

**PRACTICES AND CHALLENGES OF DECISION MAKING IN  
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF EAST  
SHOA ZONE, OROMIA REGIONAL STATE**

**MA THESIS**

**TARIKU HAILU**

**DECEMBER, 2018**

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY, HARAMAYA**

**Practices and Challenges of Decision Making in Resource  
Management in Secondary Schools of East Shoa Zone, Oromia  
Regional State**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Postgraduate Program Directorate, College  
of Education and Behavioral Sciences, Department of Educational  
Planning and Management  
HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY**

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
MASTER OF ARTS IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP**

**Tariku Hailu**

**August, 2017**

**Haramaya University, Haramaya**

POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE  
HARAMAY UNIVERSITY

As Thesis research advisor, we hereby certify that we have read and evaluated this thesis entitled Practices and Challenges of Decision Making in Resource Management in Secondary Schools of East Shoa Zone, Oromia Regional State, prepared, under my guidance, by Tariku Hailu. We recommend that it be submitted as fulfilling the thesis requirement.

Mohammed Kedir (Assistant Professor) \_\_\_\_\_  
Major Advisor Signature Date

Dawit Negassa (PhD) \_\_\_\_\_  
Co-Advisor Signature Date

As member of the board of examiners of the MA Thesis open Defense Examination, we **certify** that we have read, evaluated the thesis prepared by Tariku Hailu and **examined the** candidate. We recommended that the Thesis be accepted as fulfilling the Thesis requirement for the degree of *Master of Art in school Leadership*.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson Signature Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Internal Examiner Signature Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
External Examiner Signature Date

Final approval and acceptance of this Thesis is contingent upon the submission of its final copy to the Council of Postgraduate studies through the candidate's Department or Post Graduate Program committee.

## **DEDICATION**

I dedicate this thesis Manuscript to my beloved wife Kedija Alelu and son Jitu Tariku dedicated moral encouragement in the success of my life.

## STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR

Over all I would like declare that this thesis is my own work. I have followed all ethical and technical principles of scholarship during the preparation of thesis, data collection, and data analysis. All sources of materials used for this thesis have been duly acknowledged. This thesis has been submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for MA, Degree at Haramaya University and deposited in the library of the university so as to make available for borrowers under rules of the library. I also declare that this thesis is not submitted to any other institution for the awarded of academic MA, degree, diploma or certificate. Brief quotation from this thesis may be allowed without special permission provided that accurate acknowledgement of the source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from this thesis in whole or in part may be granted by the head of department when in his or her judgment the proposed use of material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author of the thesis.

Name: Tariku Hailu

Signature -----

Date: July2017

University: Haramaya University, Educational Planning and Management

## **BIOGRAPHICAL SKETH**

The author was born in Octonber 1987 in Shenen kebele in Jibat Woreda West shoa Zone of Oromia Regional State. He attended his Primary education Primary school and Secondary school in Shenen in Jibat Woreda and He attended his Preparatory school in Ambo in West shoa Zone and. In 2006 he sat for Ethiopian School Leaving Certificate Examination and joined to Jimma University in the department of Language and awarded with B. Ed in Afan Oromo in 2008 G.C. After graduation he has worked for 9 years (2009-2017 E.C) in Bulbula secondary school of East Shoa Zone.

Currently, he is serving as principal in Adami Tulu Jido Kombolcha Woreda Bulbula secondary school and he joined in summer program of College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, Department of Educational Planning and Management of Haramaya University in, 2015 to pursue his MA Degree in School Leadership.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First of all I would like to thank Almighty God who always with me and helped me in any hardship I faced during my study time at Haramaya University.

I would like to express my special appreciation to my major advisor Mohammed Kedir (Assistant Professor) and co-advisor Dawit Negassa (PhD) for their encouragement, insight, guidance, and professional expertise for completion of this work would not have been possible.

My special thanks also extend to my wife Kedija Alelu for her moral, financial and the whole responsibility in taking care of our child and other social life job during may stay away from the family.

I would like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to my colic's Dajene Bikila, Aduna Mul'isa, Sojato Dabi and Dabebe Nagash for their sustained encouragement and support without which the production of this thesis would have been impossible.

Furthermore, I like to acknowledge my friends who helped me in one way or another during my study time and research work. My Almighty God blesses them.

Lastly but not least, my acknowledge also goes to principals, department head, PTA and student's council of East shoa zone secondary schools who took part in interview, filling the questionnaire and document analysis for the purpose of my research work.

## **ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

MoE	Ministry of Education
PTA	Parent Teachers Association
SIP	School Improvement Program
SPSS	Statistical Packages for Social Science
UNESCO	United Nations, Educational, scientific and Cultural Organization
WEO	Woreda Education Office
ZEO	Zonal Education Office



## CONTENT OF TABLE

<b>DEDICATION</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>BIOGRAPHICAL SKETH</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>xii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>xiii</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problems	3
1.3. Basic Research Question	4
1.4. Objective of the Study	5
1.4.1. General Objective	5
1.4.2. Specific Objectives	5
1.5. Significance of the Study	5
1.6. Delimitation of the Study	6
1.7. Limitation of the Study	7
1.8. Operational Definition of Key Terms	7
<b>2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1. Concept of Decision Making	8
2.2. School Resource Management	9
2.3. Types of School Resource Management	10
2.3.1. Human resources management	10
2.3.2. Material resources management	12
2.3.3. Physical resources management	13
2.3.4. Financial resources management	14
2.4. Types of decision making in the school	14
2.4.1. Individual versus group decisions	15
2.4.2. Program and non-program decisions	16
2.5. Impacts of Decision Making in School Resource Management	17
2.6. Effective Decision Making in Resource Management	18
continuous ...	

2.7. Decision Making Practice in School Resource Management	19
2.8. Stakeholders' Involvement and Decision-making	20
2.9. Theoretical Arguments for Stakeholders' Involvement in Decision making	21
2.10. Motives for Stakeholder Involvement in Decision Making	23
2.11. Degree of stakeholders involvement in decision making	24
2.12. Role of Stakeholders in Decision Making in Resource Management	24
2.12.1. Role of principal in decision making in school resource management	25
2.12.2. Role of communities and PTA in decision making	25
2.12.3. Role of teachers in decision making in school resource management	26
2.12.4. Role of students in decision making in school resource management	27
2.13. The Challenges of Decision Making in School Resource Management	27
<b>3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>29</b>
3.1. Description of the Study Area	29
3.2. Research Design	29
3.3. Sources of Data	30
3.3.1. Primary source of data	30
3.3.2. Secondary data sources	30
3.4. Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques	30
3.5. Data Gathering Tools	31
3.6. Procedures of Data Collection	34
3.7. Method of Data Analysis	34
<b>4. DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION</b>	<b>35</b>
4.1. General Characteristics of Respondents	36
4.2. The current Practices of decision making on resource management	37
4.3. Perception of stakeholders towards the decision-making practice	42
4.4. Extent of stakeholder participation in decision making on resource management	46
4.5. Major Factors that affect decision making in resource management in the school	48
<b>5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>55</b>
5.1. Summary	55
5.2. Conclusions	58
5.3. Recommendations	59
<b>6. REFERENCES</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>7. APPENDIX</b>	<b>68</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

1: Summary population, sample and sampling Techniques	31
2: Back ground of the Respondents	35
3: The current Practices of decision making on resource management	37
4: Perception of stakeholders towards the decision-making practice	42
5: The extent of stakeholders' participation in decision making on resource management	46
6: Major Factors that affect decision making in resource management in the Schools	48

# **PRACTICES AND CHALLENGES OF DECISION MAKING IN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF EAST SHOA ZONE, OROMIA REGIONAL STATE**

## **ABSTRACT**

*The purpose of this study was to investigate the practice and challenges of decision making in resource management in secondary school of East shoa Zone. To carry out this study descriptive survey method was employed. Participants of the study were 40 department heads, 10 principals, 50 students' council and 10 parents –teacher's associations by using available sampling technique. The data were collected by using a questionnaire, interview, and document analysis. Both qualitative and quantitative data analysis method were employed in order to reach the results. Data obtained through questionnaire were analyzed and summarized using statistical tools. The data were entered into Statistical package for the Social science (SPSS Version 20.0) software analysis. Statistical measures were performed on quantitative data assembled from the respondents; comparing mean and one-way ANOVA was conducted. The findings of the study were the practice of decision making process on resource management was very low in most schools, perception of stakeholders on decision making of resource management was poor in selected secondary schools of east shoa zone, participation of stakeholders in decision making process of resource management was unsatisfactory and major factors affecting decision making practice on resource management in secondary schools were: lack of transparency, lack of guidelines, lack of knowledge and skills on guidelines, lack of stakeholders participation. Therefore the researcher the following conclusion; The decision made by school leaders in resource management were not acceptable by stakeholders, in secondary schools stakeholders were negatively perceived decision making practices made on resource management in school, in most schools the leaders did not allow stakeholders to involve in school decisions. The study revealed that the role and involvement of teachers in decision making of the studied schools was ineffective. So, school leaders should support the instructional activities by creating conducive environment to involve the stakeholders. In addition it is advisable for school leaders ensuring effective and efficient decision making system in school and also develop appreciation for team work and participation. Hence, it is necessary for school leaders to facilitate conducive environment, hence, school principal should exert maximum effort to sensitize, motivate, and encourage stakeholders'.*

# 1. INTRODUCTION

This section of the paper deals with the problem and its approach. It contains background of the study, statement of the problems, basic research questions, objective of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study and operational definition of key terms.

## 1.1. Background of the Study

Education is the base for the development of a country. Success in education leads to greater earnings for individuals and improvement of economic returns of the society (UNESCO, 2002). According to the World Bank (1988) without quality of education, development will not occur. Quality education will be assured if adequate educational resources are allocated and properly utilized (MoE, 1994). In order to carry out educational activities properly, one of the preconditions that need to be fulfilled is the existence of efficient management of education resource. This is when all school communities participate in decision making on resource management (MoE, 2005).

On the other hand in most schools resources of schools were not managed properly and no decision was being made in schools. Most of the time schools lack to implement resources on academic issue and the decision made excludes department heads and other stake holders. Even the budget of the schools is not fully run by school principals.

In the past, school principals throughout the world have been the main decision-makers at school level. This situation has been particularly evident in a number of countries such as Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and parts of the United States of America (Griffin 1995 and Jonston, 1997). During the past 20 to 30 years there is a major shift towards participative decision-making in schools (Bush and Heystek, 2003). These authors have called for greater participation in decision-making as a progressive way of making schools more democratic and more efficient.

The above general idea also reflected clearly in Africa. For example as cited in Mokoena (2011), from the beginning of 1997 all public schools in South Africa must have

democratically elected school governing bodies comprised of principals, educators, non-teaching staff, parents and learners. As a result, the nature and extent of school decision making have changed. Decision-making at schools is characterized by greater participation of all stakeholders. Parents, teachers, learners and non-teaching staff and learners who are elected to serve on the school governing bodies become school governors.

One of the key involvements in decision making in secondary schools is teachers' involvement. The reason for involving teachers' in decision making is a way to increase the productivity and efficiency of an educational organization. Pashiards (1994) explains that increasing level of teacher participation in making decisions and extending their involvement in the overall decision making process makes school policy and management more responsive to societal needs.

The other key involvement in decision making at secondary schools are parents. Parental involvement in schools through Parent Teachers Association has been widely supported and accepted in both the developed and developing countries (Brain, Reid. 2003). The Parent's involvement is however linked to the school effectiveness as well as children's performance. Lin (2010) reported that parental support and engagement in decision making is a very important factor to the success of a school and that co-operation between teachers and parents is capable of enhancing students' performance.

Students are the main actors of teaching learning activities in schools. Therefore, to achieve schools objective, their participation in school decision making is vital. Meaningful participation of students in school management is explained in terms of the level of their participation in school decision making. According to Ayalew (2003), acceptance in decision making is much more important than the quality of the decision to gain the intended objectives. This leads to, if people participate in making a decision; they tend to be more committed to the decision and more motivated to put the decision in to action. Students' participation increases student motivation and helps them have higher aims for their education and also enables them to become aware of the needs and problems of poor students, and their participation in the parent teachers' association provides feedback on matters from the students' perspective. In addition, student participation enables them to take on the

responsibility of becoming class monitors and to manage the class effectively in the teacher's absence (MoE, 1998).

Priority areas identified included increasing effectiveness and efficiency through participatory decision making in educational planning and management; establishing open, transparent and productive management systems; and promoting effective horizontal and vertical communications across the education system (MoE, 2008). Oromia Education Bureau (2001) indicated that, to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of schools as well as to provide quality education to the community, participatory decision making of education resource management is essential. However, the existing situation in the study is out of this. Their decision making process is not participatory. From the experience of the researcher, the major school actor is the only one person, school principal. Therefore, the researcher is motivated to investigate practices and challenges of decision making in school resource management in government secondary schools' of East Shoa Zone, Oromia Region.

## **1.2. Statement of the Problems**

Education is a complex endeavor. It encompasses various decision-making processes concerning different issues and educational problems. The decision made could also be categorized as the collection of scarce teaching and learning resources, the enrolment of students, employment of teaching and non-teaching staff, introduction of the new curriculum, student and staff discipline, staff training and methods of improving pedagogy and educational research (Okumbe, 1998).

Some of the management problems identified include; poor staffing, finance, infrastructure, communication, human relations and decision-making procedures (Akpan, 2003). However, Umosen (2010) stated that the main problem confronting education in less developed countries is the inability to coordinate and effectively manage available resources. This creates new demands on schools to produce effective students with skill to compete (Moran, 2009). Managerial and administrative skills are important tools for school leaders to make effective decisions on managing school resources. Most secondary schools are suffering from the principal's lack of ability, knowledge and experience.

In Oromia Regional State in different Zones many, studies were done in school participative decision making. All these studies were concerned with single participant like participation of teachers or PTA. For example, Balcha(2012) studied teachers' participation in decision making process in Bale Zone. This research has only investigated teachers' participation in decision process of school. He has not considered all the stakeholders. Research conducted by Desalegn (2014) is more focused on teacher's participation in overall decision making in school day-to-day activities in Jimma Town. A study done by Wondesen (2011) is more focusing in Nekemte Town secondary schools. He tried to assess the practice and problems of decision-making, in which he examined the overall assessment of decision-making in schools. He, however, did not consider all stakeholders' involvement in decision-making in school.

The finding of the above researches indicated that lack of proper planning, allocating resources, utilization of budget as well as absence of participatory decision making on school management are the mostly reflected problems. School leaders are not so open and transparent to share ideas for other stakeholders to make collaborative decision on resource utilization. Hence, there is a strong need to create transparent system in schools that clearly indicates the sources of finance as well as its allocation and utilization (MoE, 1994).

From the experience of the researcher, in the study area, there are problems relating with decision making practice, such as planning, allocating the resources appropriately and lack of involving all school leaders in decision making on resource management system and practicing out of the rule and regulations. This study is different from the above mentioned study in that it have been focused on practices and challenges of decision making in resource management. Therefore, this study is designed to investigate the practices and challenges of decision making in resources in secondary schools of East Shoa Zone of Oromia Region.

### **1.3. Basic Research Question**

This study focused on answering the following basic questions: -

1. What is the current practice of decision making on resource management in secondary schools of East Shoa Zone?



2. What is the perception of stakeholders towards the decision making practices on resource management in secondary schools of East Shoa Zone?
3. What is the extent of stakeholders' participation in decision making on resource management in secondary schools of East Shoa Zone?
4. What are the major factors that affect decision making practices in resource management in secondary schools of East Shoa Zone?

#### **1.4. Objective of the Study**

This part concerns on general and specific objectives of the study

##### **1.4.1. General Objective**

The General objective of the study is to investigate the practice and challenges of decision making in resource management in secondary school of East shoa Zone.

##### **1.4.2. Specific Objectives**

The specific objectives of the study will be to:-

1. Examine the practice of decision making on resource management in secondary schools of East Shoa Zone.
2. Assess the stakeholders' perception towards school leaders' decision making practices of resource management in secondary schools of East Shoa zone.
3. Examine the extent to which stakeholders participate in decision making on resource management in secondary schools of East Showa Zone.
4. Identify the major factors that affect decision making of resource management in secondary schools in East Showa Zone.

