

**SCHOOL LEADERS' EFFORTS IN CREATING A CONDUCTIVE
SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT FOR LEARNING IN SECONDARY
SCHOOLS OF NORTH SHOA ZONE,
OROMIA REGIONAL STATE**

MA Thesis

SHIFERAW KEBEDE

NOVEMBER 2016

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY, HARAMAYA

**School leaders' Efforts in Creating a Conducive School Environment for
Learning in Secondary Schools of North Shoa Zone,
Oromia Regional State**

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

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY

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

By

Shiferaw Kebede

November 2016

Haramaya University

Haramaya University

Postgraduate Program Directorate

We hereby certify that we have read and evaluated this Thesis entitled “School Leaders’ Efforts in Creating a Conducive School Environment for Learning in Secondary Schools of North Shoa Zone, Oromia Regional State” prepared under our guidance, by Shiferaw Kebede. We recommend that it be submitted as fulfilling the Thesis requirement.

Mr. Wakgari Tasisa (Assistant Professor)

Major Advisor

Signature

Date

Mr. Gemechu Abera (Assistant professor)

Co-Advisor

Signature

Date

As members of the Board of Examiners of the MA Thesis Open Defiance Examination, We certify that we have read and evaluated the thesis prepared by Shiferaw Kebede and examined the candidate. We recommended that the thesis be accepted as fulfilling the Thesis requirements for the degree of Master of Art in School Leadership.

Dr. Dawit Negassa

Chair person

Signature

Date

Dr. Habtamu Gezahegn

External Examiner

Signature

Date

Dr. Yilfashewa Seyoum

Internal Examiner

Signature

Date

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis manuscript to my wife Genet Chala for her devoted partnership in the success of my life, and my daughter Obsinet Shiferaw for her affection and love.

STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR

By my signature below, I declare and affirm that this Thesis is my own work. I have followed all ethical and technical principles of scholarship in the preparation, data collection, data analysis, and completion of this Thesis. Any scholarly matter that is included in the Thesis has been given recognition through citation.

This Thesis has been submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an MA degree at Haramaya University. The Thesis will be deposited in the Haramaya University Library and is made available to borrowers under rules of the Library. I solemnly declare that this Thesis has not been submitted to any other institution anywhere for the award of any academic degree, diploma, or certificate.

Brief quotations from this Thesis may be made without special permission, provided that accurate and complete acknowledgements of the source are made. Requests for permission for extended quotations from or reproduction of this Thesis in whole or in part may be granted by the Head of Department or Director of Postgraduate Program when in his or her judgment of the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instance, however, permission must be obtained from the author of the Thesis.

Name: Shiferaw Kebede Jima

Signature_____

Date: 12 November 2016

School/Department: Educational Planning and Management

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ACT	Australian Capital Territory
CPD	Continuous Professional Development
EIC	Education Improvement Commission
ESDP	Education Sector Development Program
ETP	Education and Training Policy
GEQIP	General Education Quality Improvement Package
HIV/AIDS	Human Immune Virus /Acquired Immune Deficient Syndrome
ICT	Information Communication Technology
MoE	Ministry of Education
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
PTA	Parent Teacher Association
RCEID	Research Center for Educational Innovation and Development
REB	Regional Educational Bureau
SIC	School Improvement Committee
SIP	School Improvement Program
TDP	Teachers Development Program
WEB	Woreda Educational Bureau

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

The author was born at Yaya Gullalle Woreda of North Shoa Zone, Oromia Regional State on 20 May 1984. He attended his primary education at Goto Primary School (Grade 1 to 6) from 1991-1995 and Fital junior secondary (Grade 7-8) from 1996-1997; and secondary education (9-12) at Fiche Secondary school from 1998 -2001. After sitting for Ethiopian School Leaving Certificate Examination in 2001, he attended Jima Teacher Training College in 2002 and graduated with Diploma in Chemistry in 2003. Then he was assigned by the Oromia Education Bureau in Kofale District found in West Arsi Zone as a primary school Chemistry teacher and he taught Chemistry from 2004 to 2006 and then transferred to Yaya Gullalle District of North Shoa Zone and was assigned at Fital Secondary School as a Chemistry teacher in 2006. He joined undergraduate study in Chemistry department, summer in-service Program at Addis Ababa University in 2005 and graduated with Bachelor of Education degree in Chemistry in 2009.

While he was teaching at Fital secondary school, the woreda education office announced to recruit a Vice-principal for Fital secondary School. According to that announcement he applied and won the competition, and served as vice-principal of Fital Secondary School since 2012. To pursue his further studies and improve his qualification on school leadership, he joined Postgraduate Program at Haramaya University in 2013.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank to my instructor and advisor Wakgari Tasisa (Assistant Professor) for his critical comments, constructive suggestions and genuine he made throughout the course of my Thesis work. I also gratefully acknowledge my co-advisor Mr. Gemechu Abera (Assistant professor) for all his assistance and unlimited support during the study. I would also like to express my gratitude for the financial support provided by MoE.

