. (2005). **School Administration**. Dekhi: Roshan offset Printer.

- Silver, P. (1983). **Educational Administration: Theoretical Perspectives on Practice and Research**. USA: Harper Row, Publishers.
- SNNPEB (2004) Teachers' Result Oriented Performance Appraisal. Awassa: Unpublished training Manual.
- SNNPRS(2005a). **Education Sector Development Program(ESDP-III)**.Awassa:Master Printing Press.
- SNNPRS(2005b). **Educational Statistics Annual Abstracts**. Awassa: Master Printing Press.
- Somech, A. and M. Wenderow (2006). The Impact of Participative and Directive Leadership on Teachers' Performance. **Educational Administration Quarterly**. Vol 42 no 5 California: Crowin press.
- Stoner and E. Freeman (1989). **Management**. 4th ed. New Delhi: Goyal Offset.
- Swindle,B.(2004). School Principals Know the 3R's of Education. **National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal**,Vol.21 No.1.Louisana: Lake Charles.
- Whetten, A. and S. Cameron (1991). **Developing Management Skills** (2nd ed). USA: Harper Collins.
- World Bank (2005). **Education in Ethiopia. Strengthening the Foundation for Sustainable Progress**. USA: World Bank.
- World Bank. (1990). **Primary Education**. Washington D.C: World Bank.
- Wossenu Yimam (2002). Teacher Management in the Public Primary Schools. A Proceeding on **Quality of Primary Education in Ethiopia**: Addis Ababa; IER.
- Zenebe Baraki(1992). Leader Role Behaviors of Senior Secondary School principals in Ethiopia. AAU: Unpublished MA Thesis.

Others

ትምህርት ሚኒስቴር (1999ሀ). የኢትዮጵያ መምህራን ልማት መርሀ ግብር ገዥ መመሪያ.

አዲስ አበባ በት.መ.ማ.ማ.ድ. የታተመ::

_____ (1999.ለ)• የት/ቤት መሻሻል ገዥ መመሪያ. አዲስ አበባ፣ በት.መ.ማ.ማ.ድ.

(የታተመ)::

ደ/በ/ብ/ሕ/ክ/መ/ት/ቤር (1996). የርዕሰ መምህራንና የሱፐርቫይዘሮች የሥራ እድገትና

የደመወዝ ምደባ. አዋሳ (ያልታተመ)::

_____ (1999). የ1999 ዓ.ም. ዓመታዊ የትምህርት እቅድ ሪፖርት አዋሳ (ያልታተመ)::

ደ/በ/ብ/ሕ/ክ/መ/ት/ቤር (1999)•የመ/ራን ልማት ኘሮግራም ለስልጠና የተዘጋጀ፡ አዋሳ

(ያልታተመ ጽሁፍ)::

APPENDIX - A

Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate Studies
College of Education

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Questionnaire to Principals

Dear Respondent!

This questionnaire is prepared to assess the major functions, skills and problems of Secondary School Principals in SNNPR State; and to suggest possible recommendations. Your genuine involvement in providing data becomes important. Please answer the questions accordingly by reading the instructions set carefully.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

I. Background Information

Instruction 1: Please indicate your answer by encircling the letter of your choice or write your opinion where it is necessary in the space provided.

1. Name of zonal (special woreda) Education Department/office _____
2. Name of your school _____
3. Sex: a) Male b) Female
4. Age (in years):
a) Below 25 b) 25-30 c) 31-35 d) Above 35
5. Your qualification:
a) B.A./B.Sc/ B.Ed/ b) Diploma c) Other(specify) _____
6. Your major area of study: _____
7. Total experience in teaching:
a) 1-5 years b) 6-10 years c) Above ten years
8. Your work experience other than teaching is _____.

9. Before you were a principal of this school, did you want to be a principal?

a) Yes b) No

c) If your answer is 'yes' or 'no', why? _____

10. How were you assigned/ appointed in this principalship position?

a) by competition on the basis of your merit

b) because you were born in this area and the society is 'yours'

c) You are appointed by higher authority

d) Other (please specify) _____

11. Are you now interested in managing (running) this school?

a) Yes b) No c) If 'no' why? _____

12. Do you think your colleagues (teachers) are interested in your management style?

a) Yes b) No c) If 'no', why? _____

13. Do you think that you are successful in managing this school?

a) Yes b) No c) If 'no' why? _____

14. Are you trained as a principal?

a) Yes b) No

15. If "no", have you had sufficient short-term orientation and work shop on school leadership?

a) Yes b) No

16. Total students' enrollment in this school is

a) Below 800 c) 1201-1600

b) 801-1200 d) Above 1601

17. Total number of teaching staff in the school:

a) Below 26 b) 26-35 c) 36-45 d) Above 46

Instruction 2: To what extent do you practice the following specific roles? Show your agreement using the rating scale:

- 3. Often
- 2. Sometimes
- 1. Never
- 0. Don't know

No	Response Items	Often	Some times	Never	Don't know
		3	2	1	0
1	You identify the weaknesses and strengths of the school as situation analysis before the school's plan is prepared.				
2	You prepare the plan according to the national and regional goals for the academic year.				
3	You allow every member of the school to know the school's plans well to enable them accomplish the objectives.				
4	The plan is shared to each department, committee, club and teacher to assure the achievement of the school's goals.				
5	You specify the activities of the school in the way that the performance will be easy and manageable.				
6	Staff members have clear understanding to whom to report and work with.				
7	Standards for the performance of plans are set.				
8	Actual performances (results) of the teachers are checked on the basis of agreed standards.				
9	Corrective actions and feedback are given after the performance of the department's, club's or teacher's plan.				
10	You create the climate of honesty, integrity and productivity in your school.				
11	You make great effort to retain outstanding teachers				
12	You arrange experience sharing program with in or out school teachers				

Instruction 3: The following questions refer to managerial skills that general secondary school principals need to apply to promote staff performance. Please read carefully each item and mark an "X" in the column to indicate that you **strongly agree** (SA), **Agree** (A), **undecided** (UD), **disagree** (D) and **strongly disagree** (SD) scales against the statements to show your managerial skills.

No	Response Items	SA	A	UD	DA	SD
1	You conduct frequent classroom observation and give necessary feedback to teachers.					
2	A conducive climate of teaching-learning process is created between teachers and students.					
3	You work well with other staff members cooperatively.					
4	Staff members work with you well cooperatively					
5	The principal involves PTA and concerned community members to work together toward school improvement					

Instruction 4: The following are the lists of some assumed managerial problems that the secondary school principals face. Please mark an 'X' in the column against where you **strongly agree** (SA), **agree** (A), **undecided** (UD), **Strongly disagree** (SD) and **disagree**(D).

No	Suggested problems	SA	A	UD	DA	SD
1	Woreda education office does not give necessary and relevant support to the schools' principals.					
2	Lack of relevant training on management issues.					
3	Lack of necessary skills of management.					
4	Absence of experience to tackle challenges.					
5	Educational background on educational management is weak.					
6	Lack of autonomy to make decisions					
7	Great number of students to manage.					
8	Lack of availability of financial resource					
9	Unnecessary interference of woreda education officers.					
10	Lack of clear understanding of the policy of education					
11	The society is not cooperative in the school activities.					
12	Communication from education office to school is slow					
13	WEO does not regularly monitor, evaluate or support to accomplish the school plan					

Instruction 5: Below are some open ended questions related to principalship performance. Please state them in brief as much as possible in the space provided

1. In your point of view, what are the other major factors affecting your principalship performance in accomplishment of the school's objectives other than the points mentioned above-IV? _____

2. What solutions you think should be taken to solve the problems you mentioned above? _____

3. Additional comments if you have _____

Thank You.

**Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate Studies**

College of Education

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Questionnaire to Woreda Education Officers

This questionnaire is prepared for the secondary school's supervisors and officers in Woreda Education office in which sampled general secondary schools are available. The purpose of the questionnaire is to gather relevant data on the function, skills and problems of untrained principals. The responses will be used for research purpose only. Hence, you are kindly requested to answer the following questions based on your observation.

Thank you for your kind cooperation

II. Background Information

Instruction 1: Please indicate your answer by encircling the letter of your choice or write your opinion where it is necessary in the space provided.

1. Zone (special woreda) Education Department /Office _____
2. Name of (special) Woreda _____
3. Sex: a. Male b. Female
4. Age (in years): a. Below 31 b. 31-35 c. Above 35
5. Your qualification: a. B.A/B.Sc/B.Ed b. Diploma c. Certificate
6. Field of specialization _____
7. Total work experience (in years): a. Below 6 b. 6-10 c. Above 10 years.
8. Experience in teaching (if any) ____ years
9. Experience in principal ship (if any) ____ years.
10. Your current job assignment:
 - a. Woreda education head d. Expert
 - b. Educational program head f. Other (specify) _____
 - c. Supervisor

Instruction 2: The following are some questions about the director(s) of the sample school in your woreda. Please indicate your opinion about them based on the questions.

11. Do you think that the principal(s) of the sample school was/were interested in the position before they became to principalship position?

- a. Yes b. No c. I does not know.