#### **1.5. Significance of the Study**

Effective, efficient and participatory decision making in resource management still needs strong attention. There was little research conducted regarding practices and challenges of decision making in resource management in secondary schools of East Shoe Zone. The finding of this research has provided information about the current practices of decision making on resource management in secondary schools of East Shoa Zone.

The research is important to introduce the role of stakeholders such as principal, PTA, teachers, students and the community in decision making on resource management. It is important to fill the knowledge gap of stakeholders on how to make decision about resource management.

The result of the study have given clear direction to different stakeholders such as policy makers, planners, trainers, and academic and supportive staff member of government secondary schools on effective decision making about resource management. The study is important to strengthen school community relation through involving them in decision making process on school resource management. It served as a starting point for those who are interested in conducting further study in the same topic.

### **1.6. Delimitation of the Study**

This study focused on the practices and challenges of decision making in resource management in secondary schools of East Shoe Zone in Oromia Regional State. There are 11 woredas, and 31 government secondary schools in the Zone. Due to the geographical set up, shortage of time and constraint of money, the research had been delimited to six (6) woredas and ten (10) government secondary schools that had been taken as sample. The sampled Woredas were Bora, Dugda, Lume, Adama, Bosat and Ada. The sampled secondary schools were Bora, Oda Bokata, Koka Ejersa, Awash Melkasa, Bosat, Doni, Ude, Wanji Gafarsa, Bole, and Hidi Hora Kilole.

To conduct this study descriptive survey design was used. The variables of the study were principals, department heads, PTA, students' council. There are other variables useful for this study those can contribute. As a result of budget and time limit the following were not included: such as supervisors, KETB, vice principals' woreda education office experts To select the samples from population sampling techniques were available, cluster and simple random sampling was used. Both primary and secondary sources of data had been used. The researcher employed questionnaire, interview and document analysis. Concerning methods of data analysis, the researcher used the quantitative and qualitative data analysis.

## 1.7. Limitation of the Study

Shortage of transportation during the travel to collect data was one of the challenges that the researcher faced. Less cooperation of the sampled schools' respondents to fill the questionnaires on time was another limitation of the study. The other limitation of the study was lack of current local researches which was related to the research title and absence of relevant and up-to-date reference materials. There was no internet access almost throughout the year to search and download references and review of related resources. However, the above mentioned problems challenged the researcher; he made strong effort and overcame them through smooth discussion with the respondents and concerned bodies.

## 1.8. Operational Definition of Key Terms

**Challenges** - Problems that affect the decision making in school Resource management

**Decision making**- refers to an act of choice by the stakeholders regarding school resource management

**East Shoa Zone** - Is one of the Oromia regional Zones presents geographically at the central part of the region.

**Practices** - Refers to the trends school leaders of secondary schools has in decision making of resource management.

**Resource management** - is the process of planning, allocating, organizing, controlling and directing school resources

**School leaders** - The school leading bodies such as principals, teachers and community

**School resource** - Refers to resources which involve human, physical and financial resources in secondary schools in order to achieve the desired educational objectives.

**Secondary school**- Is in this study, First cycle secondary school (9-10) according to the selected for the study.

**Stakeholders** – Is in school that can play role in decision making of resource management (principal, department head, students' council and PTA).

## 2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

These sections had explained the rationale of the problem studied as well as previous research related to the topic and how the findings relate to the problem at hand. The review concentrates on the theoretical orientation of the study and related literature in line with the objectives of the study.

### 2.1. Concept of Decision Making

Various authors define decision making differently. While some authors Newstrom and Pierce (1990) focus on the process involved in decision making, other e.g. (Hoy and Miskel, 1991) emphasize the problem solved during a decision making. On the other hand, some other writers Irwin (1996) focused on the actors involved in decision making. Okumbe (1998) define decision-making as the process of specifying the nature of particular problem and selecting among available alternatives in order to solve the problem. This definition of decision-making indicates that a problem precedes any decision and that there must be a number of alternative courses of action from which an optimum course will be selected Knezevich (1969) also define decision and decision making as follows: A decision can be defined as a conscious choice action from among a well-defined set of often competing alternatives.

Decision-making is a sequential process culminating in a single decision or series of decisions (choices) which stimulate moves or actions. The sequences of activities called decision-making result in the selection of course of action from alternative course intended bring about the future state affairs envisage. Decisions are a composite of values, facts, and assumptions. Each or all of these may be subject to change from time. Decision-making, therefore, is not a onetime activity but rather a continuing enterprise (Okumbe, 1998).

Every successful organization must make decision that enable the organization to achieve its goal and which meet the critical needs of members of the organization (Morphet et al, 1982). Moreover, Alkin (1992) state that decisions are made daily in school about the conduct of work, the distribution of resources, and short term goals. Decision involve policies (the definition of objectives), resources (people, money materials, and authority), and means of

execution (integration and synthesis). Insofar as the value content of this type of decision is concerned, the school principal should identify two major values; policy decision that seek purposive action; executing decision that seek coordination's of action (Wilson, 1996).

Thus, decision-making is very important and significant in school and in any organization at large to conduct work, distribute resources, plan short-term and long-term of bring about the future state of affairs as an intention, and activities of the school. Moreover, a school leaders' main job is to lead the school through effective. Decision making, and quite often they have to decide on what is to be done, who to do it, and when and where is to be done.

## **2.2. School Resource Management**

School Resource Management could be defined as the judicious use of resources to avoid wastage and to achieve institutional objectives. School Resource Management is the act and manner of handling, controlling and directing the affairs of a group. School resource management is the efficient and effective deployment of educational organizations' resources when they are needed. They include personnel, finances, and physical facilities among many.

According to, Aguokogbou, (2003), the need for adequate economic and environmental resources for running of the schools cannot be overstated. This is because poor funding among others contribute to the failure of the school programs economics resources are needed for building classrooms, furniture, transportation, etc. money will facilitate the construction of adequate space, the use of better equipment, the development of better educational materials etc. The school leaders have available sources of funds that can assist in the running of schools which include federal state and regional government, communities, Parents' Teachers' Association, individuals and religious organizations.

Decision making forms the foundation of every management and business activity. It goes without saying; in good management, decision making and problem solving can greatly improve an organizations profits and achievement of goals and objectives which starts with a purposeful, consecutive, strategic-thinking process. Making decisions is one of the prime functions of educational management, where decisions are made in such important areas as the allocation of scarce teaching and learning resources, enrolment of students, employment of

teaching and non-teaching staff, the introduction of new curriculum or curriculum reformation, student and staff discipline, staff training and methods of improving pedagogy and educational research (Okumbe, 1998). On the other hand educational effectiveness is “concerned with whether or not a specific set of resources has positive effect on achievement and if so how large this affects is”. Clearly, since effectiveness does not directly compare resource uses or costs, what is effective isn’t necessarily what is most efficient? (Husen & postlewait, 1994)

The importance of the above mentioned enable the schools to acquire school material resources is crucial so that it can be effectively managed within good knowledge of school resources and the ability to adequately explore the many sources of such resources. The school leaders in this case are expected to have good knowledge of various sources of school resources and identify the necessary stakeholders and potential donors or contributors, and analyses how they are going to convince them to support their school activities. Likewise, knowledge of school resources and their various sources is not enough if such resources, harnessed by the school system, are not effectively managed to achieve educational objectives. However, The activities of management involves decision making and implementation which, consist of planning or forecasting, organizing, staffing, commanding, coordinating, controlling, allocating, evaluating and developing. In line with this idea, Effective decision making activities are also necessary in the achievement of prudence in school resource management.

### **2.3. Types of School Resource Management**

Hornby (2000) defines resource as an organization or an individual has and can use, especially to increase wealth; a thing that gives help, support or comfort when needed. However, according to Gizaw (cited in Negussie, 2007), the main types of educational resources include human resources, material resource, physical resources, financial resources time resources and information resources.

#### **2.3.1. Human resources management**

Human resource management means managing people. People if not properly managed, create problem. Top managements of the organization are now playing more attention towards the

human resource management. Because they have now realized that their human resources need to be closely integrated with planning and decision making. According to Robbins (2005), the human resource management “refers to the philosophy, policies, procedures and practice related to the management of people within an organization.” In order for quality education to be carried out properly, one of the preconditions that need to be fulfilled is the existence of efficient management, especially human resource management. Supporting this idea Williams (2006) states that people need to be managed. However, people are unique and special resource and managing them is not simply a control process. Managing people is a challenging task. Moreover, Cheate(2001) note that if education at all levels is to function efficiently and if there is to be a constant attention given to ensuring the quality of education, highly competent administrators and supervisory personnel are a prime condition.

These have to be properly managed in order to let them contribute their best. Human resources in the education sector in terms of quality and quantity contribute largely to the overall success of the education system. It has been noted that the efficiency of the school depends largely on the teachers’ competence. This is because no curriculum can be effectively implemented without the support of well qualified and highly motivated teachers (Afolabi, 2000). Some of the present problems in schools have been created by well meaning people who lack sufficient experience in school leaders to develop and maintain quality programs. There is real danger when such persons also have the power and authority to make far-reaching decisions. An administrator should not only be good in the process of implementing the school curriculum and utilizing the school finance effectively, but also he or she has to be excellent in communicating with the school board, concerned tax payers’ group, or the staff, (Bagin and Gallagher,2001).

Generally, to achieve the goals of the school, the decision making on the human resource management needs manage effectively. When all stakeholders participate in decision making on capacity building, motivating teachers and supportive staff to give attention the interest of those staff increase on job satisfactions.

### **2.3.2. Material resources management**

Material resources are instruments with which a teacher teaches and from which students learn. No one disputes the role and function of instructional materials in enhancing the quality of education. Mbamba (1992), defines; material resource management in education as executive functions concerned with the planning, acquisition, allocation, distribution and controlling the proper use as well as maintenance of educational materials and facilities in order to realize the objectives of the education system. According to Amare (1999) instructional materials relate to all forms of materials with which students and teachers interact for the purpose of learning and teaching. Some of them are facilitating active learning, encouraging creative thinking, effecting student skill development, overcoming the limitations of time and space, concretizing abstract experiences, creating the access to invisible realities, teaching and entertaining, relating theory with practice, making learning more functional by increasing retention, assisting learning of a method of learning, and encouraging responsibility.

Regarding this, UNESCO (1997) explains that many institutions suffer from insufficient resources to purchase the complex and expensive equipment needed for their workshops and laboratories. Lack of or inadequacy of teaching materials hampers the normal learning process. It is impossible to expect competent students from schools that suffer from the inadequacy or lack of teaching materials. Since decision making mainly about problem solving, it is necessary to make decision to solve the inadequacy or lack of education materials. According to Zenez (1994), material management system helps to advocate management of different functions:- purchasing, receiving storage, inventory control and other materials management activities. Therefore, it is important to manage teaching materials properly for better achievement of the students which needs a decision made by involvement of key stakeholders.

As the above statement signifies that materials resources are costly, they must be distributed and controlled effectively to ensure as proper management and proper user. In light of this, the school leaders together with teaching and none teaching staff see it that scarce school materials resources are used and administered according to the decision making on set of rules



and regulations. If the quality decision is made by school leaders and allow the involvement of key stakeholders it leads to the school effectiveness. Therefore, school leaders should open their doors for the involvement of stakeholders in decision making of school materials resource management and to get information pertaining to resources acquisition allocation, distributions, and application to the objective it is to mean to serve. The available information on resources will help school leaders to set a certain controlling mechanism to be applied by school community.

### **2.3.3. Physical resources management**

Learning can occur anywhere, but the positive learning outcomes generally sought by educational systems happen in quality learning environments. Learning environments are made up of physical, psychosocial, and service delivery elements. Physical learning environments or the places, in which formal learning occurs, range from relatively modern and well-equipped buildings to open-air gathering places. The quality of school facilities seems to have an indirect effect on learning, an effect that is hard to measure. The quality of any school program is largely dependent upon the degree of the organization of its teaching facilities.

They are characterized by the presence of adequate, well planned, and properly equipped physical facilities, which are very much similar in nature and operation to the facilities in the actual working places. Berhe, (2011) and TGE (1994) elaborate that due attention is given to the provision and appropriate usage of educational facility, technology, materials, environment, organization and management to strengthen the teaching-learning process and the expansion of education.

A functional as well as pleasant working environment may contribute a great deal to teaching. Thus, considerable thought should go into the planning and construction of physical facilities in order to create the appropriate environment. The creation of appropriate physical facilities is not just a matter of providing the necessary funds and materials. They should be well planned which is basically required the quality of decision making done by school leaders. Making the facilities conducive for learning may result in competence of learners. The process of managing and organizing resources is called resource utilization. The utilization of resources

in teaching brings about fruitful learning since it stimulates students sense as well as motivating them (MOE, 2003).

#### **2.3.4. Financial resources management**

According to Ogbonnaya (2000) financial management deals with the source of funds, their efficient uses and maximization of costs or losses for greater profitability of the business, and in ministerial department, post primary institutions for enhanced welfare of students and staff. Pandey (1995) visualized financial management as “that management activity which is concerned with the planning and controlling of an organization’s financial resources”.

The implication of all the definitions so far is that financial management is directly concerned with decision-making on the proper use of available funds. Supporting this idea, Kruger (2005) confirms that School financial management entails four basic or fundamental actions, namely, financial organizing, planning, leading and control which need quality decision made by participation of key stakeholders that leads to school effectiveness. However, poor decision made cases poor management of fund that leads to inefficiency and low production of teaching resources in schools. In brief, decision makers need relevant facts that will allow the ability to map out how big the problem is and how it could be solved by the allocation or non-allocation of resources.

#### **2.4. Types of decision making in the school**

Researchers and experts concerning decision-making have developed way of classifying different type of decision based on the nature and purpose they serve. In this regard, Assefa (1995) classified decision in to “individual and group decision, personal and organizational decisions, programmed and non-programmed decision intermediary, appellate and creative decisions, rational and non-rational decisions”. In addition, other writers such as Ivancevich et al. (2005) and Okumbe (1998) classified based on nature of the problem as programmed decision that is repetitive and routine activities and none-programmed decisions that is novel, unstructured, and new problem. However, for the most part, these different classification systems are similar, differing mainly in terminology (Ivancevich et al, 2005). The present researcher also believes that almost all the ideas proposed by the authors are similar except in their scope, width and ways of expressing the different types of decision-making.

Therefore, this section mainly focuses on the types of decision-making based on their nature, time and purpose. These are: (1) Individual versus Group Decisions and (2) Program and Non-program Decisions.

#### **2.4.1. Individual versus group decisions**

Individual and group decisions are kind of decision based on a number of people involved in decision-making process. Based on the nature of the problem and the situation, some decisions may be made better by group, while others may be handled by individuals. As pointed out by Newsrom, and Pierce, (1990) the question of decision making by individuals or involving other should not be determined by leader personal preference, but by the nature of the problem and the situation. Group decision-making is sometime referred to by other terminologies: participative decision – making, collective judgment management or plural management (McEwan, 1997).

Decisions relating to the determinant of the organizational objective and formulation of plans, strategies and policies fall in this category. Today important decisions are made by group than individuals. This is because there is great deal of information available in a participative decision-making process. Supporting this idea (Legesse, 2008) stated that, group decision would become particularly appropriate for non-programmed decisions because these decisions are complex and few individuals have all knowledge and skills necessary to make the best decisions.

This implies that groups can make higher quality decision than individuals because different ideas come together from different groups and select the best form the given alternatives. Thus, in school context, the school principals are not the only person that makes decision and the other people like teachers implement the decision without involving on the issues; and also the others should to accept the decision to agree with the action to be chosen. Supporting this idea, Adane et al. (2002) state that, schools principals no longer make decision on their owns. That is because they need information and advice from several sources especially teachers and pupils to act rationally. As argued by Ayalew (2003) write that acceptance in decision making is much more important than the quality of the decision to gain the intended objectives .That is if people participate in making a decision; they tend to be more committed

to the decision and more motivated to put the decision in to action so that what are wanted will be achieved.