Special thanks and appreciation goes to my family, especially my wife, Genet Chala, who encouraged me during the course study and research period in taking all family burdens. In addition, the generous support and contribution from my colleagues and friends are deeply acknowledged and emphasized in all cases of my future life. This will never be forgotten. Special thanks are due to all instructors of the Department of Educational Planning and Management at Haramaya University.

Furthermore, I sincerely thank for the privilege Haramaya University accorded me during my stay at the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, Department of Educational Planning and Management, Postgraduate Program Directorate, and Haramaya University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	iv
STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR	v
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	vi
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xii
ABSTRACT	xiii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	3
1.3. Research Questions	5
1.4. Objectives of the Study	6
1.4.1. General objective of the study	6
1.4.2. Specific objectives of the study	6
1.5. Significance of the Study	6
1.6. Delimitations of the Study	7
1.7. Limitations of the Study	8
1.8. Operational Definition of Key Terms	8
1.9. Organization of the Study	9
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	10
2.1. The Concept of Leadership	10
2.2. Importance of School Improvement Program	11
2.3. Creating a Conducive School Environment	11
2.4. Roles of School Leaders in Creating a Conducive School Environment	16
2.4.1. Building school leadership capacity	17
2.4.2. Shared vision resulting in program coherence	18
2.4.3. Broad involvement and collaboration reflected in roles and actions	18
2.5.4. Professional development of School Leaders	19
	Continuous...

2.5. Tasks of School Leaders in Creating a Conducive School Environment	20
2.5.1. Building respectful and safe school	20
2.5.2. Involve participatory school environment	21
2.5.3. Ensuring physical security features of School	21
2.5.4. Ensure school rules and regulations	22
2.6. Factors affecting School Leaders in Creating a Conducive School Environment	22
2.6.1. Leadership competency related factors	22
2.6.2. Management related factors	23
2.6.3. Support related factors	24
3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	26
3.1. Description of the Research Site	26
3.2. Research Design	26
3.3. Sources of Data	27
3.3.1. Primary sources of data	27
3.3.2. Secondary sources of data	27
3.4. Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques	27
3.5. Data Collection Instruments	29
3.5.1. Questionnaire	30
3.5.2. Interview guide	31
3.5.3. Document review	31
3.5.4. Observation	31
3.6. Procedures of Data Collection	32
3.7. Methods of Data Analysis	32
3.8. Ethical Considerations	33
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	34
4.1. Background Information	34
4.2. Extent School Environment Conducive for Learning	37
4.3. Extent School Leaders Exert their Efforts in Creating a Conducive School Environment for Learning	50
4.4. Factors Affecting School Leaders' Efforts in Creating a Conducive School Environment for Learning	62

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	72
5.1. Summary	72
5.2. Conclusions	74
5.3. Recommendations	76
6. REFERENCES	78
7. APPENDICES	85

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Population, sample size and sampling techniques	29
Table 2: Background information of the respondents	35
Table 3: Teachers' and SIC members' views toward the extent to what school environment was conducive for learning regarding school facilities.	38
Table 4. Teachers' and SIC members' views toward the extent to what school environment was conducive for learning regarding students empowerment.	42
Table 5. Teachers' and SIC members' views toward the extent to what school environment was conducive for learning regarding student support.	46
Table 6. Teachers' and SIC members' views to what extent school leaders exert their efforts in creating a conducive school environment regarding to school facilities.	51
Table 7. Teachers' and SIC members' views to what extent school leaders exert their efforts in creating a conducive school environment regarding to students empowerment.	54
Table 8. Teachers' and SIC members' views to what extent school leaders exert their efforts in creating a conducive school environment regarding to students support	57
Table 9. Teachers' and SIC members' views toward leadership competency related factors affecting school leaders' efforts in creating a conducive school environment for learning.	63
Table 10. Teachers' and SIC members' views toward management related factors affecting school leaders' efforts in creating a conducive school environment for learning.	66
Table 11. Teachers' and SIC members' views toward support related factors affecting school leaders' efforts in creating a conducive school environment for learning.	68

SCHOOL LEADERS' EFFORTS IN CREATING A CONDUCTIVE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT FOR LEARNING IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF NORTH SHOA ZONE, OROMIA REGIONAL STATE