12 Do you think that the principal(s) are interested in managing the school now?

- a. Yes b. No c. I do not know

13. Do you think the principals are successful?

- a. Yes b. No c. I do not know

14. Are teachers interested in the management style of principals?

- a. Yes b. No c. I do not know

Instruction 3: To what extent does the principal of the sampled school do the following specific roles. Please show your agreement using:

3= Always 2= Sometimes 1= Never

No	Response Items	Always	Sometimes	Never
1	The school principal identifies the weaknesses and strengths of the school as a situation analysis before the school's plan is prepared.			
2	The school plan is prepared on the basis of national and regional goals for the academic years.			
3	The plan prepared has clarity.			
4	Departments, clubs and etc. of the school prepare the plan on the basis of the school plan.			
5	Standards for the performance of plans are set.			
6	There are step by step procedures of work to control school members' daily duties.			
7	The school activities are categorized into departments and units of work for effective management.			
8	Reporting from school to woreda is clear complete and timely.			
9	School level trainings /experience sharing programs are arranged to develop staff's proficiency.			
10	The principal of the school initiates the concerned bodies of the school to accomplish their activities in cognizance of their school objectives.			

Instruction 4: The following questions refer to managerial skills that general secondary school principals need to apply to promote staff performance. Please read carefully each item and mark an “X” in the column to indicate that you **strongly agree** (SA), **Agree** (A), **undecided** (UD), **disagree** (D) and **strongly disagree** (SD) scales against the statements to show your managerial skills.

No	Response Items	SA	A	UD	D	SD
1	The school members accomplish the plan in harmony.					
2	The principal has good relationship with woreda education office.					
3	The concerned bodies of the school are made to participate in the school activities well.					
4	The school principal encourages teachers and other members of the school to accomplish the school’s objectives.					
5	The principal involves PTA and concerned communities members to work together toward school improvement program.					
6	The principal of the school always comes with innovative idea in the school improvement program.					

Key:PTA=Parent Teachers Association

Instruction 5: The following are the lists of some assumed managerial problems that the secondary school principals face. Please mark an ‘X’ in the column against where you **strongly agree** (SA), **agree** (A), **undecided** (UD), **Strongly disagree** (SD) and **disagree**(D).

No	Assumed problems	SA	A	UD	D	SD
1	The principal lacks training on school management.					
2	Lack of basic knowledge of management to solve situational problems.					
3	Absence of experience to face challenges that encounter the school or him/her self.					
4	The principal lacks commitment					
5	Unable to create good relation with stake holders to manage the school effectively.					
6	Lack of clear understanding of educational policy.					
7	Unable to involve the society in the school improvement program.					
8	The decisions made are not on the basis of factual information.					
9	Unable to send clear, complete and current reports to woreda education office.					
10	Unable to cooperate with Woreda education office as expected.					
11	Lack of interest in principal ship position.					
12	Lack of acceptance by the stakeholders.					

Instruction6: Answer the following open ended questions.

1. Please, briefly mention the major managerial problems that sampled general secondary school principals face in your Woreda other than the points mentioned above.

2. List from your experience what could be done to improve the performance of the general secondary school principal?

3. What other general comments do you have?

Thank you

Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate Studies
College of Education

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Questionnaire to Teaching Staffs

Dear Respondent!

This questionnaire is prepared to assess the major functions, skills and problems of Secondary School Principals in SNNPR State; and to suggest possible recommendations. Your genuine involvement in providing data becomes important. Please answer the questions accordingly by reading the instructions set carefully.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

I. Background Information

Instruction 1: Please indicate your answer by encircling the letter of your choice or write your opinion where it is necessary in the space provided.

1. Name of zonal (special woreda) Education Department/office _____
2. Name of your school _____
3. Sex: a) Male b) Female
4. Age (in years)
a) Below 25 b) 25-30 c) 31-35 d) Above 36
5. Your qualification
a) B.A./B.Sc/ B.Ed/ b) Diploma c) Other(specify) _____
6. Your major area of study _____
7. Total experience in teaching
a) 1-5 years b) 6-10 years c) Above ten years
8. Your current post other than teaching is:
a) Department head c) Committee's/ Club's head
b) Unit leader d) other (specify) _____

Instruction 2: The following are some questions about your principals .Please read them carefully and answer the questions accordingly.

9. Do you think that the director(s) of this school is(are)interested in leading this school?

- a)Yes b) No c)I do not know.