Generally, decisions may be taken either by an individual or groups. Even if the group decision making may have its own limited disadvantage in school organizations making the decisions by group is preferable than one individuals. As argued by McEwan (1997), group decision can bring more resource to many decisions than a single individual. Different people bring a variety of information, ideas, and viewpoints. Moreover, group decision helps to facilitate the identification of creative and innovative solution to the problems through participating staff members.

#### **2.4.2. Program and non-program decisions.**

The other decision making type view is Program and Non-Program decision making. According to Simon cited in (vecchio, 1991) distinguishes decision in terms of whether they are fairly routine and well-structured or novel and poorly structured. For Okumbe (1998) program decisions are made on routine problems, whereas, non-programmed decision is in response to problems which are either novel or poorly defined. Knezevich(1969) also agrees on the above idea. He notes that programmed decisions are used in repetitive and routine activities. This means when definite procedures can be worked out, program decisions cover the routine problems of an organization that do not need a new response for each recurrence. In contrast, non-programmed decisions encompass novel, unstructured, and consequential issues for which no cut-and dried method can be developed.

From the above point of view, programmed decisions are the easiest for school principals to make a decision. In this case, the nature of the problem is clearly defined and is well understood by them. Moreover, while employing programmed decisions what principals often need to do follow either written or unwritten policies, procedures or rules to make solution for the problems in their school. Supporting this idea, Tripathi and Reddy (2002) have concluded that, programmed decisions are the easiest for educational managers to make. Furthermore, program decisions are not time taking and simpler. Instead of to thinking to bring some solution for a problem on their own what principals are required in programmed decision is to

implement a policy. It can thus be said that programmed decision has limited opportunity when it comes to exercising creativity and independent judgment.

## **2.5. Impacts of Decision Making in School Resource Management**

The implementation of decision-making through the full participation of parents and communities entails challenges. When compared with teachers and head teachers, community groups do not focus on education matters and this often creates conflict (Workneh, 2012). Prior to managing and evaluating performance, the school leaders be sure that the school is being supplied with various types of resources adequately utilized in due course of time.

In light of this, good knowledge and the appropriate utilization of these resources are vital in the achievement of effectiveness in resource management in the school. Moreover, according to Ogwo (1996) management as a term is strictly used for the purpose of controlling activities of industries, firms, private business establishment and large cooperation. The activities of management involves decision making and implementation which, consist of planning or forecasting, organizing, staffing, commanding, coordinating, controlling, allocating, evaluating and developing. A correct decision makes the human life better and provides some control over life. However, a bad decision may force a person to result in making even another worse decision! As the problem of decision-making is in fact the problem of coping with uncertainty, which is ubiquitous, it is thought worthwhile to start with a brief passage giving an overview of uncertainty and linking it with decision making (Kozine, 2004).

Further according to Ehiamentalor (1988) have expressed concern about the problem of planning in educational innovation. This is the stage at which the administrator is made to participate. There were evidences of planning of some sort, but invariably, these were usually inadequate implementation plans. The inadequacies of such plans were usually based on wrong premises and inaccurate data information on program leads to wrong decision made. Thus, the program fail because the planners truncate their responsibility at the level of planning which needs quality decision made, and those administrators in the field who ought to have been involved were not always invited in the implementation planning, hence the poor end result because of poor decision made.

Employees improve understanding and perceptions among colleagues and superiors, and enhance personnel value in the organization when they participate in the decision making process (probst, 2005). In theory, rational decision making leads to optimal decisions. In practice, however, we know that world constraints, common decision making mistakes, and risks situations make fully rational decision difficult to achieve. So managers can make better decisions by using decision roles, multi variable testing and decision software and by avoiding common decision making error called escalation of commitment (Williams, 2006).

Accordingly, considerable focus has to be given by school leaders in decision-making, planning, provision, as well as the utilization and controlling of school resource facilities. Moreover, school leaders should be familiar with their school aims, policies and systems, roles and responsibilities of people who are doing the work to achieve the aim and to implement policies and working together, for effective management of educational resources. The decision to be made will either be subjected to cause either positive or negative effect on individual, group or corporate organizations. The choice to be selected may be informed by emotions, information, logic, hope and creativity; all of which crowd in on the human being.

## **2.6. Effective Decision Making in Resource Management**

In developing high involvement organization, school leaders must deliver information, knowledge, power, and rewards to employees (Lawler, 1992). A decision group's leader facilitates communications between individuals and integrates the incoming response so that a united response occurs. Information about the school and work, and knowledge of the field as well as power should be shared with stakeholder to increase their participation by allowing them the opportunity to participate in making decision that affects them (Organ & Batema, 1991). Principals are expected as a core of decision making in resource management in any schools, and also responsible for the outcomes of that decision made. Ivancevich and kono (2002) suggests a guideline for a leader to improve the quality of decision in groups. These are creating an environment in which the group members feel free to participate and express their opinions, include all the concerned bodies and people who can provide the needed additional information relevant to the problem and involved those individuals whose acceptance and commitment are important.

The principal must be prepared and encouraged to exert leadership on instructional issues. The mission and goals for the school must be the foremost priority for all participants in decision making resource management process and it is the principal's duty to make them known (Pashiardis, 1994). He also adds, principals can be a powerful force for school change when they are flexible enough to allow teachers to take part in rational problem solving and responsible, widely shared decision making. The allocation of time as evidence of administrator commitment will encourage teachers to initiate and continue their involvement in the process.

In general school leaders should facilitate for effective decision making through providing appropriate information, motivating employees, especially, principals have responsibility to empower the employees through rewarding, training as to make a quality decision about school resource management.

## **2.7. Decision Making Practice in School Resource Management**

Every successful organization must make decision that enable the organization to achieve its goal and which meet the critical needs of members of the organization Morphet (1982). Moreover, Alkin (1992) state that "decisions are made daily in school about the conduct of work, the distribution of resources, and short term goals". Decision involve policies (the definition of objectives), resources (people, money materials, and authority), and means of execution (integration and synthesis). Insofar as the value content of this type of decision is concerned, the school principal should identify two major values; policy decision that seek purposive action; executing decision that seek coordination's of action (Wilson, 1996).

Thus, decision-making is very important and significant in school and in any organization at large to conduct work, distribute resources, plan short-term and long-term of bring about the future state of affairs as an intention, and activities of the school. Moreover, a school leaders' main job is to lead the school through effective. Authority on the other hand gives them the right to use power. In organizations therefore people derive power from the positions they hold. Given the authority and rights to use power, then those with positions (like Principals) that wield power are likely to have the ability to influence the actions of their subordinates.

But then, it is important to note that the subjects hereby referred to can contribute to influence positively or negatively on the decisions made in schools. Principal who value and manage wisely the knowledge among the experienced members of staff will often succeed in making decisions that will gain popular support within the institution. The school management should therefore develop appropriate decision making styles, but more importantly, the ability for the Principal to know what decision making style she/he ought to use, who to involve in making the decision even if by way of consultation and what type of decision to make.

## **2.8. Stakeholders' Involvement and Decision-making**

The term “stakeholders” has become fashionable in many countries, including South Africa. The term is based on the assumption that certain groups and individuals have an interest, or a “stake”, in the activities of an institution. According to Bush and Heystek (2003), the stakeholders are all those people who have a legitimate interest in the continuing effectiveness and success of an institution. In contextualizing this definition, one gets a picture of an ideal situation where various stakeholders in a school setting (parents, teachers, learners and the principal) come together and make decisions in pursuit of a common interest. This reform in decision-making approaches followed by schools presents a challenge for principals in terms of their skills and capacities as they have to adopt more collaborative and inclusive decision-making processes.

Research into the ever-changing school environment and the changes experienced by principals clearly shows that there is now a far greater focus on principals' interpersonal skills and capabilities. Since principals are now required to lead the whole school community while facilitating participation and collaboration among stakeholders in decision-making, planning and budgeting, their leadership skills and capacities are critical (Cranston 2001; Jackson 2000; Williams and Port in 1997). The implementation of decision-making through the full participation of parents and communities entails challenges. When compared with teachers and head teachers, community groups do not focus on education matters and this often creates conflict (Workneh, 2012).

In addition, Jackson (2000) points out that principals need “continually and increasingly to involve staff in collective decision-making” as key aspects of their job, and he emphasizes the



importance of consultation, collective decision-making and delegated responsibility. It is clear that nowadays there are marked changes in the roles and responsibilities of principals in comparison to earlier, when the principal was the main (often only) decision-maker in the school. Other scholars in the field of school leadership and stakeholder involvement underscore the importance of facilitative leadership by school principals. Principals have to initiate, implement and sustain viable forms of teacher empowerment and shared decision-making at school level. Scholars point out the need to think in terms of notions of “power with” and “power through” rather than the more traditional hierarchical “power over” notion that probably most closely aligns with how principals operated in the past (Blasé, and Blasé, 2000).

One may conclude that the success of participatory decision making has much to do the readiness of the principal to share power and his ability to establish the processes to make participatory decision making works. Somech (2002) shares this view: “Leaders must be willing to let go of traditional authority roles, not only allowing teachers to have a greater voice but helping to prepare them, providing support and establishing an environment of trust.” Acker-Hocevar and Touchton (1999) hold a similar view: “Principals must know how to create conditions that foster empowerment and release their control over other stakeholders, alter their roles, and engender commitment, trust, and respect.” A study conducted by Mulford et al. (2000) in primary schools in Tasmania examined school decision-making processes as perceived by principals, teachers and school council members.

Their findings seem to suggest that all the stakeholders (teachers, parents and learners) need to be engaged in real decisions about teaching and learning in the school if real improvement in education is to be achieved. Other studies of shared governance, such as those by Karlsson (2002) and Mncube (2007) point towards the same understanding. The next section provides theoretical arguments for stakeholders’ involvement in decision-making.

## **2.9. Theoretical Arguments for Stakeholders’ Involvement in Decision making**

Arguments for participation in decision-making are generally grounded in four theoretical orientations, namely the democratic, socialist, human growth and development, and

productivity and efficiency arguments (Somech, 2002); Keith 1996). This discussion focuses only on the democratic, human growth and development, and the productivity and efficiency argument as they are the ones relevant to this article. The democratic argument for participation has also been called the ethical approach (Somech, 2002).

The democratic argument reflects the belief that offering the opportunity to participate in the decision-making of an organization is a moral imperative because individuals have the right to exercise some control over their work and their lives (Somech, 2002). In the school setting this argument suggests that teacher participation is necessary to professionalize and democratize teaching. Furthermore, a democratic school environment is believed to encourage children to participate in and sustain a country's system of government (Barth, 2001).

Though the link between participation and democratic and pluralistic values is often cited, the emphasis on participation for professionalization or equity reasons has been found to be less prevalent among school principals than other emphases (Blasé, and Blasé, 2000). The second argument for participation, which is human growth and development, advocates “assigning greater importance to the intrinsic motivational properties of work itself by allowing greater employee influence, autonomy, and responsibility” (Keith,1996). This orientation towards participation views the involvement of employees as a means of enhancing their lives by providing the opportunity for growth and learning within the workplace. The assumption of the human growth and development theory of participation is that work must provide intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and must satisfy workers' psychological needs such as affiliation, power, and self-esteem. Finally, the argument most commonly known as worker participation is promoted as a way to increase the productivity and efficiency of an organization.

Somech(2002) calls it a “pragmatic” rationale. In the educational setting, where this rationale is widespread, teacher participation is believed to improve the quality of educational decisions and therefore to improve instruction. This theory can be summarized as follows: “Flatter management and decentralized authority structures carry the potential for achieving outcomes unattainable by the traditional top down bureaucratic structure of school” (Somech, 2002).

In the language of business, worker participation yields “higher quality products and services, less absenteeism, less turnover, better decision-making, better problem solving, and less

management overhead – in short, greater organizational effectiveness” (Duke, 2005). Conley (1991) argues that worker participation is the best way to increase the productivity and efficiency of an organization. Contextualizing this assumption, it can be argued that teacher participation is the best way to improve school effectiveness.

To summarize these issues, there are four theoretical orientations. Such as democratic, socialist, human growth and development, and productivity and efficiency arguments about resource decision making. The democratic argument approach is relevant to encourage participation decision making about school resource management. It is called an ethical approach. Many literatures confirmed that participatory decision making is appropriate decision making practice to make an organization effective. As a researcher, the participatory decision making is democratic and should be supported and implemented in school.

## **2.10. Motives for Stakeholder Involvement in Decision Making**

The motives for participatory management can broadly be classified into two kinds: the first might be labeled humanistic or democratic (Koopman & Wierdsma, 1998). Essentially, this rationale argues that people have the right to participate in decisions that affect their life. It assumes that individuals have the ability, or at least the potential, to participate intelligently. The second major kind of rationale has been labeled pragmatic or human relations (O’Hair & Reitzug, 1997). It suggests that participatory management is an instrumental way to achieve productivity, efficiency, or other valued organizational goals.

In addition and in specific reference to educational settings, Duke & Gansneder, (1990) report that during the past three decades, the rationale for principals to increase teachers’ involvement in school decision making has ranged from the pragmatic arguments that educational innovation is unlikely to succeed without teachers’ support to the philosophical view that teachers have a right to be involved, regardless of the outcome. From the pragmatic perspective, participation is thought to improve the quality of educational decision making. Teacher participation is thought to give administrators access to critical information close to the source of any problems of schooling, namely the classroom. Increased access to and use of this information are thought to improve the quality of curricular and instructional decisions.

Moreover, the involvement of diverse professions can improve the quality of the decisions through utilization of varieties of expert knowledge.

### **2.11. Degree of stakeholders involvement in decision making**

Apodaca-Tucker & Slate (2002) proposed that a superior could call on subordinates to participate to varying degrees, ranging from exclusion to full participation. On the same note Dean, (1993) postulated that typically, the degree of involvement has been conceptualized in terms of a continuum, as follows: first the autocratic decision making where no advance information on a decision is given to subordinates and the superior makes the decisions on his or her own. Secondly consultative decision making where the superior shares the problem with the sub-ordinates, getting their ideas and suggestions then makes a decision, which may or may not reflect his or her own influence. Thirdly, democratic decision making is where the superior shares the problems with the subordinates.

Together they analyze the problem and arrive at a mutually acceptable solution which is adopted (Dean, 1993). This literature suggests that the usual areas for collaboration or decisional involvement includes: hiring personnel and providing staff development; establishing academic and related policies; school budget; selection of textbooks and other instructional materials; curriculum development; planning new school facilities; addressing students' academic and other needs; student discipline issues; resolving problems in school-community relations; evaluation and assessment of students and teachers' performance; resolving grievances of staff and students; and teaching methods (Apodaca-Tucker & Slate, 2002,).

### **2.12. Role of Stakeholders in Decision Making in Resource Management**

One of the main focuses of this was strengthening school management and parent and community partnership in order to improve decision making at school level as sited in (MOE, 2005). These parties are expected to take responsibility for problems and weaknesses that rise in schools, and they play leading roles in implementing effectives and decisions (MoE, 2007). According to Jawahar and McLaughlin (2001), primary or key stakeholders include investors, employees, customers and suppliers. Secondary stakeholders, on the other hand, are those

individuals, groups or organizations who can indirectly influence or be influenced by the organization's actions. The involvement of parents, teachers, local councilors and education officials in school management can help to promote decision-making at school level, which improves the quality of schooling and students' achievement.

### **2.12.1. Role of principal in decision making in school resource management**

The role of school principal is one of the factors in the success or failure of the education system at school level and plays an important role in financial administration and staff management. From this we can say school principal is responsible for managing and controlling the human, financial and material resources of the school. At the same time school principal are responsible to ensure the participation of communities, students and local administration in decision making of resource management. MOE, (2005) the woreda educational office is given the role of supervising, monitoring and evaluating the activities of the schools and of ensuring that the schools are provided with the necessary human, material and financial resources.

Effective management of schools may lead to improved performance and productivity. School Principals play a critical role in establishing and maintaining school participatory decision making (LithWood and Steinbatch, 1999). Therefore, school principal could make a key contribution to the creation of conducive environment for the staff for educational achievement.