Shiferaw Kebede

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to analyze school leaders' efforts in creating a conducive school environment for learning in secondary schools of North Shoa Zone. To achieve this purpose, the descriptive survey method was employed. Interview, questionnaire, document analysis and observation checklist were used as instrument of data collection. Data were collected from 10 government secondary schools. A total of 107 teachers, 73 SIC members, 10 PTA head and 5 secondary school supervisors were used for the study. The data were analyzed by frequency, percentage, mean scores, and narrative description. To check whether there exists a significant difference between the opinions of teachers and SIC members, independent t-test was employed. The study indicates most of the respondents were experienced enough and had awareness about their school nature and culture. The study found that most school leaders were not qualified with leadership profession. According to this study, secondary school environment was moderately conducive for learning regarding to school facilities and students empowerment. However, the extent to which students were supported in schools was underway in secondary schools. In terms of school facilities, there were inadequate facilities like standard laboratories and libraries, lack of access and use of technologies like internet and adequate computers and separate latrines. Regarding to empowerment of students, opportunity for gender equality of students to participate in school leadership was under way. Provisions of supports for students were problematic in secondary schools. In this case, students with special needs were ignored which needs nearby support. Regarding to school facility and students support, low efforts were employed by school leaders in creating a conducive learning school environment that address the physical and mental health needs of all students and staff. They employed moderate efforts regarding to empowering students. Low leadership competency, technical skill and experience of school leaders were among the factors highly affecting school leaders to create conducive learning school environment. Based on the findings, some recommendations were suggested. First, School leaders should use their understanding of SIP to enhance conducive school environment for learning. Second, MoE and REB should provide training for school leaders in professional development activities and bring competent and trained personnel to the leadership position.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

School leadership has become a priority in education policy agendas internationally. Because, effective school leadership is essential to improve the efficiency of schooling. Effective school leaders in schools have positive effects upon quality education. They also lead to students' better academic achievements and overall success of schools Nasubuga (2003). School leaders have a key role to play in setting direction and creating a positive school culture including the proactive school mindset, and supporting and enhancing staff motivation and commitment needed to foster improvement and promote success for schools in challenging circumstances (Christopher and Pamel, 2013).

As presented in Education Sector Development Program V (ESDP V), one of the priorities of the education and training system in Ethiopia is to promote effective leadership, management and governance at all levels in order to achieve educational goals by mobilizing and using resources efficiently. In spite of great efforts under General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP), in the period of ESDP IV student attainment and learning outcomes have not improved in line with targets. For ESDP V, therefore, the emphasis on education quality for all students remains a priority (MoE, 2015).

The reason why Ministry of Education (MoE) highly focused on the overall purpose of the GEQIP is to improve the quality of general education throughout the country. To improve student achievement, implementation of School Improvement Program (SIP) in the schools is significant (MoE, 2007a). One of the four SIP domains is a conducive school environment. These define the environment required to support effective teaching and learning. In addition, school environments must be accessible, safe and healthy (MoE, 2015).

According to Wallace (2002) school leadership has a significant effect on school improvement. Harris and Muijs (2005) argue that school leaders are expected to mobilize the abilities and efforts of the teaching staff to provide effective educational program. School

leaders have a vital role in shaping the culture of a school, the vision for student wellbeing and ensuring that effective policies, procedures and strategies are in place to respond to bullying and unacceptable behavior. Teachers and schools leaders can also provide opportunities for students to have a voice in developing policies and programs (Coles and Southworth, 2002).

Similarly, safe and effective schools start with school leaders who are committed to a shared and well-developed vision of a safe, caring, respectful, supportive and inclusive school community, which sends clear messages that bullying and unacceptable behavior are not tolerated (Dart, 2006). Effective school leaders are the one who create conducive teaching environment, build positive relationship with his employee, prepare perfect and accurate plan, initiates the work moral of teachers and students, become diplomat control the application of the plan for its achievement, give argent feedback when it is necessary (Samson, 2011).

Effective school leaders recognize the potential they have to create a school environment where teachers thrive and students achieve their greatest potential in a safe and nurturing school setting (Johnston, 2001). Creating safe, orderly, warm, and inviting school environments is critical to ensure that all children and youth achieve their highest potential and contribute to society, no matter their socioeconomic background or geographic location. In order to create this type of environment, school leaders must work towards integrating services (academic, behavioral, social, emotional, and mental health) through collaboration using a multitier system of support (Bluestein, 2001). Building maintenance and other school activities for safety factors require the active participation of parents, teachers, students, and citizens, which calls for creative effort of the school leaders (Tsigereda, 2014). Healthy education is only possible in a well protected and disciplined environment and human nature to bring effective teaching – learning process in schools (Markos, 2011).

An environment conducive to learning is critical to foster academic achievement of students (Saxon, 2005). In order for students to be successful in school, they need to feel safe, secure, and connected to the school and their teachers. A variety of factors must be in place to accomplish that level of safety and connection. Students need teachers and other adults who care about them and their achievement, and they need to know that they will not be physically

or emotionally harmed while at school. Students need to be armed with knowledge about the resources available to them and what to do and who to talk to if they do not feel safe. And finally, students need a clean environment that is conducive to learning with few distractions or opportunities to waste time. When these factors are in place, students are free to learn and achieve at their highest levels (Findley, 2006). Accordingly, one of the primary responsibilities of school leaders is to create and maintain the organizational characteristics that reward and encourage collective efforts (Mengistu, 2014).

Therefore, creating a safe and secure school environment involves multiple facets of a school environment, including the school climate, norms, goals, values, interpersonal relationships, and the physical state of the building. In order for students and staff to perform at their best, they must feel safe in all aspects of their experiences, which require a concerted effort on the part of school leaders (Bluestein, 2001). Hence, to improve students result and enhance students' performance or school success, school leaders' efforts in creating a conducive school environment for learning becomes a timely area of interest for the researcher in secondary schools of North Shoa Zone, Oromia Regional State located in central of Ethiopia.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Education reform is top of the agenda of almost every country in the world. Yet despite massive increases in spending and ambitious attempts at reform, the performance of many school systems has barely improved in decades (OECD, 2007). In recent years, the notion of improving a school in its totality has gained momentum in the world. However, any effort of promoting quality education is not a smooth function (Mulatu and Teketel, 2014).