10. Are interested in their management style?

- a)Yes b) No c)To some extent d)I do not know

11. Do you think that the director(s) of this school is(are)successful?

- a)Yes b) No c)To some extent d)I do not know

Instruction 3: The following are some statements about management functions that the school principal performs. Please indicate to what extent the principal of your school does the following specific roles. Show your agreement using the rating scales:

3= Always

2= Sometimes

1= Never

No	Statements on managerial functions	Always	Sometimes	Never
		3	2	1
1	The principal identifies the weaknesses and strengths of the school as situation analysis before the school's plan is prepared			
2	The principal prepares the plan according to the national and regional goals for the academic year.			
3	The principal allows every member of the school to know the school's plan well to enable them accomplish the objectives.			
4	The plan is shared to each department, committee, club and teacher to assure the achievement of the school's goals.			
5	The principal specifies the activities of the school in the way that their performance will be easy and manageable			
6	Staff members have clear understanding to whom to report and work with.			
7	Standards for the performance of plans are set.			
8	Actual performances (results) of teachers are checked on the basis of agreed standards.			

9	Corrective actions and feedback are given after the performance of the department's, club's or teacher's plan			
10	Your school principal creates the climate of honesty, integrity and productivity in the school.			
11	The principal makes effort to retain good teachers.			
12	The principal initiates the concerned bodies of the school to accomplish their activities in the school to accomplish their activities in cognizance of the school's objectives.			
13	The principal arranges experience sharing program among teachers in the school or with teachers of other schools.			

Instruction 4: The following items refer to some of the managerial skills that secondary schools principals need to apply to promote staff performance. Please read carefully each item and mark an "X" in the column to indicate that you **strongly agree** (SA), **Agree** (A), **undecided** (UD), **disagree** (D) and **strongly disagree** (SD) scales against the statements to show your managerial skills.

No	Items	SA	A	UD	SD	D
1	The school principal conducts frequent classroom observation and gives necessary feedback to teachers.					
2	Conductive climate of teaching-learning process is created between teachers and students.					
3	The principal works well with other staff members cooperatively.					
4	The principal involves PTA and concerned community members to work together towards school improvement program.					
5	The principal checks that the lesson of the school is related with students real life situation.					
6	Your school principal encourages you to conduct action research on the school's real problem.					
7	The principal looks a mechanism for staff members develop their profession.					
8	The principal communicates the school's rules, policy and regulations to the stakeholders clearly and regularly.					
9	The principal considers the opinion of students as a vital input in evaluating the school plan.					

Key: PTA=Parent teachers Association.

Instruction 5: The following are the lists some assumed managerial problems that mainly face the untrained principals or principal with relatively low knowledge of principal ship. Therefore, please indicate your agreement against the column using the rating scales:

- SA= strongly agree SD= strongly disagree
 A = agree D= disagree
 UD= undecided

No	Suggested Problem	SA	A	UD	D	SD
1	Lack of proper training on school-management					
2	Absence of experience to tackle challenges					
3	Lack of qualification in principalship					
4	Lack of commitment					
5	Unable to utilize resources (man power and material) properly					
6	Unable to create fund raising mechanisms					
7	Lack of interest in principal ship position					
8	Lack of coordination decision making process					
9	Lack of clear understanding of educational policy					
10	Policies and rules of the school are not formulated clearly					
11	Unable to involve stat holders (society) in the accomplishment of school activities					
12	Unable to give convincing comments after the accomplishment of a plan (eg. Lesson plan)					

Instruction 6: Below are some open-ended questions related to principalship performance. Please state them in brief as much as possible in space provided.

- In your point of view, what are other factors affecting your school principal to accomplish the school's objective effectively?

- What solution you think should be taken to solve his/her problems mentioned above?

- Additional comments is you have

Thank You.

Appendix-D

Some Statistical tools used for analysis I. Chi- square test(X^2)

No	Items	Respondents	Scales			X^2 calculate.	Table value
			3(high)	2 (medium)	1 (low)		
1	Identification of weaknesses and strengths.	1	9	4	0	9.86	9.49
		3	48	75	28		
		Total	75	100	30		
2	The plan is made known by every member of the school	1	8	5	0	17.05	9.49
		2	18	20	3		
		3	50	71	30		
		Total	76	98	33		
3	Specification of the school plan	1	10	1	2	13.91	
		3	47	78	26		
		Total	57	79	28		
4	Arranging experience sharing & traing	1	6	5	2	25.75	9.49
		2	8	29	4		
		3	22	62	67		
		Total	36	96	73		
5	Setting clear standards	1	8	4	1	7.45	9.49
		2	15	21	5		
		3	56	58	37		
		Total	79	83	43		
6	Checking actual performances against standards	1	9	3	1	5.89	9.49
		3	57	54	41		
		Total	66	57	41		
7	Taking corrective actions and giving feedback	1	9	4	0	10.92	9.49
		3	57	54	46		
		Total	51	67	46		
8	Creating climate of honesty integrity.	1	8	4	1	7.02	9.49
		3	63	53	35		
		Total	71	57	36		
9	Retaining outstanding teachers	1	6	5	2	1.96	9.49
		3	66	47	38		
		Total	72	52	40		
10	Initiation of stakeholders	1	14	2	41	13.75	9.49
		3	58	27	151		
		Total	72	29	192		