### **2.12.2. Role of communities and PTA in decision making**

The FDRE government has put a policy direction regarding the management and organization of the schools which stated that it will be professional, coordinated, efficient and effective with an overall coordination of the democratic leadership of committees consisting of members from the community( MoE, 1994).Communities were expected to raise funds for purchasing basic school equipment, hiring contract teachers, constructing schools and classrooms, building teachers' houses, and encouraging girls to enroll in schools and also expected to participate in preparing annual action plans (MoE, 2005). Decisions that are made at local level are arguably more responsive to specific issues related to school contexts. An

important achievement has been observed in South Africa in this regard, since school-based governance is often integrated with participatory decision-making (Naidoo, 2005).

According to De Grauwe (2011), the involvement of parents, teachers, local councilors and education officials in school management can help to promote decision-making at school level, which improves the quality of schooling and students' achievement. However, the implementation of decision-making through the full participation of parents and communities entails challenges. When compared with teachers principals and community groups do not focus on education matters and this often creates conflict (Naidoo, 2005).

However, community participation in education in this study is to mean the level or extent of community involvement in the education resource management (planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluating) process, activities; or running of schools. That is the level to which parents and other identifiable community groups contribute towards creating an environment conducive for efficient and effective teaching and learning. In other words, it refers to the involvement by the community in education program with the framework of national development program.

### **2.12.3. Role of teachers in decision making in school resource management**

Teachers are one of the crucial stakeholders who can directly participate in the decision making in school resource management as key stakeholders. Concerning this idea Mullins (2005) sited that staff participation in decision making leads to higher performance and which is necessary for survival in an increasingly competitive world. Wilkinson (1999) corroborated this fact and saw involvement of employees in decision making as empowerment while a neglect of employees in decision making was seen as an assumption that workers are untapped resources with knowledge and experience and an interest in becoming involved, employers need to provide opportunities and structures for their involvement. He also assumed that participative decision making is likely to lead to job satisfaction and better quality decisions and those gains are available both to employers (increased efficiency) and workers.

The involvement of workers in decision making will improve the quality of workers decision making in the organization. In contrast, where teachers lack motivation and involvement in decision making, truancy, excessive excuses, abstention and complaints usually emerge leading to general ineffectiveness, inefficiency, low productivity and non-achievement of goals of organization (Awotua-Efebo, 1999). Without participation of teachers, changes in education are impossible (UNESCO, 2005). As stated by Newcombe and McCormick (2001) there are two areas of financial decisions (technical and operational financial decision) in which teachers can directly be involved.

#### **2.12.4. Role of students in decision making in school resource management**

One of the stakeholders who can participate in decision making in school resource management is students' council. Meaningful participation of students in school management is explained in terms of the level of their participation in school decision-making in resource management. For example, students may initiate action and participate with adults in the decision-making process. Students' participation increases student motivation and helps them have higher aims for their education (MOE 1998). To conclude, the Government of Ethiopia has recently focused on improving school-based management through the devolution of education decision-making to school level. To achieve this objective, it has promoted the roles of various education stakeholders in decision-making.

### **2.13. The Challenges of Decision Making in School Resource Management**

The government has recognized the weak management and implementation capacity at school level was one of the main barriers to achieving access, equity and quality in primary education (MOE, 2005). After 2005, therefore, the government acknowledged the importance of school management for improving school-based decision –making. However, the woreda Administration still had more powers of critical decision making and improving governance in schools. For instance, the woreda education office was responsible for recruiting teachers and managing the financial and material resources of the schools (MOE, 2005).

There are different situational factors or challenges that can influence the quality of decision making: The first one is leadership factors, which can be defined differently in different

authors. According to Armstrong (1990) leadership is a system of influencing and guiding people's behavior to get the work done. The second factor is delegation of authority and responsibility, the third is communication factor and the fourth factors are motivational factor. These are factors or challenges that may face in decision making in school resource management.

The other factors which can hinder the action of decision making in school resource managements are raised by different researchers differently. As Achoka, (2003) stated, Political influence is the critical issue in decision making in school resource management. He explained the issue as follows. Political influence is a thorny issue in schools as some politicians sometimes demand that head teachers in schools within their localities be of their choice. Such politicians hope to gain support from the influence of the head teachers. Thus when a head teacher from another locality or community is posted to a school, he/she may not be as effective as he/she would have wished due to constant interference by the local politicians. Some politicians also incite parents or the community against such head teacher as stated in (Bush and Oduro, 2006). These all are the challenges or factors which hinder the decision made by head teacher and other stakeholders in school resource management.

The other challenges which can influence the decision making in school resource management is the physical facility as described by (Ozogi,1997). Head teacher face challenges in decision making and in managing resources in their schools due to lack of adequate physical facilities which is due to lack of funds. As Kaime, (1990) described "Physical facilities such as classrooms, home science and craft rooms, workshops and laboratories that are well equipped are the greatest challenge being faced by parents and education authorities including head teachers yet the physical facilities have a bearing on quantitative growth and quality of education". This constraint may made great challenges on head teacher and other stakeholders in decision making in school resource management.



### **3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY**

This section discusses mainly about the research design, data sources, population sample, sampling techniques, and data gathering tools and methods of data analysis were discussed in details.

#### **3.1. Description of the Study Area**

East Shoa Zone is one of 20 Zones in Oromia Regional state that is located in the central part of the region. In the north it is bordered by Amhara Region, in the north-west by Western Shoa Zone and Special zone of Oromia surrounding Finfine, in the west by West Shoa zone, in the north-east by Afar Regional State, in the south-east by Arsi Zone and in the south-west by the Southern Nation Nationalities and People region. The zone is characterized by hot and moderate hot climatic conditions. Farming is the most common economic source of the zone. According to the report by East shoa Education Office 2009, in the zone there are 2 government Kinder Gartan (KG) schools, 581 primary schools, 31 secondary schools and 10 preparatory schools (East Shoa, 2009).

#### **3.2. Research Design**

The study investigated the practices and challenges of decision making in resource management in secondary schools of East Shoa Zone, Oromia Regional State. A descriptive survey design was employed. Descriptive survey research design helps to gather a large variety of data related to a problem under study and it is also effective for providing a snapshot of the current behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs in a population. Moreover, the descriptive survey design also helps to provide adequate information that enables the researcher to suggest some valuable alternatives. Supporting this, Keeves (1990) has pointed out that descriptive design of research is a fact finding study with adequate and accurate interpretation of the findings. The researcher used both quantitative and qualitative approach to identify the problems. Therefore, to have a clear picture on the existing problems and to accomplish the objectives stated above a descriptive survey become appropriate. So, a descriptive survey design has been employed in the study.

### **3.3. Sources of Data**

Both primary and secondary sources of data were employed in this study.

#### **3.3.1. Primary source of data**

Primary data was collected directly from the respondents such as Department heads, students' councils, principals and Parents-Teachers Association (PTA) members.

#### **3.3.2. Secondary data sources**

Secondary data was gathered from written documents of schools such as, minutes of meeting in the school and reports written on decision making of school resource management and related written available documented materials.

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

Under this heading the target population of the study and the sample size and sampling techniques are described.

#### **3.4.1. Target population**

The target population of the study was government secondary school principals, department heads, students' council members, and parent- teacher association. The zone has 10 woredas and 31 government (9-10) secondary schools. Six (6) woredas and ten (10) secondary schools are selected. The selected woredas are:- Bora, Lume, Adama, Boset, Dugda, and Ada'a . The sampled schools were Oda Bokata, Bora, Koka Ejersa, Awash Melkasa, Bosat,Wanji Gefersa, Bole, Ude, Hidi Hora Kilole and Doni secondary schools.

#### **3.4.2. Sample Size and Techniques**

The total number of selected subjects was 10 principals, 40 department heads; 10 PTA chair persons, 50 students' council. The sampling techniques the researcher used were cluster sampling, simple random sampling and available sampling. The woredas were classified into three cluster groups based on their geographic location. After classifying the woredas into three clusters based on their geographical location, the researcher selected 6 (60%) of them by simple random sampling techniques to give equal chance. From 31 secondary schools, 10

(32.2%) of the schools were selected by using simple random sampling techniques. The subjects from each school were selected by using available sampling techniques. This indicates that the sample comprises 32.25% of the population of the total number of government secondary schools which is higher than 10% recommended by social science researchers (Mugenda, 1999).

Table1: Summary population, sample and sampling Techniques

Woreda	Schools	Dep't heads			Principals			Student Council member			PTA chair persons		
		P	Sam	%	Pop	Sam	%	Pop	Sam	%	Pop	Sa	%
Lume	Koka Ejersa	4	4	100	1	1	100	5	5	100	1	1	100
Adama	Wonji gefersa	4	4	100	1	1	100	5	5	100	1	1	100
	Awash Malkasa	4	4	100	1	1	100	5	5	100	1	1	100
Bora	Bora	4	4	100	1	1	100	5	5	100	1	1	100
Bosat	Bosat	4	4	100	1	1	100	5	5	100	1	1	100
	Doni	4	4	100	1	1	100	5	5	100	1	1	100
	Bole	4	4	100	1	1	100	5	5	100	1	1	100
Dugda	Oda Bokota	4	4	100	1	1	100	5	5	100	1	1	100
Ada'a	Ude	4	4	100	1	1	100	5	5	100	1	1	100
	HidiHoraKilole	4	4	100	1	1	100	5	5	100	1	1	100
	Total	40	40	100	10	10	100	50	50	100	10	10	100
	Sampling Techniques	Available			Available			Available			Available		

*Key: p=population, Sam=sample population, Population=110, population sampling=110*

### 3.5. Data Gathering Tools

Many experienced researchers use different data gathering tools to get real information to answer the study questions. Using different types of tools for gathering data helps to get sufficient data for the problem on the study. Supporting this idea, John (1999) states that employing multiple methods of data collection helps the researcher to combine the strength and amend some of the inadequacies when only single method is used independently. Therefore, the researcher used three data gathering instruments in this study. These are questionnaire, interviews and documents analysis.

#### 3.5.1. Questionnaire

The researcher used questionnaire as it is the most important method to collect quantitative data from the respondents in survey research. Koul (1996) suggested that questionnaire is widely used in educational research to obtain information about certain conditions and practices and to inquire into opinions and attitudes of individuals and groups. It allows individual adequate time and privacy to complete the responses and it is easy to administer. The scoring of each scale varied from 1 to 5 with Likert scale. The items in the questionnaire were divided into two main sections: The first section was about biographic information of the respondents which includes age, sex, education level and position; the second section was the five rating scales strongly disagree, disagree, undecided, agree and strongly agree and items were prepared to answer the study questions. The questionnaire was designed to gather relevant data from the respondents, that is, student councils, principals and department heads.

### **Pilot test**

The validity of an instrument refers to how well an instrument measures the particular concept. Checking the validity of data collecting before providing for the actual study subject is the core to assure the quality of the data (Yalew, 1998).

Testing the reliability of the questionnaire using a pilot test was carried out. Reliability indicates the accuracy or precision of the measuring instrument (Norland, 1990). The pilot test seeks to answer the questions, does the questionnaire consistently measured what it intended to measure. The items in questionnaire were tested on school which was selected for pilot test. The questionnaire was distributed, first to 5 students' council members, 1 school principal, 4 department heads, 12 teachers and 1 PTA head from Adami Tullu secondary school. Since Adami Tullu secondary school is one of East Shoa Zone government secondary schools' and not included in the main study as sample; it is valuable to test the questionnaire. In pre-testing the questionnaire, the main concern was to detect and correct problems which might cause confusion to the respondents.

It is also useful to improve the format of the questionnaire to be clear. The pilot survey was used to determine whether the words in each question were properly understood. The designed questionnaire was distributed for respondents in pilot test. Data collected from the respondents was analyzed using SPSS that provides information, reliability coefficient (alpha). A

reliability coefficient (alpha) of 0.70 or higher is considered as acceptable reliability. However, the output result of SPSS was indicating the following Cronbach's alpha coefficient for each item.

Reliability statistics			
No	Variables	No of items	Cronbach's Alpha
1	Current practice of decision making on resource management	7	.769
2	Perception of stakeholders towards the decision making practices on resource management	5	.873
3	Stakeholders' participation in decision making on resource management	3	.807
4	Major factors that affect decision making practices in resource management	8	.828
Average of Reliability coefficient			.776

Therefore, the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was obtained to check for internal consistency for each item was from the low 0.769 to 0.873 the higher point of Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient and for all items 0.776 Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient which was considered high. As shown in the above table, Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for all items was 0.776. Hence, the questionnaire items were considered to be consistent.

### 3.5.2. Interview guide

Quantitative form of questionnaire is insufficient to provide necessary information about decision making on resource management in secondary school. As a result, the researcher used interview to supplement data obtained from the questionnaire. Interview was conducted verbally through face to face interaction between the researcher and the respondents, PTA chair persons. The interview permits more in-depth examination in which the interviewer capture perception, opinions, and experience of interviewees (Moser, 2007). The interview was prepared for 10 PTA Chair persons.

### 3.5.3. Document Analysis

The researcher analyzed different documents such as, education resource registration books; minutes of meeting in the school resources, schools records and documents that show decisions made in relation to education resource in the secondary schools.

### 3.6. Procedures of Data Collection

The tools used for gathering data were designed on the basis of review of related literature and basic research questions. To make the study successful, the researcher made face to face contact with school principals to establish rapport, introduce the purpose of the study, and to secure cooperation for collecting data using the tool. Next, the researcher distributed the questionnaires for the respondents selected for the study with the help of school principals and other volunteers. To avoid barriers of understandings regarding to PTA committee head the researcher himself interviewed them. The researcher collected the questionnaire from the department heads, student's councils and principals. The document analysis was analyzed by narrative.

### 3.7. Method of Data Analysis

Data obtained from principals, department heads and student council members through questionnaire was analyzed using quantitative data analysis while the data gathered from PTA chairpersons through interview were analyzed qualitatively and data gathered through document analysis was analyzed using qualitative method. The data which were collected through close ended questionnaires were tabulated. The interpretations were made using mean and comparing ANOVA. The items were classified into different tables in line with the basic questions. Each of the items were analyzed and interpreted. The data obtained through structured and unstructured interviews was transcribed, organized and discussed. The qualitative data was analyzed using narrative. The data gathered through questionnaire was analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 for windows. The interpretations were made using five point likert scale measurements based on the following mean score results: 1, 1.00 -1.49 = strongly disagree/ Verylow 2, 1.50–2.49 = Disagree/Low 3, 2.50 –3.49 = undecided/ Average /medium, 4, 3.50 – 4.49 = Agree /High 5, 4.50 – 5.00 = strongly agree/Very high

### **3.5. Ethical Considerations**

The researcher informed the respondents about the purpose of the study. Additionally, they were informed that their participation in the study would be based on their interest and agreement. The research did not personalize any of the respondent's response during data presentation, analysis and interpretation. According to Best and Khan (1999) involving participant work is important considering the ethical principles lay down to protect them. To make the research process professional, ethical consideration will be made. Furthermore, the information was used for other purposes other than the research purpose in education.

## 4. DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This section focuses on the presentation and analysis of data collected from East Shoa governmental secondary schools on practices and challenges of decision making in resource management. The data was collected through questionnaire, interview and document analysis. This chapter is divided in to two parts. The first part discusses the characteristics of the respondents while the second part deals with the analysis of the findings in line with the research questions.

### 4.1. General Characteristics of Respondents

The respondents for this study were selected from ten (10) governmental secondary school in East Shoa zone. A total of 100 respondents the questionnaires were distributed and 100 (100%) were returned. Of these respondents, 10 (10%) were principals, 40 (40%) department heads, 50(50%) students council. Concerning interview 10 (10%) PTA representative were also interviewed.

**Table 2: Background of the Respondents**

No	Variable	Principals		Dep't Head		Students council		Total		
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
1	Sex	Male	10	100%	28	70%	34	68%	72	72%
		Female	-	-	12	30%	16	32%	28	28%
2	Age	20 and below	-	-	-	-	46	92%	46	46%
		21-30	7	70%	24	60%	4	8%	35	35%
		31-40	2	20%	14	35%	-	-	16	16%
3	Education level	41 and above	1	10%	2	5%	-	-	3	3%
		Grade 9-10	-	-	-	-	50	50%	50	50%
4	Current position	BA/BSc/	10	10%	40	40%	-	-	50	50%
			10	10%	40	40%	50	50%	100	100%

All the respondents, that is 100 respondents who were expected or designed to be included in the study filled and returned the questionnaire. Their demographic characteristic of the



respondents is indicated in table 2 above. As indicated in table 2, all principals 10 (100%) from sample schools were males. Similarly, 28 (70%) department heads were males and 12 (30%) of department heads were females. 34 (68%) student's councils were males and 16 (32%) of student's councils were females. This shows that school principals, department heads and school student's council members are almost all in all males. In school position issue female representation is very low as compared with male and females have skill to manage resources efficiently. Therefore females should be promoted to top managerial position in order to make sound decision for resource management.