Ethiopian government prepared the national Education and Training Policy (ETP) in 1994, and with the framework of the ETP launched the first five years ESDP in 1997 as part of a twenty years education sector plan to increase the growth enrollment rate of both primary and secondary schools MoE (2002). Despite these remedial actions, rapid expansion achievements in access have not been accompanied by adequate improvements in quality; quality has deteriorated (World Bank, 2008). In support of this, despite the rapid expansion of secondary

schools and enrollment of students in Ethiopia since the traditional period, many parents and students were worried about the quality of education (Demoze, 2007).

Concerning the quality of school infrastructure and facilities improvements in school infrastructure and facilities have not yet reached the expected standard in most schools. In the analysis of the implementation of ESDP IV, it was observed that progress on cross-cutting issues implementation was weaker than expected. The presentation of cross-cutting issues in ESDP IV failed to encourage joint action. One major challenge during ESDP IV relates to the insufficient attention given to those cross-cutting issues which were present in the plan but for which little coordinated action took. These were prioritized in ESDP V action plan (MoE, 2015).

School is not always a safe place for a refugee child; quite often, it is at school that he or she is abused or exploited. The nature of violence inflicted on students in learning environments can be emotional, physical and psychological, and range from the subtle to the very explicit. All too frequently it is sexual and gender-based (Bluestein, 2001).

Researchers and scholars, for example, Saxon (2005) believe that hostile activities or any form of school aggression can create an environment which is not conducive to learning as it negatively affects pupils emotionally, contributes to pupils' low academic achievement and increases dropout rates. For effective learning to take place, the learning environment must be friendly to both the students and the teachers. Learning can become more pleasant and effective if the school environment is more conducive and welcoming than hostile. Even though there may be other factors contributing to this situation, one major factor that could be responsible is the school leaders' lack of the necessary leadership skills and appropriate leadership styles (Moswela, 2004). In support of this, school leaders didn't create a friendly environment in all efforts to improve the instructional climate and students' sense of connectedness to the learning-teaching process (Kedir, 2015).

MoE (2002) describe that, the long standing problems associated with the Ethiopian education system were essentially lack of quality and relevance, and continuous decline in quality and

standard. In some areas quality has deteriorated as a result of rapid expansion because the government provides priority to build schools to increase taking capacity rather than fulfils educational inputs of facilities (MoE, 2007a).

Abiy (2014) in his conclusions stated that, on issue of the current practice of schools in creating safe and healthy school environment, libraries and laboratories of the schools could not provide the service to students due to lack of attention of the administration to assign trained personals. As per the knowledge of the researcher, there is no previously conducted research on what government secondary schools on North Shoa Zone look like from the angle of school leaders' efforts in creating a conducive school environment for learning. In fact, a research was conducted on evaluation the implementation of SIP; but was limited to the interplay of the domains of SIP in secondary schools of North Shoa Zone. It did not address the conducive school environment domain in depth. Therefore, this study is different from others and focuses on school leaders' effort in creating a conducive school environment for learning regarding to school facilities, student empowerment and support in North Shoa Zone Secondary Schools.

1.3. Research Questions

In order to analyze school leaders' efforts in creating a conducive school environment for learning, the following research questions have been drawn to be answered in the study.

1. To what extent secondary school environment is conducive for learning in North Shoa Zone?
2. To what extent do school leaders exert their efforts in creating a conducive school environment for learning in secondary schools of North Shoa Zone?
3. What are the factors affecting school leaders' efforts in creating a conducive school environment for learning in secondary schools of North Shoa Zone?

1.4. Objectives of the Study

The objective of this study categorized into general objective and specific objective stated here under.

1.4.1. General objective of the study

The general objective of the current study is to analyze school leaders' efforts in creating a conducive school environment for learning in General Secondary Schools of North Shoa Zone.

1.4.2. Specific objectives of the study

The study is targeted to achieve the following specific objectives:

1. To examine the extent to which secondary school environments are conducive for learning in North Shoa Zone.
2. To analyze the extent to which school leaders has exerting their efforts in creating a conducive learning environment in secondary schools of North Shoa Zone.
3. To find out factors affecting school leaders' efforts in creating a conducive school environment for learning in secondary schools of North Shoa Zone.

1.5. Significance of the Study

The findings of this study may provide information for school leaders, educational sector experts and policy makers the extent to which school environment is conducive, the extent to which school leaders are exerting their effort in creating a conducive school environment, factors that affect school leaders in creating a conducive school environment for learning. Moreover, it may indicate direction to school leaders and other stakeholders (school improvement partners, Woreda and Zonal educational bureau experts) ways and means to maximize school leaders' efforts in creating a conducive school environment for learning, and how to manage and solve factors that affect school leaders to make school environment

conducive for learning in secondary schools. The study could serve the researcher how to manage school environment and create a conducive school environment in his professional work. At last, the study could serve as basis for others to conduct further study in this area.