Key:

1= principals 2= WEOWs 3= TSs

t- test, s^2 and other statistics

No	Items	Mean			Weighted mean	t cal	t table	s_1^2	s_2^2
		1	2	3					
13.1	Conducting frequent classroom observation	4.31		3.24	3.32	0.12	2.093	1.69	0.9
14.2	The principal comes with innovative ideas.	4.54	3.80		3.98				
15.1	Lack of proper training.	4.08	3.49	3.67	3.66				
15.2	Lack of basic knowledge of management	4.23	3.61	3.28	2.91				
15.3	Lack of understanding of educational policy.	2.54	6.88	2.95	2.91				
15.4	Lack of experience	3.54	3.61	3.26	3.35				
15.5	Lack of proper training.			2.81					
16.1	Lack of autonomy	2.38							
16.2	Un necessary interference	3.54							
16.3	The society is not cooperative	2.15							
16.4	Communication is low.	3.15	3.37		3.32	11.97	2.41	-0.34	2.179
16.5	Lack of support from WEO.	3.46							
16.6	Un able to crate good relation with stakeholders.		3.61	2.84	3.00	1.34	1.88	3.5	1.988
16.7	Un able to cooperate with WEOs.		3.07						
16.8	Lack of acceptance by stakeholders		2.88						
17.1	Lack of commitment.		3.27	2.99	3.05	1.55	2.02	1.22	1.988
17.2	Un able to utilize resource			3.08					
17.3	Un able to crate fund crating mechanisms.	4.31		3.32	3.4	0.4	1.81	2.61	2.06
15.4	Lack of interest		2.9	2.72	2.76	1.79	1.71	0.82	2.00
17.5	The decisions made are not on the basis of facts.		3.39	3.25	3.28	1.34	1.63	0.63	2.00
17.6	Great number of students to manage	3.46							

APPENDIX - E

Yem special woreda education office

General information about schools in the woreda.

1. Total number of schools in the woreda = 27
2. Primary schools in the woreda are = 25
3. Total general secondary school = 1
4. Total preparatory and general secondary school = 1
5. trained principals in general sec. schools are none.

Secondary schools

	Name	No of teaching Staff	No of students	Trained principals	Untrained principals
1	Saja	9	86	No	2
2	Fofa	35	1128	No	2



Gurage Zone Education Department 2000 E.C General Secondary Schools

No	Lists of Schools	Number of teaching staff	Number of students	Number of Principals	The condition of the principals
1	Kotter Gedra	15	945	1	Untrained
2	kebena	7	234	1	
3	Gemboro	14	865	1	
4	Aba Francua	22	1178	2	
5	Yedege	8	212	1	
6	Gedebano	9	414	1	
7	Dinkula	14	621	1	
8	Enseno	13	959	1	
9	Zenaener	5	161	1	
10	M/Cheza sefer	15	755	1	
12	Darge	6	482	1	
13	Mike	10	397	1	
14	Koshe	17	577	1	
15	Kuante	13	645	1	

* Micheza = Mihor cheza sefer



**SILTIE ZONE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT 2000 E.C LISTS OF GENERAL
SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND GENERAL INFORMATION**

No	Lists of Schools	Number of teaching staff	Number of Students	Numbers of principals	Remark
1	Mitto	14	354	1	
2	Tora	27	1372	2	
3	Sankura	16	669	1	
4	Hulbarag	12	225	1	
5	Lera	17	1106	1	
6	Kilto	8	366	1	
7	Kutere	16	1160	2	
8	Kawokoto	15	1191	2	
9	Silti	40	1706	2	

1. Total number of schools in the Zone = 243
2. Primary Schools in the Zone = 236
3. Total general secondary schools = 8
4. Total general and Preparatory schools= 12



Declaration

I, the undersigned hereby declare that this thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other universities, and that all sources of material used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: Seyoum Kinfu

Signature 

Date 06/06/2008

This thesis has been produced under my supervision and submitted for examination with my approval as a university advisor.

Name: Zenebe Baraki(Ph.D)

Signature 

Date 20/06/08

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
ADDIS ABABA ETHIOPIA