Concerning the age of respondents, 46 (92%) of students council members were below 20 years of age. 4 (8%) of students council were between 21-30 years of age. 7 (70%) of school principals have age of 21-30 years, 2 (20%) of school principals have age of 31-40 years and 1 (10%) of school principal has age above 41 years. 24 (60%) of department heads have an age of 21-30 years. 14 (35%) department head were between 31-40 years of age and 2 (5%) of them were 41 and above years of age. In general, the age of respondents, is between 20 and 40 years of age. In most schools principals' age lied between 21 to 30 years as a result principals lack experience therefore they were unable to make participatory decision making on resource management. This shows that the age of respondents composed of different age groups enable to understand the decision making in resource management of secondary school in general.

Regarding to educational level of respondents, the study revealed that all the school principals 10 (100%) were first degree holders. Similarly 40 (100%) department heads were first degree and 50 (100%) student's council were grade 9-10. This indicated that, there were no leaders those have MA in general and qualified in EdPM/school leadership to make participatory decision and manage skill fully school resources.

#### **4.2. The current Practices of decision making on resource management**

Regarding the practice of decision making on resource management, questionnaires were distributed to ten (10) East Shoa government secondary schools and all of them (100%) were returned. Of these respondents, 10 (10%) were school principals, 40 (100%) were department heads, and 50 (100%) were students council members. In addition, 10 (100%) PTA representatives were interviewed. An assessment of school-based decision making was assessed below in two sections. For the purpose of analysis respondents response on the items

are presented on a five point Likert scale: from Strongly Agree, 5, to Strongly Disagree, 1. As shown below, the Average mean values was interpreted as: mean 1.0-1.49, Strongly Disagree, 1.50-2.49, Disagree, 2.50-3.49, medium, 3.50-4.49, Agree and >4.50, Strongly Agree in decision making activities.

Table 3. The current Practices of decision making on resource management

No	Item	Respondents	N	Mean	Df	ANOVA	
1.1	There is a participatory decision making process on school resource management	Principal	10	2.10		F-Value	Sig.
		dep't heads	40	1.88	2		
		Students council	50	2.02	97		
		Total	100	1.97	99		
1.2	There is a clear procedure by which decisions on school resource management is made.	Principal	10	1.90	2	.242	.785
		dep't heads	40	1.75	97		
		students council	50	1.74	99		
		Total	100	1.76	99		
1.3	The School makes transparent decisions on resource management	Principal	10	2.10	2	1.064	.349
		dep't heads	40	1.75	97		
		students council	50	1.84	99		
		Total	100	1.83	99		
1.4	The school gives awareness creating training for stakeholders on resource management	Principal	10	2.10	2	.721	.489
		dep't heads	40	1.88	97		
		students council	50	1.86	99		
		Total	100	1.89	99		
1.5	The school effectively utilizes resources	Principal	10	2.20	2	1.223	.299
		dep't heads	40	1.95	97		
		students council	50	1.96	99		
		Total	100	1.98	99		
1.6	School leaders facilitate collaborative decision making process on resource management in school	Principal	10	2.30		1.261	.288
		dep't heads	40	1.88	2		
		students council	50	1.88	97		
		Total	100	1.92	99		
1.7	The school leaders are very knowledgeable on how to utilize school resources	Principal	10	2.10		.139	.870
		dep't heads	40	2.00	2		
		students council	50	2.02	97		
		Total	100	2.02	99		

*N=100, significant at  $\alpha=0.05$ , Df between 2 and 97 for principals, department head, student council.*

*Grand Mean =1.91*

As shown in item 1 of table 2, the respondents were asked whether there is participatory decision making process on school resource management. The school principals, department heads and student council members response mean point was 2.10, 1.86 and 2.02 respectively.

The average mean scores of all respondents to this item is 1.97 that lies between 1.5 -2.49 (disagree). This implies that, there is low participatory decision making process on schools resource management. Moreover, the comparison of mean at ANOVA value  $F(2, 97)$  ( $\alpha=0.05=0.927$ ) showed, there is no statistically significance difference between the three groups of respondents' as  $p=0.399$  that is  $>0.05$ . This implied that, all groups have the view that there was less participatory decision making process on school resource management.

Most of PTA representative in interview responded that:

*In our school most of the time school principal calling meeting for the sample to sign on the agenda without discussing with members decisions made.*

Therefore from the above data researcher can concluded that school principals were not encouraging all stakeholders in decision making and lack of follow up the implementation of decision making procedure.

The document analysis was confirming this idea that minutes of meeting during the decision making process documented in the school. It was observable that members or stake holders who responsible for the decision making in resource management activities in school was not fully involved. Only a few individuals were made decision. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that, participatory decision making process on school resource management was very low.

However, Jackson (2000) points out that principals need “continually and increasingly to involve staff in collective decision-making” as key aspects of their job, and he emphasizes the importance of consultation, collective decision-making and delegated responsibility. The result indicates that the practice in schools does not meet what in the literature shows.

Concerning item 2 of table 2, the respondents were asked to rate the item which states “There is a clear procedure by which decisions on school resource management is made”. In relation to this, the School principals, department heads and student council members' response mean point was 1.90, 1.75 and 1.74 respectively. The average mean of the respondents was 1.76 and it falls between 1.5-2.49 which means disagree. This indicates that the average mean is below the average. This shows that, there was lack of following procedure by which decisions on

school resource management is made. On the other hand, the ANOVA test result  $F(2, 97) \alpha = 0.05 = 0.242$  indicates that the observed result is less than the standard table value which shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the three groups of respondents' as  $p \text{ value} = 0.785$  is  $> 0.05$ . This implies that, there is agreement among the groups that there was unsatisfactory procedure by which decisions on school resource management is made.

Walker (2007), argue this ideas, when everyone in an organization participates in the decision-making process, organizational communication is much more effective and everyone produces more efficient results by sharing decision making with other employees, participants eventually achieve organization objectives that influence them. Therefore, there was unclear procedure by which decisions on school resource management was made.

As shown in item 3 of table 2, respondents were asked that to rate the item which states "the School makes transparent decisions on resource management" school principals, department heads and student council members response mean point was 2.10, 1.75 and 1.84 respectively. The average mean for this item was 1.83 and it falls between 1.5-2.49 which means disagree. This indicates that the level of transparency of practice of decision making on school resource management falls at disagree. This means that the schools lack transparent decisions making on resource management. Beside this, one way ANOVA was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on ideas. One way ANOVA test result  $F(2, 97)$  at  $\alpha = 0.05 = 1.064$  and  $p \text{ value} = 0.349$  is  $> 0.05$ . This shows, there is no statistically significant difference between the three groups of respondents'. These practices showed that there was great problem in schools regarding decision making in resource management activities.

In item 4 of table 2 the respondents were asked to rate the item which states the " school gives awareness creation training for stakeholders on resource management" School principals, department heads and student council members response mean point was 2.10, 1.88 and 1.86 respectively. The average mean of the respondents was 1.89 and it falls between 1.5- 2.49. This shows that respondents disagree about the issue raised on the awareness creation training given to the staff. In other words, there is low awareness creation training given to the staff. To strengthen the above result, the result of one way ANOVA was  $F(2, 97)$  at  $\alpha = 0.05 =$

0.721) which is less than the standards that indicates there is no statistically significant difference between respondents. The p-value = 0.489 is  $> 0.05$ . This showed that, the school gives little awareness creation training for stakeholders on resource management.

In item 5 of table 2 the respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on if the school effectively utilize resources. Accordingly, the principals, department heads and student council members' response mean was 2.20, 1.95 and 1.96 respectively. The average mean of the respondents was 1.98 and it falls between 1.5-2.49. One way ANOVA test was applied to check if all respondents expressed their opinion on the issue. The ANOVA result  $F(2, 97), \alpha = 0.05 = 1.223$  and p-value 0.299 is  $> 0.05$ . This shows that there is agreement among the three groups of respondents that the school resource utilization effectiveness is in serious problem.

As observed in document analysis in most of schools there was little utilization of resources. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the current practices of decision making on resource management had given less attention.

Accordingly, (MOE, 2003), the utilization of resources in teaching brings about fruitful learning since it stimulates students sense as well as motivating them. On the other hand educational effectiveness is "concerned with whether or not a specific set of resources has positive effect on achievement and if so how large this effect is". Clearly, since effectiveness does not directly compare resource uses or costs, what is effective is not necessarily what is most efficient (Husen & Postlewait, 1994). However, utilization of resources in school is less life-threatening as well as the school property was found to be less-preval.

In item 6 of table 2, the respondents were asked "School leaders facilitate collaborative decision making process on resource management in school." School principals, department heads and student council members response mean point was 2.30, 1.88 and 1.88 respectively. The average mean for this item was 1.92 and it is found in between 1.5 -2.49. This shows that respondents disagree about the issue raised on the school leaders facilitate collaborative decision making process on resource management in school. One way ANOVA test was applied to see if all respondents expressed the same opinion on the idea. The ANOVA result  $F(2, 97)$  at  $\alpha = 0.05 = 1.261$  is less than the standard value of F and the p-value 0.288  $> 0.05$ . This showed that there is no statistically significant difference among the three groups of the

respondents. This indicated that there was a poor practice of school leaders in facilitating collaborative decision making process on school resource management.

As pointed out by Newsrom, and Pierce, (1990) the question of decision making by individuals or involving other should not be determined by leader personal preference, but by the nature of the problem and the situation. Group decision–making is sometime referred to by other terminologies: participative decision – making, collective judgment management or plural management (McEwan, 1997). However, there was poor practice of school leaders to encourage collaborative decision making process in resource management in all sampled schools.

In item 7 of table 2, the respondents were asked to rate the degree of their agreement on school leaders' knowledgeable on how to utilize school resources. Accordingly, school principals, department heads and student council members response mean point was 2.10, 2.00 and 2.02 respectively. The average mean for this item was 2.02 it is founded between 1.5-2.49. One way ANOVA test was applied to check whether all groups of the respondents equally expressed their opinion on the idea. The ANOVA result  $F(2, 97)$  at  $\alpha = 0.05$  is  $= 0.139$  and the  $p$ -value  $= 0.119$  is  $> 0.05$ . There are no statistically significant differences among the three groups of the respondents. This indicated that the sampled schools' leaders are not knowledgeable enough to effectively utilize school resources.

Principals are required to lead the whole school community by facilitating participation and collaboration among stakeholders in decision-making, planning and budgeting, their leadership skills and capacities are critical (Cranston 2001; Jackson 2000; Williams and Port in 1997). However, the school leaders lack enough knowledge to effectively utilize school resources.

### **4.3. Perception of stakeholders towards the decision-making practice**

Regarding to the perception of stakeholders towards the decision making practices of secondary schools of East shoa zone of oromia region 5 items were distributed for respondents to answer them, in order to identify the present opinion of stakeholders on school resource management activities. The respondents response on the items presented to respondents to be

rated on a five point Likert scale: from Strongly Agree, 5, to Strongly Disagree, 1. As shown below, the average mean values are interpreted as: mean 1.0-1.49, Strongly Disagree, 1.50-2.49, Disagree, 2.50-3.49, medium, 3.50-4.49, Agree and >4.50, Strongly Agree on the perception of stakeholders towards the decision making practices in resource management in secondary schools.

Table 4. Perception of stakeholders towards the decision-making practice

No	Items	Respondents	N	Mean	Df	ANOVA	
						F-value	Sig.
2.1	People in the school have good attitude on decisions made by the school	Principal	10	2.40	2 97 99	.320	.727
		dep't heads	40	2.20			
		students council	50	2.18			
		Total	100	2.21			
2.2	Various types of decisions made in school are undertaken timely	Principal	10	1.80	2 97 99	.336	.716
		dep't heads	40	1.85			
		students council	50	1.98			
		Total	100	1.91			
2.3	The school make believable decision on resource management	Principal	10	2.10	2 97 99	.069	.933
		dep't heads	40	2.10			
		students council	50	2.16			
		Total	100	2.13			
2.4	Most decisions made in the school are acceptable	Principal	10	2.20	2 97 99	.100	.905
		dep't heads	40	2.25			
		students council	50	2.30			
		Total	100	2.27			
2.5	In most case decisions-made in school are based on actual information	Principal	10	2.40	2 97 99	.549	.579
		dep't heads	40	2.10			
		students council	50	2.26			
		Total	100	2.21			

\*N=100, significant at alpha level 0.05, Df between 2 and 97 for principals, department head, student council. Grand Mean =2.15

As shown in item 1 of table 3, the respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on whether people in the school have good attitude towards the decisions made by the school. School principals, department heads and student council members response mean value was 2.40, 2.20 and 2.18 respectively. The average mean for this item was 2.21. The average mean of the respondents was 2.21 and it falls between 1.5-2.49. One way ANOVA test was

applied to check whether all groups of the respondents equally expressed their opinion on the idea. The ANOVA result  $F(2, 97)$  at  $\alpha = 0.05$  is  $= 0.320$  and the p-value  $0.727$  is  $>0.05$ . There are no statistically significant differences among the three groups of the respondents. This means that the respondents disagreed on the issue. This indicated that people in the school have negative attitude towards decisions made by school.

In item 2 of table 3, the respondents were asked to show their degree of agreement on if various types of decisions made in school are undertaken timely. School principals, department heads and student council members response mean value was 1.80, 1.85 and 1.98 respectively. The average mean for this item was 1.91 and it was in between 1.5-2.49. One way ANOVA test was applied to check whether all groups of the respondents equally expressed their opinion on the idea. The ANOVA result  $F(2, 97)$  at  $\alpha = 0.05$  is  $= 0.336$  and the p  $0.716$  is  $> 0.05$ . There are no statistically significant differences among the three groups of the respondents. This indicated that the respondents disagree on the issue. This shows that the decisions made on the school resource was improper.

To support the above idea, through interview, some PTA representatives confirmed that there was lack of immediate decision making by schools on school resource. They said that the schools were too late to give fair and timely decision on school resource issue. On other hand, from document analysis, it was assured that the decisions made on resource management were unable to manage timely.

As shown in item 3 of table 3, the respondents were asked to rate their agreement on if schools make believable decision on resource management. School principals, department heads and student council members response mean value was 2.10, 2.10 and 2.16 respectively. The average mean of the respondents was 2.13 and it fall between 1.5-2.49 and it was rated below the average. One way ANOVA test was applied to check whether all groups of the respondents equally expressed their opinion on the idea. The ANOVA result  $F(2, 97)$  at  $\alpha = 0.05$  is  $= 0.069$  and the p  $0.933$  is  $> 0.05$ . There are no statistically significant differences among the three groups of the respondents. It indicated that the decision made by the school concerning resource management was unbelievable.



As argued by McEwan (1997), group decision can bring more resource to many decisions than a single individual. Different people bring a variety of information, ideas, and viewpoints. Moreover, group decision helps to facilitate the identification of creative and innovative solution to the problems through participating staff members. However, what was practically acted in schools are far apart different from this. Most decisions made on resource management in the school were less participatory to that school principals make group decision on every issue of the school rarely.

As shown in item 4 of table 3, the respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on whether most decisions made by the school are acceptable. The School principals, department heads and student council members response mean value was 2.20, 2.25 and 2.30 respectively. The majority of the respondents expressed their disagreement on the idea. The average mean of the respondents was 2.27 and it is found between 1.5-2.49 below the average. One way ANOVA test was applied to check if all groups of the respondents equally expressed their opinion on the idea. The ANOVA result  $F(2, 97)$  at  $\alpha = 0.05$  is  $= 0.100$  and the  $p$  0.905 is  $> 0.05$ . There are no statistically significant differences among the three groups of the respondents. This indicated that most school decisions made by school leaders on resource management were unsatisfactory by stakeholders. This also showed that there is agreement among the three groups of respondents that the most decisions made by the school are unacceptable.