1.6. Delimitations of the Study

This study was undertaken to analyze school leaders' efforts in creating a conducive school environment for learning. To make this research manageable, geographically, the study was delimited to North Shoa Zone, Oromia Regional State. Out of 13 woreda and 1 city administration in the Zone, it was delimited to 4 Woradas and 1 City administration to have manageable size of sample woradas and City. Besides, due to time and financial constraints, work overload of the researcher, and to make the study more manageable and feasible, the study was delimited to 10 (ten) government General Secondary Schools (9-10).

A conducive school environment for learning could have various dimensions. For example, good governance and administration in schools, empowering community about schools, school facility, student empowerment, student support, physical and emotional school environments and many others. To make the study more manageable, this study was delimited to school facility, student empowerment and student support as per SIP frame work prepared by MoE (MoE, 2011b). This was because; the existence of favorable and positive atmosphere for the process of learning-teaching has a huge contribution for the provision quality of education (MoE, 2011a).

Hence, this study was delimited content wise to the extent to which school environment are conducive for learning, extent to which school leaders exert their efforts and factors affecting school leaders in creating a conducive school environment for learning regarding to school facilities, student empowerment and student support in the time frame of 2014/15 in North Shoa Zone Secondary Schools.

1.7. Limitations of the Study

Research work cannot be free from limitations. To this end, some limitations were also observed. One apparent limitation was that, shortage of time due to the burden of school work of the researcher. In addition, the study lacked the accessibility of relevant and up-to-date reference materials in carrying out the study. Moreover, locally written literature specifically on school leaders' efforts is scarcely available. Also the study was limited to the respondents' unwillingness to fill out and return the questionnaire. However, the researcher overcome these all problems with patience, arranged convenient time and place in order to get enough valid responses.

1.8. Operational Definition of Key Terms

Conducive: A favorable and enabling school environment for learning.

Conducive School environment: A favorable school environment providing the right conditions which enable for free leaning in terms of school facilities, students empowerment and students support.

Creating: - Facilitating and bringing about a desired learning school environment.

Cross-Cutting Issues: Are issues like gender, special need and inclusive education, HIV/AIDS that are crucial to consider in school for facilitating learning.

Effort: Struggle of school leaders to make school environment conducive for learning.

Indicators: Statistics that allow value judgments to be made about the performance level of a conducive school environment.

Learning: is the act, process of gaining knowledge, skill and abilities gained through schooling.

Principal: Administrative head and professional leader in charge of secondary school.

School Improvement Committee (SIC): Is a committee drawn from teachers, students, administrative staff, parents and the community chaired by the principal responsible for the implementation of SIP in schools.

School leaders: In this study school leaders are supervisors, principals, Vice-principals, Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) heads, unit leaders, department heads and student councils.

School leadership: is the process of enlisting and guiding the talents and energies of teachers, students, and parents toward achieving a common educational aims.

Standard: A level of excellence, that is measurable, that all schools attempts to achieve in order to improve students result.

1.9. Organization of the Study

This research paper is organized into five chapters. The first chapter holds the introduction part of the study which consists of background of the research, statement of the problem, objective of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study and operational definition of key terms. The second chapter deals with review of literature pertinent to the research. The third chapter discusses about research design and methodology. The collected data from the subject of the study are carefully analyzed and interpreted under the fourth chapter. The fifth chapter summarizes the research and forward conclusions and recommendations on the basis of the findings of the study. References and appendix, which include questionnaires, interview guide questions, observation checklist and school document review checklists and other related materials, are also part of the document.

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. The Concept of Leadership

Yukl (2002) said that “the definition of leadership is arbitrary and very subjective. Some definitions are more useful than others, but there is no ‘correct’ definition. As John (2008) says: “a leader takes people where they want to go, great leader takes people where they do not necessarily want to be, but ought to be”. This implies that leaders guide activities to accomplish mutual goals even more than expected by followers. Leadership is a process of providing direction and influencing individuals or groups to achieve goals (Kouqing, 2009). Another popular definition of leadership is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal (Northouse, 2007).

The concepts of leadership, management and administration overlap and have been accorded different emphases over time and in different contexts. The concerns of organizational leadership focuses on vision, strategic issues, transformation, ends, people and doing the right thing while that of management focuses on implementation, operational issues, transactions, means and systems (Christopher and Pamela, 2013). While leadership involves steering organizations by shaping other people’s attitudes, motivations and behaviors, management is more closely associated with maintenance of current operations (Pont et al., 2008). Leadership should provide the drive and direction for raising achievement, while management should make best use of the resources and processes to make this happen (Earley and Weindling, 2004). An often quoted phrase is “managers do things right, while leaders do the right things” (Bennis and Nanus, 2008).

School leaders are in charge of connecting and adapting schools to their surrounding environments. According to Earley and Weindling (2004), the school leader tries to take charge and bring about school improvement. School leadership has become a priority in education policy agendas across Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and partner countries because; it plays a key role in improving classroom practice, school policies and connections between individuals and the outside world by influencing the

motivations and capacities of teachers, as well as the school climate and environment. It contributes to improved student learning by shaping the conditions and climate in which teaching and learning occur (Pont et al., 2008).

2.2. Importance of School Improvement Program

SIP is a national program established in 2007 by MoE in collaboration with regional state professionals with an aim to realize harmonized implementation of school system relevance and quality assurance (MoE, 2007b). School improvement is a strategy for educational change that focuses to increase student academic achievement by modifying classroom practice and adapting the management arrangements within the school to support teaching and learning (Hopkins, 2005). Achieving excellence in schooling like all fields of human endeavor requires a commitment to continuous improvement and quality assurance (ACT, 2009).

The main purpose of SIP is to encourage the school to work closely with the community for resolving its problems and promoting its development (Upadhyaya, 2003). The ultimate objective of the school improvement is to improve student achievement levels by enhancing the way curriculum is delivered, by creating conducive environment for learning and by increasing the degree to which parents are involved in their children's learning at school and in the home (EIC, 2000). School improvement is important to bring genuine school community, collaborative decision making, and stewardship whereby students, staff and community and rich curriculum opportunities for students (McMahon, 2011).

2.3. Creating a Conducive School Environment

School environment refers to the social, academic and emotional contexts of a school—the “personality” of the learning context— and how it is perceived by students, staff and community. This climate is influenced by a broad range of factors, from disciplinary policies to instructional quality to student and teacher morale (Bluestein, 2001).

The school alone cannot create conducive school environment for effective teaching and learning process. To create safe and maintained school environments it needs the genuine participation of school leaders to ensure quality of education. To strengthen this idea, for creating and sustaining environments to support teaching and learning officials, directors and other central and area office staff support efforts of school personnel, family members and community collaborator to create safe and supportive learning environments (Andres, 2007). To support this, when students believe that adults in the school care about them have high expectations for their education and will provide the support essential to their success, they thrive. When teachers and staff are deeply engaged in creating a safe, nurturing, challenging school environment, their job satisfaction increases (Bluestein, 2001).

Conducive environment reinforces the teachers by providing a good stimulus for effective learning to take place. Such stimulus is not only provided by ensuring good physical plant planning but also through proper maintenance of such physical facilities. Conducive school environment where good working facilities exist is a catalyst for effective teaching and learning. In school where there is enough space for the teachers to walk round in the classroom while delivering lesson will promote rapt attention of students and good academic performance (Saifullah, 2011).

School environment which is facilitated by essential inputs such as library, laboratory with science kits, clean toilets, attractive classrooms, etc create conducive atmosphere for learning to be improved. Besides to this, creating conducive school environment need to meaningful participation of all stakeholders and visionary leadership. Therefore, conducive school environment facilitate for effective teaching and learning process and it encourage students' participation on their learning and enhance the academic achievements of the students. Such kinds of school environment reduce the educational wastage (repetition, dropout, and low academic achievement of the students') (MoE, 2007a).

All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug-free, and conducive to learning. An environment conducive to learning is critical to foster the academic achievement of students (Andrés, 2007). School environment is the learning environment

created through the interaction of human relationships, physical setting, and psychological atmosphere Perkins (2006) cited in (Sarah, 2009). In safe and productive learning environments students willingly engage and participate in the broad range of learning opportunities. They contribute to decisions about their learning and their contributions are valued. A conducive school environment describes quality learning environments are created to focus on student needs and foster potential skills and interests; schools create opportunities for students to develop into self regulating learners within and beyond the classroom; and schools value participation, and support student expression of new knowledge and understanding (ACT, 2009).

When students feel secure in the school community they can attend their education with motivation. Students need to be empowered and their voices need to be heard so as to make their contribution and engage and active participation in the decision making process of their school. Conducive school environment for learning has three elements: These are school facility, empowerment of students and support for students (MoE, 2011b).

2.3.1. School facility

School facility describes the extent to which school has fulfilled facilities that meet the standards of the school and thereby enabled the teachers and administration personnel of the school to properly discharge duties. This element incorporates one standard and five performance indicators. The indicators are: secured fence and attractive premises, favorable and inspiring class room, standard teaching-learning aides and materials that equipped with appropriate equipment educational development center, laboratory/science kit, library, teachers' resting room, sports grounds, etc), adequate access to standard toilets particularly designated for ladies and gents together with water facilities, and access and use of complete information and commutation technology (ICT) for teaching purposes (like radio, tape player, plasma, computer, etc) (MoE, 2011b).

There is relationship between the conditions of school buildings and student achievement (Hunter, 2006). Teaching and learning process does not take place in a vacuum but rather in an

environment structured to facilitate learning. The school facilities consist of all types of buildings for academic and non-academic activities, equipment for academic and non-academic activities, areas for sports and games, landscape, farms and gardens including trees, roads and paths. Others include furniture and toilet facilities, lighting, acoustics, storage facilities and packing lot, security, transportation, ICT, cleaning materials, food services, and special facilities for the physically challenged persons (Ihuoma, 2008).