To support the above idea, interview was conducted with PTA chair persons. Accordingly, most of the PTA chairpersons from the sampled schools said that since they rarely participate on decisions making process in school resource management, they unbelievably accept schools' decisions. This indicated that there was less participation of stakeholders in decision making process in school resource management.

In line with this, Ayalew (2003) write that acceptance in decision making is much more important than the quality of the decision to gain the intended objectives. That is if people participate in making a decision; they tend to be more committed to the decision and more motivated to put the decision in to action so that what are wanted will be achieved. However, what was practically acted in schools are far apart different from this. Most decisions made in the school most of the time facilitated by school leaders.

As shown in item 5 of table 3, the respondents were asked to show their degree of agreement on whether decisions-made in school are based on actual information. School principals, department heads and student council members response mean value was 2.40, 2.10 and 2.26 respectively. All the respondents' response averages mean is 2.21 and its falls between 1.5-2.49. This indicated the disagreement of the respondents on the idea. One way ANOVA test was applied to check whether all groups of the respondents equally expressed their opinion on the idea. The ANOVA result  $F(2, 97)$  at  $\alpha = 0.05$  is  $= 0.549$  and the  $p = 0.579$  is  $> 0.05$ . There are no statistically significant differences among the three groups of the respondents. This showed that in most case decisions-made in school were without actual information.

Adane et al. (2002) state that schools principals no longer makes decision on their own. That is because they need information and advice from several sources especially teachers and pupils to act rationally. However, in practice the Schools do not use actual information to make decisions on resource management. Therefore, it is possible to sum up those in sampled secondary schools stakeholders negatively perceived decision making practices made on resource management.

#### **4.4. The extent of stakeholders' participation in decision making on resource management**

Regarding to the extent of stakeholders' participation in decisions making on resource management of secondary schools of East shoa zone of oromia region 3 items were distributed for respondents to answer them, in order to identify the present opinion of stakeholders on school resource management activities. The respondents asked to rate as very low (1.00-1.49), low (1.50-2.49), medium (2.50-3.49), high (3.50-4.49) and very high  $\geq 4.50$ .

Table5: The extent of stakeholders' participation in decision making on resource management

No	Item	Respondents	N	Mean	ANOVA		
					Df	F-value	Sig.
3.1	The extent of stakeholders' involvement in decision-making process	Principal	10	1.80	2 97 99	.931	.398
		dep't heads	40	1.75			
		students council	50	1.98			
		Total	100	1.87			
3.2	The degree of stakeholders knowledge on decision making guide line	Principal	10	1.80	2 97 99	1.200	.450
		dep't heads	40	2.08			
		students council	50	2.30			
		Total	100	2.16			
3.3	The extent of school transparency in decision making in resource management	Principal	10	1.90	2 97 99	1.085	.342
		dep't heads	40	2.00			
		students council	50	2.18			
		Total	100	2.08			

*\*N=100, significant at alpha level 0.05, Df between 2 and 97 for principals, department head, student council. Grand Mean=2.03*

As shown in item 1 of table 4, the respondents were asked about the extent of stakeholders' involvement in decision-making process. School principals, department heads and student council members response mean value was 1.80, 1.75 and 1.98 respectively. The average mean of the respondents to this item was 1.87 and it fall between 1.5 -2.49 which is translated as low. One way ANOVA test was applied to check if all groups of the respondents equally expressed their opinion on the idea. The ANOVA result F (2, 97) at  $\alpha = 0.05$  is = 0.931 and the p 0.398 is  $> 0.05$ . There are no statistically significant differences among the three groups of the respondents. This implies that the extent of stakeholders' involvement in decision-making process on resource management was rated below the average.

Concerning this idea Mullins (2005) sited that staff participation in decision making leads to higher performance and which is necessary for survival in an increasingly competitive world. Conley (1991) argues that worker participation is the best way to increase the productivity and

efficiency of an organization. However, in practice school leaders less involved stakeholders in decision making process of resource management.

Concerning item 2 of table 4, the respondents were asked the degree of stakeholder's knowledge on decision making guideline. School principals, department heads and student council members response mean value was 1.80, 2.08 and 2.30 respectively. The average mean for this item was 2.16 it and found between 1.5-2.49 translated as low and below the average. One way ANOVA test was applied to check whether all groups of the respondents equally expressed their opinion on the idea. The ANOVA result  $F(2, 97)$  at  $\alpha = 0.05$  is  $= 1.200$  and the  $p$  value  $0.450$  is  $> 0.05$ . This implies that there was statistically significance difference between the three groups of respondents. This showed that the degree of stakeholders' knowledge on decision making guideline was low.

Through interview, most PTA representatives confirmed that they have low awareness on guide line of decision making on resource management. They said that they were unaware of their roles on how to monitor, manage and make decisions on school resources.

As shown in item 3 of table 4, respondents were asked that "the extent of school transparency in decision making on school resource management". School principals, department heads and student council members response mean value was 1.90, 2.00 and 2.18 respectively. The average mean for this item was 2.08 it falls between 1.5-2.49 represents as low and below average. One way ANOVA test was applied to check whether all groups of the respondents equally expressed their opinion on the idea. The ANOVA result  $F(2, 97)$  at  $\alpha = 0.05$  is  $= 1.085$  and the  $p$  value  $0.342$  is  $> 0.05$  which shows, there is no statistically significant difference between the three groups of respondents. This indicates that the extent of school transparency in decision making in school resource management is low.

#### **4.5. Major Factors that affect decision making in resource management in the school**

For the purpose of this study, identifying the major factors related to school leaders' functions, was also very helpful to make analysis of major factors that may hinder school leaders. Hence, the respondents were asked to rate some pre-designed or identified factors for this study that may hinder the activities of decision making in resource management for school

leaders. For analysis purpose, the table below shows the average mean values were interpreted as: mean 1.0-1.49, Strongly Disagree, 1.50-2.49, Disagree, 2.50-3.49, medium, 3.50-4.49, Agree and >4.50, Strongly Agree for factors mostly hinders school stakeholders decision making practices.

Table 6: Major Factors that affect decision making in resource management in the school

No.	Item	Respondents	N	Mean	Df	ANOVA	
						F-value	Sig.
4.1	Lack of vision	Principal	10	3.90	2 97 99	.024	.976
		dep't heads	40	3.90			
		students council	50	3.94			
		Total	100	3.92			
4.2	Lack of transparency	Principal	10	3.70	2 97 99	.159	.853
		dep't heads	40	3.85			
		students council	50	3.76			
		Total	100	3.79			
4.3	Lack of clear guide line in school	Principal	10	3.90	2 97 99	.132	.876
		dep't heads	40	4.10			
		students council	50	4.06			
		Total	100	4.06			
4.4	Lack of stakeholders' participation	Principal	10	3.80	2 97 99	.893	.413
		dep't heads	40	3.93			
		students council	50	4.00			
		Total	100	3.95			
4.5	Lack of leaders' knowledge and awareness on school policy	Principal	10	4.30	2 97 99	.069	.933
		dep't heads	40	4.30			
		students council	50	4.26			
		Total	100	4.28			
4.6	Lack of self-confidence	Principal	10	3.80	2 97 99	.270	.764
		dep't heads	40	3.90			
		students council	50	3.96			
		Total	100	3.92			
4.7	Shortage of resources	Principal	10	4.00	2 97 99	.556	.575
		dep't heads	40	4.03			
		students council	50	4.12			
		Total	100	4.07			
4.8	Interference of political authorities	Principal	10	4.40	2 97 99	.540	.585
		dep't heads	40	4.18			
		students council	50	4.24			
		Total	100	4.23			

\*N=100, significant at alpha level 0.05, Df between 2 and 97 for principals, department head, student council. Grand mean =3.95

According to table 5 above, in item 1 respondents were asked whether or not that “Lack of vision” was the major factor that hinders school leaders’ decision making in resource management activities. School principals, department heads and student council members response mean value was 3.90, 3.90 and 3.94 respectively. The average mean value for respondents was 3.92 and it fall between 3.50-4.50 and represents as high. One way ANOVA test was applied to check whether all groups of the respondents equally expressed their opinion on the idea. The ANOVA result  $F(2, 97)$  at  $\alpha = 0.05$  is  $=0.024$  and the p value  $0.976$  is  $> 0.05$ . This indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between groups. This shows that there is agreement among the groups that there is lack of vision beside of school leaders and stakeholders.

However, from the literature review Cheng (2005) defined vision as an image of a future that the school stakeholders want to achieve or care about. This tells us that, an agreeable vision is a stimulant to work hard towards the desired common goals. So, it is observable from the result that key necessary issue was missed at school. The respondents agree about the lack of vision means there is lack of vision beside stakeholders and school leaders. Therefore, the absence of or lack of vision is serious problem to be improved.

Concerning item 2 of table 5, the respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on if there was lack of transparency of school leaders in decision making on school resource. School principals, department heads and student council members response mean value was 3.70, 3.85 and 3.76 respectively. The Average mean of respondents was 3.79 and it falls between (3.50- 4.49). One way ANOVA test was applied to check whether all groups of the respondents equally expressed their opinion on the idea. The ANOVA result  $F(2, 97)$  at  $\alpha = 0.05$  is  $=0.159$  and the p value  $0.853$  is  $> 0.05$ . This indicated that there is no statistically significant difference among the three groups and this shows that stakeholders agreed on the lack of transparency on school decision making in resource management.

According to De Grauwe (2011), the involvement of parents, teachers, local councilors and education officials in school management can help to promote decision-making at school level, which improves the quality of schooling and students’ achievement. However, the implementation of decision-making through the full participation of parents and communities entails challenges. When compared with teachers principals and community groups do not

focus on education matters and this often creates conflict (Naidoo, 2005). Therefore, doing alone in decision making in resource management in the school create lack of transparency.

Item 3 of table 5, stakeholders were asked to rate their degree of agreement whether or not there was lack of clear guideline in school on which decisions are made. School principals, department heads and student council members response mean value was 3.90, 4.10 and 4.06 respectively. The average mean value of the respondents was 4.06 and it falls between 3.50 - 4.49. One way ANOVA test was applied to check if all groups of the respondents equally expressed their opinion on the idea. The ANOVA result of  $F(2, 97)$  at  $\alpha=0.05=0.132$  is less than the standard table value of  $F(3.10)$  at  $df(2, 97)$  and  $p$  value =  $0.876 > 0.05$ . This indicates that there is no statistically significant difference among the three groups. This showed that there was lack of clear guideline for decision making on resource management in school.

In interview the PTA chair persons were asked if they have clear information and knowledge on guide line of decision making. Accordingly, most of the PTA chairpersons expressed that they did not have any information and awareness on guide line of decision making. They complained that they need to have trainings on the issue. This indicated that the PTA members were not transparently informed or told about the issue of guide lines of decision making on school resource.

However, Alvani (2001), personal experience of people who are going to make decisions can be useful as one of information sources in making decisions; but whenever these experiences are used as the only guide and basis for making decisions, it cannot guarantee a successful outcome. As general, this indicated that there was lack of clear guide line to make acceptable decisions in school

As shown in items 4 of table 5, the respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on if there was lack of stakeholders' participation on decision making process. School principals, department heads and student council members response mean value was 3.80, 3.93 and 4.00 respectively. The average mean of the respondents was 3.95 fall between 3.5- 4.49. One way ANOVA test was applied to check whether all groups of the respondents equally expressed their opinion on the idea. The ANOVA result of  $F(2, 97)$  at  $\alpha=0.05=0.893$

is less than the standard table value of F (3.10) at df (2, 97) and  $\rho$  value = 0.413 > 0.05. This indicates that there is no statistically significant difference among the three groups. This shows that stakeholders agreed on the lack of participation in school decision making on resource management. This indicated that the participation of stakeholders in decision making of resource management had its own draw back in the sampled schools.

To support the above idea, interview was conducted with PTA chair persons. Accordingly, most of the PTA chairpersons from the sampled school said that they rarely participate on decisions making process in school resource management. They complained that any concerned part should think of the issue. They confirmed that the PTA members were only required to approve the plans prepared by school principals.

However, in contrast of this Wilkinson (1999), assumed that participative decision making is likely to lead to job satisfaction and better quality decisions and those gains are available both to employers and workers. In general, the result of the study showed that there was lack of stakeholders' participation on decision making process concerning resource management.

In item 5 of table 5, the respondents were asked about whether leaders lacked knowledge and awareness on school policy. School principals, department heads and student council members response mean value was 4.30, 4.30 and 4.26 respectively. The average mean of the respondents was 4.28 and it falls in between 3.5-4.49. One way ANOVA test was applied to check if all groups of the respondents equally expressed their opinion on the idea. The ANOVA result of F (2, 97) at  $\alpha=0.05=0.069$  is less than the standard table value of F (3.10) at df (2, 97) and  $\rho$  value = 0.933 > 0.05. This indicated that there is no statistically significant difference among the groups and shows that school leaders lacked of knowledge and awareness on school policy.

Pashiards (1994) explains that increasing level of teacher participation in making decisions and extending their involvement in the overall decision making process makes school policy and management more responsive to societal needs. However, Wilkinson (1999) corroborated this fact and saw involvement of employees in decision making as empowerment while a neglect of employees in decision making was seen as an assumption that workers are untapped resources with knowledge and experience and an interest in becoming involved, employers



need to provide opportunities and structures for their involvement. So, the responses of stakeholders indicate that there was less knowledge and awareness school principals were a serious problem to be improved.

In item 6 of table 5, the respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on if there was lack of self-confidence to make decision on school resource. School principals, department heads and student council members response mean value was 3.80, 3.90 and 3.96 respectively. The average mean for this item was 3.92. The average mean of the respondents was 3.92 fall between 3.5-4.49. One way ANOVA test was applied to check whether all groups of the respondents equally expressed their opinion on the idea. The ANOVA result of F (2, 97) at  $\alpha=0.05=0.270$  is less than the standard table value of F (3.10) at df (2, 97) and  $p$  value =  $0.764 > 0.05$ . This indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between the three groups and the respondents agreed on that school leaders lacked of self-confidence to give decision on resource management. This indicated that school leaders lacked self confidence to decision making on resource management.

As shown in item 7 of table 5, the respondents were asked to rate their agreement on whether or not shortage of resources in school was a challenge for decision making process. School principals, department heads and student council members response mean value was 4.00, 4.03 and 4.12 respectively. The average mean of the respondents was 4.07 and it falls between 3.5-4.49. One way ANOVA test was applied to check if all groups of the respondents equally expressed their opinion on the idea. The ANOVA result of F (2, 97) at  $\alpha = 0.05$  is  $=0.556$  and the  $p$  value  $0.575$  is  $> 0.05$ . This indicates that there is no statistically significant difference among the three groups which shows that stakeholders agreed that there is a shortage of resources in school.

In support of the above items, during document analysis shortage of resources in the school on factors that inadequate facility due to lack of resources in the school. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that shortage of resource is one of factors that affect decision making in resources management in the school.

According to Ozogi (1997) the challenges which can influence the decision making in school resource management is the physical facility. Head teacher face challenges in decision making

and in managing resources in their schools due to lack of adequate physical facilities which is due to lack of funds. Therefore, the schools participated in this study were not out of the above mentioned constraints which is great problem to be improved.

Regarding to item 8 of table 5, the respondents were asked to rate their agreement on whether there was interference of political authorities during decision making in school. School principals, department heads and student council members response mean value was 4.40, 4.18 and 4.24 respectively. The average mean of the respondents was 4.23 and it falls in between 3.5-4.49. One way ANOVA test was applied to check whether all groups of the respondents equally expressed their opinion on the idea. The ANOVA result of  $F(2, 97)$  at  $\alpha=0.05$  = 0.540. This point is much less than the standard table value of  $F(3.10)$  at  $df(2, 97)$  and  $p$  value = 0.585 > 0.05. This indicates that there is no statistically significant difference among the three groups the respondents. This implied that Stakeholders are agreed that there was interference of political authorities in school decision making activities.

In line with this, according to Achoka (2003), political influence is the critical issue in decision making in school resource management. He explained the issue as follows: "Political influence is a thorny issue in schools as some politicians sometimes demand that head teachers in schools within their localities be of their choice. Such politicians hope to gain support from the influence of the head teachers". In the same way, there was the interference of political authority in decision making in sampled schools.