In support of the above idea, Earthman (2004) rates temperature, heating and air quality as the most important individual elements for student achievement. Some physical elements (furniture and equipment, arrangement and layout, display and storage and ICT in the classroom improve comfort, wellbeing and probably attitude and so, perhaps, improve achievement (Higgins et al., 2006).

2.3.2. Empowerment of students

Empowerment of students describes the extent to which school has developed structures and procedures that enabled students to develop a sense of responsibility and self disciplined culture. This element has one standard and five indicators. The indicators are: student participation in decision making process, gender equality of students to participate in school leadership, integration of reproductive health and other issues related to family life education in school programs, students' behavioral change and students' demonstration in acceptable sense of responsibility in the teaching-learning process and bear self-confidence and enjoy freedom (MoE, 2011b).

According to Nuthall (2007) it is difficult for school leaders to create an environment conducive to enhancing self-worth of students unless they examine and understand similarities and differences between teachers' and students' understandings and perceptions of the impact of various classroom interactions. Liu and Breit (2013) contend that influential high-impact educational practices are characterized by students experiencing diversity, reflecting and integrating learning, and discovering relevance of learning through real-world applications.

2.3.3. Student support

According to MoE (2011b), student support describes the extent to which school has favorable environment , secure, safe supportive and meets the needs of students which enabled them to attain successful performance outcome and students with special needs have been able to score successful accomplishment due to equal learning opportunities and special support provided for their talents. This element has two standards and twelve indicators. In the first standard, the indicators are top priority given to improve performance of students, equal opportunity for students, provision of all rounded support to students, implementation of system that brings self confidence of female students, safe and secure environment, budget allocation and utilization for students' health and safety, and school's rules of procedures.

In the second standard, the indicators are integration of special needs education in Continuous Professional Development (CPD) program, implementation of special needs education program, successful performance of special need students in their education, satisfaction of students in special need education program, and class room arrangement in a cost effective manner to suit the use of students with special needs are indicators for the school to be conducive for learning (MoE, 2011b). Schools should give special attention in identification of the needs of students who deserve special support (Abiy, 2012). One of the most effective measures for keeping schools safe and secure includes the development of school safety plans and prevention programs that support students' healthy social and emotional development (Kingshott and Mckenzie, 2013).

Sustainable school improvement requires support in all levels of learning organization and capacity building within the school's staff (Lambert, 2003). School leaders should consult health and social care professionals, pupils and parents to ensure that the needs of children with medical conditions are effectively supported (Davis, 2000). When schools help students feel a sense of support, respect and belonging, students have a stronger desire to learn (Duncan, 2013). It is fundamental to acknowledge that student welfare is the responsibility of school leaders working in a whole school context. Each teacher has a vital role as a source of support and determinant of success for students. The most significant amount of students' time, apart

from family, is spent with teachers who are often the most important adult connection – the first contact point for many issues and services (Johnston, 2001).

To sum up, school environment has relation with students' behavior and achievement. When the environment became conducive and well facilitated with the necessary facilities, it supports positively students learning, behavior and achievement. A positive school environment creates an optimal setting for teaching and learning. On the other hand, when the environment is not conducive and less facilitated, they contribute negatively for the learning, behavior and achievement of students (Solomon, 2014).

2.4. Roles of School Leaders in Creating a Conducive School Environment

Effective school leaders recognize the potential they have to create a school environment where teachers thrive and students achieve their greatest potential in a safe and nurturing school setting (Cowan and Vaillancourt, 2013). Two of the most important roles of school leaders are their monitoring and evaluation of their school's performance. The performance of school can be expressed as the output of the school, which in turn is measured in terms of the average achievement of the pupils at the end of formal schooling (Jaap Scheeres, 2000). Ineffective School leaders are insufficiently informed about the day-to-day running of their schools and depend too heavily upon the head for information on how the school is performing (Earley and Weindling (2004).

School leaders have a vital role in shaping the culture of a school, the vision for student wellbeing and unexpected behaviors (harassment, discrimination and violence). Teachers and schools leaders can also provide opportunities for students to have a voice in developing policies and programs (Rigby, 2010). School leaders have a responsibility to ensure students are safe within the school and broader online learning environments (Fuller, 2009). According to Leslie (2000), the role of school leaders are creating a context conducive to change (culture, the relationships of people within and outside of the school, resources, local, state, and Federal Policies and Rules, demographics, and the physical facilities); developing and communicating

the vision; planning and providing resources; investing in professional development; monitoring and checking progress and, continuing to give assistance.

Researches on school leadership affects has revealed a number of leadership practices that are particularly conducive to enhancing student learning. These show that certain leadership practices are associated with measurable improvements in student learning. This report identifies four major domains of responsibility as key tasks for school leadership to improve students' learning within their schools supporting and developing teacher quality, defining goals and measuring progress, strategic resource management and collaboration with external partner (Pont et al., 2008).