## 5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section deals with summary, conclusion and recommendations. In this section, first a summary of the study and the major findings are made. Second, conclusions of the fundamental findings are drawn. Lastly, some possible recommendations are made on the basis of the findings of the study.

### 5.1. Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the practices and challenges of decision making in resource management in secondary schools of East shoa Zone of Oromia Regional State, and to come up with remedial solutions in order to improve the current practices. The following basic questions were raised in the study:

1. What is the current practice of decision making on resource management in secondary schools of East Shoa Zone?
2. What is the perception of stakeholders towards the decision making practices on resource management in secondary schools of East Shoa Zone?
3. What is the extent of stakeholders' participation in decision making on resource management in secondary schools of East Shoa Zone?
4. What are the major factors that affect decision making practices in resource management in secondary schools of East Shoa Zone?

The sample size of the study was 10 principals, 40 department heads, 50 student council members' and 10 PTA representatives that were found in 10 secondary schools from 6 woredas of East Shoa Zone. The researcher used available sampling techniques for selecting respondents. Besides that, to achieve the objectives of the study, the data were gathered mainly through questionnaire, interview and document analysis. The questionnaire had been piloted before it was distributed to the respondents. Both quantitative and qualitative data obtained were analyzed by using mean and one way ANOVA. Based on the analysis of the data, the following findings were obtained from the study.

#### **A. The current practice of decision making on resource management**

In east shoa government secondary schools undertaken in this study the current practices identified in the above presentation was;

- The decision making process on school resource management in secondary schools were less participatory as its average mean of the respondents was 1.97. This indicated the participatory decision making was below the average.
- There were procedures lacks clarity indicated in school in resource management activities made as the average mean of the respondents was 1.76.
- There were a less transparency of schools on decision making in resource management as the average mean of the groups was 1.83.
- The awareness creating training for stakeholders on resource management in the school were rarely given as the average mean of the respondent's was 1.89.
- The effectiveness of school on utilizing resources was below the average. The average mean of the groups was in between 1.5-2.49(1.98).
- The school ladders insufficiently facilitate collaborative decision making process on resource management as the total average mean of the groups was 1.88.
- The knowledge of school leaders how to utilize school resource or on school resource utilization activities were inadequate as the average mean of the respondents was 2.02

In generally the total average of those all items was 1.91, its falls between 1.50-2.49 and the total average of the P- value was  $0.497 > 0.05$ . It means that there was problem on the current practice of decision making on resource management in selected schools.

#### **B. The perception of stakeholders towards the decision making practices on resource management.**

Based on the second objective the result obtained;

- The stakeholders in the school did not have positive attitude towards decisions made in the school as showed the average mean of the respondents (2.21).
- The perception of most schools stakeholders towards decision making practices on resource management was not timely in the school as the average mean was (1.91)
- Most decision made on resource management was not believable and acceptable by stakeholders because of less perception as the average mean was 2.13 and 2.27 respectively.

- The most schools unable to use actual information for decision made on resource management since principals were the only person who made decision as the average mean of the groups was 2.21.

Generally, the total average of those items was 2.15, it falls between 1.50-2.49 and the p-value  $0.772 > 0.05$ . This indicates that, there was low perception of stakeholders towards the decision making practices on resource management in selected schools

### **C. The extent of stakeholders' participation in decision making on resource management.**

In line with the third basic question of the study, the results obtained are presented as follows;

- There was low involvement of stakeholders in decision making process in resource management as the average mean of the respondents was (1.87).
- There was insufficient stakeholders' knowledge about decision making guideline of resource management as the average mean of the groups was (2.16).
- There was lacks transparency in decision making process in resource management in schools as the average mean of the respondents was 2.08.

Generally, the total average of those items was 2.03, its falls between 1.50-2.49 and the p-value  $0.396 > 0.05$ . This indicates that, there was low extent of stakeholders' participation in decision making on resource management.

### **D. The major factors that affect decision making practices in resource management**

From the analysis part the result obtained in line with the last basic question are the following:

- There is lack of vision among stakeholders and school leaders as the average mean the respondents were 3.92.
- There is lack of transparency in decision making process of resource management as the average mean of the groups was 3.79.
- There is lack of clear guideline in the school required for decision making in resource management as the average mean of the respondents was 4.06.
- There is lack of stakeholders' participation in decision making of resource management in school as the average mean of the respondents was 3.95.

- There is lack of leaders' knowledge and awareness on school policy related to decision making in resource management as the average of the respondents was 4.28.
- Leaders and stakeholders have lack of self-confidence in decision making process of resource management in the schools as the average mean of the respondents was 4.07.
- There are insufficient resources required for the daily school activities which had an impact on leader' decision making as the average mean of the groups was 4.23.

Generally, the total average of all items was 3.95, its falls between 3.50-4.49 and the p-value  $0.746 > 0.05$ . This showed that, major factors that affect decision making practices in resource management are mentioned in the selected schools.

## **5.2. Conclusions**

From all the results obtained from this study the following major conclusions were made;

Regarding practice of making decision on resource management of secondary schools were lacks participatory decision making, there were less involvement of stakeholders, lack of clear procedures on decision making, problem of transparency, less awareness training, in effective and inefficient resource utilization and skill gap of school leader on resource utilization were the major problems concluded under decision making on selected secondary school on resource management.

As presented in findings on perception of stakeholders towards the decision making practice on resource management is very low. The average mean score of the respondents lied below average. The researcher concluded that the attitude of stakeholders on resource management in most schools were negative, most decision made on resource management were less valued by stake holders, most schools decision making process on resource management were misinformed and unable to use actual information.

Regarding extent of stakeholders participation in decision making on resource management of selected secondary schools were low involvement of stakeholders, lack of knowledge on decision making guide line and lack of transparency on decision making process of resource management were identified in most schools. In addition communication between school and stakeholders were poor flow.

From the result, was found that there were several major factors that hinder school leaders' decision making practices. These include absence of vision, transparency, clear guideline, stakeholders' participation, leaders' knowledge and awareness on school policy, self-confidence, and sufficient resources and influence of political authorities that negatively affect quality decision making activities in secondary schools. Those mentioned factors are mainly decreases the quality of decisions made by school.

### **5.3. Recommendations**

Based on the findings of the study and the conclusions drawn, the following recommendations are made:

The school leaders, department heads, education offices should equalized the number of males and females' proportional, and encourage the appointment of females' in different position of schools leadership.

The school decision making practices in schools should involve teachers', parents', students, community members in school decision making.

School principals should not only support the instructional activities, but also create conducive environment to involve the stakeholders in ensuring effective and efficient decision making. And also develop appreciation for teamwork and participation.

School principal should exert maximum effort to sensitize, motivate, and encourage student council members. This can be done by encouraging students to participate fully in the management of schools by announcing student council members in occasions of social meetings and educational conferences.

School leaders create a team spirit among all stakeholders and positive work relationship between stakeholders by using clear and transparency to develop trust, motivation and shared vision among all actors in school.

School leaders are expected to be highly devoted for creating the opportunity to know what should be done in the school for the stakeholders'.

Decisions were made without sufficient and tangible information. Therefore, it is important to recommend that, decisions should be based on sufficient and tangible information and creating favorable environment with adequate evaluation.

Quality decision making process is the backbone for proper accomplishment of school activity. Therefore, school leaders and other stakeholders should make good decision with accountability, transparency and satisfy the needs of students, teachers, and leaders by itself and the community at large.

If stakeholders take more interest in schools the school leaders may be able to get support from stakeholders. Therefore, school leaders need to give clear orientation and awareness to encourage stakeholders.

It is advisable that stakeholders are clearly oriented and aware of what is going on in schools. Besides, it is expected to avoid making decision by school principals without making decision with committee.

It is advisable that school leaders use the scarce resources of the school economically and selectively for the prioritized activities.

It is also advisable that school leaders in collaboration with stakeholders encourage parents and community to develop willingness toward supporting schools through awareness creation, organizing school endowment funds, encouraging donations both in kind and in cash, preparing panel discussions, conducting education conferences quarterly.

The recommendation drawn for future research regarding decision making activities on school resource management is that, this study focused on the principals, department heads and student council members and PTA as school stakeholders. However, Secondary Schools have multiple stakeholders including WEO, ZEO, NGOs and private owners and the community at large to explore quality of decision making on resource management in secondary schools from different perspectives. Future researcher might consider exploring other stakeholders and large number of secondary schools and encouraged to conduct in a wider scope and to a more diverse extent to get clear image of decision making in resource management in the organizations.



## 6. REFERENCES

- Achoka, J. K. 2003. *Parents Involvement in Secondary School Management. The case of Busia and Uasin Gishu Districts in Kenya*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis Nairobi: Kenyatta University.
- Acker-Hocevar M, Touchton D. 1999. *A Model of Power as Social Relationships: Teacher Leaders Describe the Phenomena of Effective Agency in Practice. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada,*
- Adane Tessera, 2002. *School Organization and Management: Distance Education Material for In-Service Trainees Continuing and Distance Education Division*. AAU
- Afolabi, F. O. 2000. Preparation of teachers for effective implementation of secondary school curriculum in Ondo State. *Journal of Educational Research and Evaluation*, 4 (2): 48 – 56
- Aguokogbuo, C.N. 2003. Funding the UBE Programme in Nigeria: *The Nigeria Universal Basic Education Journal*, Vol. 2, and No.1. Faculty of Education, University of Nigeria Nsukka.
- Akpan, R. J. 2003. *School plant management in Nigeria*. Uyo: Original Publishing House.
- Alkin, K. 1992. *Encyclopedia of Educational Research* (6th ed). Encyclopedia Britannica. Vol. 4. Chicago.
- Amare, A. 1999. *Availability and Use of Instructional Materials in Tigray Primary and Equity*, University of Sussex. And Row Publishing and sons, Inc.
- Apodaca-Tucker, M. T., & Slate, J. R. 2002: *School-based management: views from public and private elementary school principals*. Retrieved 27, from [http:// epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n23.html](http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n23.html)
- Armstrong, M. 1990. *A hand book of human resource Management*. London: kaganpare Ltd.
- Asefa Abahumna. 1995. *Teachers' Participation in Decision –Making in the Technical and Vocational School of Ethiopia*: Unpublished Master's Thesis, A.A.U

- Awotua-Efebo EB .1999. *Effective Teaching Principles and Practice*. Port Harcourt, Pen Graphics.
- Bagin, Don and D.R. Gallagher.2001. *The School and Community Relations*. Seventh Edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Barth RS. 2001. Teacher leader. *Phi Delta Kappan*.
- Best, J. W. & Kahn, J. V. (2003). *Research in education* (9thEd.). USA: Pearson Education, Inc
- Blase J, Blase J .2000. Principals' perspectives on shared governance leadership. *Journal Of School Leadership*, 10(1), 9-39.
- Brain, Reid. 2003. Constructing parental involvement in an Education Action Zone: *Whose need is it meeting?* Educational Studies. 29(2 and 3), 292-305.
- Bush T, Heystek J 2003a. *School governance in South Africa.Compare*,33(2),127–138.
- Bush, T. &Oduro, K.T.2006. New principals in Africa: preparation, introduce a practice: *Journal of Educational Administration*. 44 (4), 359 – 375.
- Cheatle, Kevin .2001. *Mastering Human Resource Management*. Hound mills: Palgrave. Consult, Calabar. Decision making: Lessons from the demand-Control model.
- Conley S 1991. Review of research on teacher participation school decision-making. *Review of Research Education*,
- Cranston, N.C. 2001. Collaborative decision-making and school-based management Challenges rhetoric and reality. *Journal of Educational Enquiry* 2(2), 1-22.
- De Grauwe, et al., 2011. *Strengthening Local Actors: The Path to Decentralizing Education, Kenya, Uganda, and Lesotho*, Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning and UNESCO.
- Dean, J.1993: *Managing the Secondary School*. London: Routledge *Difference*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Duke KE 2005. *Principals' Practices Regarding Teacher Participation in School Decision-making*. D.Ed. Dissertation. Twin Cities: University of Minnesota.
- Duke, D. & Ganseder, B.1990. *Teacher Empowerment: The View from the Classroom*.
- Ehiametalor, E.T. 1988. Management of Private educational institution: Education and national development. *Nigerian Educational Research Association*.

- Gizaw Zewge.1989. *Educational Management: Concepts, Principles and Problems*, Unpublished Material, Addis Ababa.
- Griffin GA 1995.Influences of shared decision making on school and classroom activity. *The Elementary School Journal*, 96: 29-45.
- Hornby A.S and Janathan C.(eds.) 2000. *Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current House Pvt Ltd*.
- Husen, T. and Postlethwaite, T.N.1994.Financing education in international encyclopedia of education.(vol.3, PP.1412-1416). Kidlington: Pergamon
- Hoy, W. &Miskel, C.G. 1991. *Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice*. (4th ed). New York: McGraw–Hill, Inc.
- Irwin J.W. 1996. *Empowering Ourselves and Transferring School: Educators Making a Difference*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Ivancevich, J. and Kono, p.2002.*Organizational Behavior: Key Concepts, Skill and Best Practices*. New York: McGraw Hill Irwin.
- Invancevich, J. Konopaske, R & Matteson, M 2005. *Organizational Behavior and Management* (7th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill Companies, Inc.
- Jackson DS. 2000. The School Improvement Journey: Perspectives on leadership. *School Leadership and Management*, 20(1), 61-78.
- Jawahar, I. M., and G. L. MCLAughlin, 2001, *Toward a Descriptive Stakeholder Theory: An Organizational Life Cycle Approach*, *Academy of Management Review* 26, 397.
- Jonston C. 1997. *Leadership and the Learning Organization in Self-managing Schools*. Doctoral Thesis, Unpublished. Melbourne: University of Melbourne
- Karlsson J .2002. The role of democratic governing bodies in South African schools. *Comparative Education*, 38(3): 327–336.
- Keeves, J.P. 1990. *Educational Research, Methodology and Measurement: An International Handbook*. New York: Pargamen Press PIC.
- Keith JR.1996. Acritical perspective on teacher participation in urban schools. *Educational AdministrationQuarterly*, 32(1): 45–79
- Knezevich, S.J.1969. *Administration of Public Education* (2nd Ed.). New York: Marper and Row Publishing.

- Koopman, P. L., & Wierdsma, A.F.M. 1998: *Participative management*. In P.J.D. Doentu, H. Thierry, & C. J. de-Wolf (Eds.), *Personnel psychology: Handbook of work and organizational psychology* (Vol. 3, 297-324). Hove, UK: Psychology Press/Erlbaum Taylor and Francis.
- Koul, L. 1996. *Methodology of Educational Research* (2<sup>nd</sup> revised ed). Vikas Publishing House Pvt Ltd. 404p
- Kozine. I. 2004. *Survey of decision-making theories*. National Laboratory, Denmark.
- Krüger, M. L.; van Eck, E.; Vermeulen, A. 2005. *Why principals leave: Risk factors for Premature departure in the Netherlands compared for women and men*. *School Leadership & Management*, 25(3), 241-261. doi: 10.1080/13603120701576266
- Lawler, E.E. 1992. *The Ultimate Advantage: Creating the High Involvement Organization*.
- Legesse Debele. 2008. *Trainers' Participation in Decision-Making in Selected Governmental Technical Vocational and Training College of Addis Ababa*: Unpublished Master's Thesis, A.A.U
- Lin R. *The Role of Parent-Teachers Associations*; 2010. Available: uk: <http://www.ehow.co>.
- Lithwood and Steinbach. 1999. *Changing Leadership for changing time* Bukcham open
- Mbamba ANM. 1992. *Book of reading in educational management*. Harare: USESCO.
- McEwan, E.K. 1997. *Leading your Team to Excellence: How to Make Quality Decision* Crown Press, London.
- Mncube V. 2007. *Social justice, policy and parents' understanding of their voice in School governing bodies in South Africa*. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 39: 129– 143
- MOE. 1994. *Ethiopia Education and Training Policy*. Addis Ababa: EMPDA.
- MOE. 1998 *Education Sector Development Programme I (ESDP-I): Action Plan*, Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education
- MOE. 2005. *the Federal Democratic of Ethiopia Education Sector Development Program III (ESDP-III). Program Action Plan*. Addis Ababa: Berhanenaselam Printing Enterprise.

- MOE. 2007. *General Education Quality Assurance package*. Addis Ababa.
- MOE. 2008. *the Review of the Ethiopian Education and Training Policy and Implementation*, Addis Ababa: EMPDA.
- Moran, T.M. 2009. Fostering Teachers Professional in School: The Role of Leadership Orientation and Trust. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 45 2(217-247).
- Morphet, E.L. 1982. *Educational Organization and Administration* (4th Ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Mugenda. A. G. 1999. *Research Methods, Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Nairobi: ACD press.
- Mullins L J .2005. *Management and Organizational Behavior*. Seventh edition prentice Hall
- Naidoo, J. 2005. *Education Decentralization and School Governance in South Africa*: Nairobi University Press.
- Newcombe, N, and McComick J, 2001. *Trust and Teacher Participation in School Based Financial Decision Making*. London: SAGE Publication
- Newstrom, J.W. & pierce, Jon L.1990. *Windows in to Organizations*. New York: Management Association, Amacom.
- O’Hair, M. J. & Reitzug, U. C. 1997. Restructuring schools for democracy: Principals’ Perspective. *Journal of School Leadership*, 7, 266-286
- Ogbonnaya, N.2000. *Education Finance*. Onitsha: cape publishers International Limited
- Ogwo B.A.1996. *Curriculum Development and Educational Technology*: Makurdi Onairi Printing & publishing Co. Ltd.
- Okumbe, J.A.1998. *Educational management: Theory and Practice*. Nairobi, Kenya; Nairobi. University Press.
- Organ, D.W. & Bateman, T.S. 1991. *Organizational Behavior* (4th Ed.). Boston Home-Wood, IL 60430.
- Owens, R.G 1987. *Organizational Behavior in Education* (3rd Ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. Orientation and Trust. *Education Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 452
- Pandey, I.M.1995. *Financia Management*.New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Limited

- Pashiardis, p. 1994. Teachers' Participation in Decision-Making. *International Journal of Educational Management*. 8(5), 1417.
- Robin, S. 2005. Management. 7<sup>th</sup> Ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Probst, T.M. 2005. Countering the negative effects of job in security through participative publishing. *Com. Revitalization and Expansion*. Washington DC.
- Somech, A. 2002. *Explicating the Complexity participative Management*. An Investigation of Multiple Dimensions. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(3) pp. 49-61. <http://eag.sagepub.com>: [Accessed Oct.25, 2010].
- TGE ( Transitional Government of Ethiopia). 1994. Addis Ababa: BerhanenaSelam. Printing press.
- Tripathi, P.C & Reddy, P.N. 2002. *Principles of Management (2nd Ed)*. Tata McGraw-Hill: India. New Delhi 110 008.
- Umosen, A. O. 2010. *Analysis of resource allocation in primary schools in AkwaIbom State, Nigeria*. Unpublished M. Ed Thesis, University of Calabar, Calabar, Nigeria.
- UNESCO, 1997. Training of Teachers/ Trainers in Technical and Vocational Education.
- UNESCO, 2002. *Teacher Education Guidelines: Using Open and Distance Learning*. UK: University Press,
- UNESCO, 2005. Teacher Involvement in Educational Change. Regional Bureau of Education for Latin America and the Caribbean: Chile.
- Vecchio, R.P. 1991. *Organizational Behavior*. (2nd Ed.) Chicago: The Dryden press.
- Williams, K. 2006. *Introducing Management*. Third Edition. Amsterdam: Elsevier Ltd.
- Wilkinso,a .1999. 'Empowerment: Issues and Debates' *QWL News and Abstracts*, ACAS, 11: 28-33.
- Wilson, R.E. 1996. *Educational Administration*, Kent State University.
- Williams RC, Portin B. 1997. *Challenges to Leadership: The Changing Role of the Principal in Washington State*(Research Report). Olympia, Western Australia: Association of Washington School Principals.
- World Bank.1988. Education in sub-saran Africa, Policies for Adjustment, Revitalization and Expansion. Washington DC.

Workneh, Abebe. 2012. *School Management and Decision-making in Ethiopian Government Schools: Young Lives*, Oxford Department of International Development (ODID), University of Oxford, *Queen Elizabeth House*, 3 Mansfield Road, Oxford OX1 3TB, UK

Yalew Endaweke Mulu. 1998. *Fundamental principles of research and implementation*. Bahir Dar: Alpha printing enterprise.

Zenez J.G. 1994. *Purchasing and material management* (7<sup>th</sup>ed.). Canada. John Wiley

## 7. APPENDIX

### 7.1. APPENDIX- I

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY**  
**POST GRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE**  
**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCE**  
Department Educational Planning and Management  
Program MA School Leadership

**Questionnaire to be filled by principals, department heads and students**  
**Dear respondents!**

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information on **practices and challenges of decision making in school resource management** in secondary schools of East Shoa Zone of Oromia Regional State. The information you are going to give will be very significant to investigate the practices, identify the existing challenges and forward possible recommendations to improve decision making in school resource managements. Be sure your responses will be confidential and used only for research purposes only. Therefore, you are kindly requested to be honest and frank in responding all the questions you will be asked.

In responding to the questionnaire, please note the following point.

- ❖ It is un necessary to write your name on the questionnaire
- ❖ Read all instructions before attempting to answer the questions
- ❖ No need of discussing with other to fill the questionnaire
- ❖ Put "X" mark in the boxes or blank space provided
- ❖ Give your answer for all questions

**Thank You in advance for your cooperation**



### Part one: Back ground Information

Please answer the following questions by reading each of them

1. Name of Woreda \_\_\_\_\_
2. Name of School \_\_\_\_\_
3. Current position in the school \_\_\_\_\_
4. Sex: male  female
5. Age: 20 and below  21-30  31-40  above 41
5. Level of education \_\_\_\_\_

Please give your response by putting (X) under the number which most closely represents your opinion of agreement

**Key: Strongly Disagree 1, Disagree 2, Undecided 3, Agree 4 and Strongly Agree 5**

NO.	Items	Level of agreement				
		1	2	3	4	5
<b>Part.1</b>	<b>The current Practices of decision making on resource management</b>					
1.1	There is a participatory decision making process on school resource management.					
1.2	There is a clear procedure by which decisions on school resource management is made.					
1.3	The School makes transparent decisions on resource management					
1.4	The school gives awareness creating training for stakeholders on resource management					
1.5	The school effectively utilize resources					
1.6	School leaders facilitate collaborative decision making process on resource management in school					
1.7	The school leaders are very knowledgeable on how to utilize school resources					
<b>Part 2</b>	<b>Perception of stakeholders towards the decision-making practice</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	People in the school have good attitude on decisions made by the school					
2.2	Various types of decisions made in school are undertaken timely					
2.3	The school make believable decision on resource management					
2.4	Most decisions made by the school are acceptable					
2.5	In most case decisions-made in school are based on actual information					

**Part 3: The extent of stakeholders' participation in decision making on resource management**

Please rate each items from very high to very low and tick (X) under the number which most closely represents the degree of your opinion

**Key: Very Low =1, Low =2, Moderate=3, = High 4 and = Very High 5**

No.	Items	Level of Rating				
		1	2	3	4	5
<b>Part.3</b>	<b>The extent of stakeholders participation in decision making on resource management</b>					
3.1	The extent of stakeholders' involvement in decision-making process					
3.2	The degree of stakeholders knowledge on decision making guide line					
3.3	The extent of school transparency in decision making in resource management					

**Part Five: Major Factors that affect decision making in resource management in the school**

Please give your response by putting (X) under the number which most closely represents your opinion of agreement

**Key: Strongly Disagree 1, Disagree 2, Undecided 3, Agree 4 and Strongly Agree 5**

No.	Items	1	2	3	4	5
Part.4	<b>Major Factors that affect decision making in resource management in the school</b>					
4.1	Lack of vision					
4.2	Lack of transparency					
4.3	Lack of clear guide line in school					
4.4	Lack of stakeholders' participation					
4.5	Lack of leaders' knowledge and awareness on school policy					
4.6	Lack of self-confidence					
4.7	Shortage of resources					
4.8	Interference of political authorities					

## 7.2. APPENDIX- II

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY****POST GRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE****COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCE****Department Educational Planning and management****Program MA School Leadership****Interview guides organized for PTA**

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information of **practices and challenges of decision making in school resource management** in secondary schools of East Shoa Zone of Oromia Regional State. Be sure that the information gathered will be used only for research purpose. Hence, you are kindly requested to provide the necessary information is very helpful to the quality of research.

Name of the school \_\_\_\_\_ Woreda \_\_\_\_\_ Position \_\_\_\_\_

Educational qualification \_\_\_\_\_ Sex \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 1 How do the school committee members actively participate in decision-making process in school Resource management?
- 2 How schools give immediate and fair decision about resource?
- 3 How school motivate PTA members towards any decision-made in school
- 4 At what extent the PTA members positively accept the decision made in school?
- 5 At what extent the PTA members are well informed about decision making guide lines on school Financial resource management?
- 6 How PTA members monitor any decision made about school resource?

## 7.3. DABALEE- I

## YUUNIVARSIITII HARAMAYAA

## SAGANTAA EEBBA BOODDEE

## KOLLEEJII BARNOOTAA FI SAAYINSII AMALAA

Muummee:- Bulchiinsaaf karoora Barnootaa

Sagantaa: Digirii lammataa(MA) Bulchiinsa mana barnootaatiin

Bargaaffilee hoggantoota manneen barnootaa, itti gaafatamtoota Muummeewwanii fi Barattootaan guutamuu qabanii

Kabajamtoota Odeeffannoo kennitootaa!

Kaayyoon bargaaffiilee kanneenii bulchiinsa qabeenya mana barnootaa irratti hojiirra olmaa fi rakkinoota mudatan irratti akka manneen barnootaa naannoo oromiyaa godina shawaa bahaatti odeeffannoo funaanuudha. Odeeffannoon ragaan isiin kennitan kunis hojiirra oolmaa sakattta'uu, rakkoolee jiran adda baasuu fi murtee bulchiinsa qabeenya manneen barnootaa irratti kennamu fooyyessuu keessatti baay'ee barbaachiinsaadha.

Odeeffannoon isin kennitan kun dhimma qorannoo qofaaf kan oolu ta'uu, beektanii deebii keessan bilisaan keennuun galmaan ga'insa qorannoo kanakeessatti ga'ee olaanaa qaba.kanaafuu odeeffannoo kennitaniif iftoominaa fi ofitti amantummaa akka qabaattan kabajaan gaafatamtaniittu. Bargaaffilee kanneen deebisuuf, qabxiilee armaan gadii xiyyeeffannoo keessa galchuun barbaachisaa ta'a.

- Bargaaffii kana irratti maqaa barreessuun hin barbaachisuu,
- Deebii kennuun dura qajeelfamoota hundaa seeraan dubbisa
- Nama biroo waliin marii taasisuun hin barbaachisuu
- Bakka duwaa yookaan saanduqaa qophaa'e irratti mallattoo (x) kaayyaa
- Gaaffilee hunda irratti deebii kennuu hin dagatinaa

Kutaa tokko : odeeffannoo waliigalaa

Gaaffilee gadii tokko tokkoon dubbisuun deebii itti kennaa.

1. Maqaa Aanaa : \_\_\_\_\_
2. Maqaa Mana barnootaa: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Mana barnootaa sana keessatti gahee hojii \_\_\_\_\_

4. Saala : dhiira \_\_\_\_\_ Dubaraa \_\_\_\_\_  
 5. Umurii:- waggaa 20 gadi \_\_\_\_\_ waggaa 21-30 \_\_\_\_\_ waggaa 31-40 \_\_\_\_\_ waggaa 41 ol \_\_\_\_\_  
 6. Sadarkaa barnootaa \_\_\_\_\_

Lakkoofsa yaada kiyatti baay'ee dhihaata jettuu mallattoo "X" kaa'uudhaan daabii kee kenni

Furtuu: 1 Baay'een mormaa, 2 nan morma, 3, hin murteessine 4, itti waliigala 5 sirriittan itti waliigala

T/L	Ayitamii	sadarkaa				
		1	2	3	4	5
Kutaa 1	Bulchiinsa Qabeenya manneen barnootaa irratti hojiirra oolmaa kenniinsa murtee yeroo ammaa					
1.1	Bulchiinsa qabeenya mana barnootaa irratti adeemsi murtee kennuu hirmaachisaadha.					
1.2	Bulchiinsa qabeenya mana barnootaa irratti murtee kennuuf qajeelfamni ifaan lafa kaa'ame ni jira					
1.3	Manni barnootaa bulchiinsa qabeenyaa irratti murtee iftoomina qabu nikenna					
1.4	Manni barnootaa namoota Bulchiinsa qabeenya mana barnootaa irratti murtee fudhataniif hojii hubannoo uumuu ni kenna.					
1.5	Manni barnootaa qabeenyatti haalaan nifayadama					
1.6	Kenninsa murtee qabeenya mana barnootaa irratti hoggantoonni manneen barnootaa murteen gareen akka kennamuuf haala ni mijjeessu,					
1.7	Itti fayyadaminsa qabeenyaa irratti hoggansi mana barnootaa hubannoo gahaa qaba					
Kutaa 2	Hojii irra oolmaa keenninsa murtee irratti hubannoo qooda fudhattootaa	1	2	3	4	5
2.1	Murteen Manni barnootaa kennu ilaalchisee hawaasni mana barnootaa ilaalcha gaarii qaba					
2.2	Murteewwaan garaagaraa mana barnootaa keessatti raawwataman yeroo isaanii kan eeggataniidha					
2.3	Bulchiinsa qabeenya irratti murteen manni barnootaa kennu amansiisaadha					
2.4	Murteen mana barnootaatiin kennamu baay'een isaa fudhatama qaba					
2.5	Murteen mana barnootaa keessatti kennamuu yeroo baay'ee odeeffannoo qabatamaa irratti hundaa'a.					

Kutaa 3: sadarkaa hirmaannaa qooda fudhattoonni kenninsa murtee qabeenya mana barnootaa irratti qaban: Lakkoofsa yaada kiyya naaf ibsuu danda'a jettu jalatti mallattoo "X" barreessuun baayee olaanaadhaa hanga baayee gadaanaatti kaa'i.

Furtuu:- Baay'ee olaanaa 1, Olaanaa 2, giddugaleessa 3, Gadaanaa 4, Baay'ee gadaanaa 5

T/L	Ayitamii	sadarkaa				
Kutaa 3	sadarkaa hirmaannaa qooda fudhattoonni kenninsa murtee qabeenya mana barnootaa irratti qaban:	1	2	3	4	5
3.1	Adeemsa kennisa murtee irratti sadarkaa qooda fudhattoonni qaban					
3.2	Hubannoo qooda fudhattoonni qajeelfama murtee kennuu waliin wal qabatu irratti qaban					
3.3	Bulchinsa qabeenya mana barnootaa irratti sadarkaa iftoominaa manni barnootaa qabu					

Kutaa 4: bulchiinsa qabeenya mana barnootaatiin walqabatee wantoota murtee kennuu irratti dhiibbaa uumanLakkoofsa yaada kiyya naaf ibsuu danda'a jettu jalatti mallattoo "X" barreessuun baayee olaanaadhaa hanga baayee gadaanaatti kaa'i.

Furtuu: 1 Baay'een mormaa, 2 nan morma, 3, hin murteessine 4, itti waliigala 5 sirriittan itti waliigala

T/L	Ayitamii	sadarkaa				
Kutaa 4	qabeenya mana barnootaa irratti murtee kennuu ilaalchisee wantoota rakkoo uuman	1	2	3	4	5
4.1	Mul'ata dhabuu					
4.2	Iftoomina dhabuu					
4.3	Qajeelfamni ifaa ta'e dhabamuu					
4.4	Qooda fudhattoota hirmaachisuu dhabuu					
4.5	Hubannoo dhabuu hoggansaa fi imaammata mana barnootaa irratti hubannoo uumuu dhabuu,					
4.6	Ofitti amanamummaa dhabuu					
4.7	Hanqina qabeenyaa					
4.8	Qaamni siyaasaa harka keessa galfachuu					