In line with the above idea, school leaders shall give special attention to the following core points: creating a favorable school environment where students can learn in a stable condition and gain high satisfaction whereby effectuating the learning-teaching activity; guiding teachers and staff to positive school vision so that students would be able to acquire the future bright hope and develop their potential; developing the professional development of all teachers and staff and identifying the training needs of the management and the school community (MoE, 2011a).

2.4.1. Building school leadership capacity

Leadership capacity means broad-based, skillful participation in the work of leadership. By "broad-based" It means that if the principal, a vast majority of the teachers, and large numbers of parents and students are all involved in the work of leadership, then the school will most likely have a high leadership capacity that achieves high student performance (Linda, 2003). In order for the leadership of a school plays its roles effectively it should be empowered (Mulatu and Teketel, 2014). Without high-quality, skilled, and sustainable leadership at the school, district, and policy-making levels, the transformation of public schools will not occur (Fran and Gaddy, 2001). Leadership capacity in schools requires "broad-based, skillful participation in the work of leadership (Lambert, 2003).

2.4.2. Shared vision resulting in program coherence

For school to be conducive for learning, a broad-based, shared sense of leadership must be alive in the school community. Building the capacity of many — teachers, parents, and students, as well as superintendents, principals, and school board members — to engage in leading reform efforts is critical (Stephen, 2009). A shared vision based upon the core values of participants and their hopes for the school ensures commitment to its realization. Realizing a shared purpose or vision is an energizing experience for participants, and a shared vision is the unifying force for participants working collaboratively (Linda, 2003).

The quality of leadership can make a difference between a school which struggles and one which strives for the highest levels of attainment, between a school where pupils and staff are pulling in different directions and one where everyone collaborates and works towards a shared purpose (Coles and Southworth, 2002). The school leadership should design a clear vision for the school and it has to work in collaboration with the school community; and it should formulate directives and move to the vision (MoE, 2011a).

2.4.3. Broad involvement and collaboration reflected in roles and actions

School leaders should communicate and collaborate with families to address the health and safety needs of individual students (Bluestein, 2001). Collaboration and the expansion of roles lead to a sense of collective responsibility for all the students in the school, the broader school community, and the education profession as a whole. When working together, they form a concentration of leadership that is a powerful force in a school (Linda, 2003). Through their participation in professional organizations, school leaders can take agency over workforce policy issues and contribute to shaping the conditions in which they work (Pont et al., 2008). Safe and successful learning environments are fostered through collaboration among school staff and community-based service providers while also integrating existing initiatives in the school (Garcia, 2003).

For effective leadership, intellectual abilities of a leader are not essential. Rather, effective leadership requires a leader's good networking with the people concerned in different areas; this may be relationships with teachers, members of governing body and other staff. In governing an institution, we need the cooperation of people working at different stages (Salahuddin, 2009). In support of this idea, change will require strong leaders - those who can build, maintain, and strengthen collaborative relationships within schools and outside of schools (Fran and Gaddy, 2001). One of the most important keys to the success of a school leader is the relationship he or she establishes with his or her staff. Importantly, relationships are the lifeblood of the school community; and help translate aspirations into experiences and are the single most powerful signifiers of communication and culture (Gelsthorpe and West-Burnham, 2003).

The school improvement literature has consistently underlined the importance of school community involvement in decision-making processes and the contribution of strong collegial relationships to positive school environment. It has been shown that effective schools have tighter congruence between values, norms and behaviors of principals and teachers and that this is more likely to result in positive school performance (Christopher and Pamel, 2013). There must be meaning full involvement of school leaders in the in school improvement evaluation process. The active participation of the school community is the major one. School improvement plan will be more successful with the cooperation of principals, teachers, student council and other groups/parents and the other members of the community (MoE, 2011a). Among leadership roles which the secondary school leaders play to build school culture, collaboration was better performed than other roles (Mengistu, 2014)

2.5.4. Professional development of School Leaders

CPD plays a great role in order to create safe and conducive school environment for teaching and learning process. High quality and continuing professional development is critical to creating and maintaining safe and supportive learning environments (Andrie, 2007).

Professional development designs that attend to school leaders incorporates activities of Surfacing (what do we currently believe and do?) of ideas, assumptions, histories, and prior knowledge; engaging in inquiry (what new knowledge can we generate?) (e.g., examining student work, conducting action research and observations, and reading and discussing recent research); entering into dialogue and reflection that we can understand (how do we make sense of prior assumptions and practice in light of what we now know?) (Linda, 2003). To support this idea, reflection, inquiry, and dialogue are the three most critical skill dimensions for improving schools (Martinez, 2001). To bring changes in schools, enabling school leaders was necessary. Even though it was necessary, secondary school leaders were not supported to cope with in changing local and global environment, including profession through continuous training and development was not given to them and which affect their performance in bringing school progress (Markos, 2011).

2.5. Tasks of School Leaders in Creating a Conducive School Environment

Efforts to improve school climate, safety, and learning are not separate endeavors and must be designed, funded, and implemented as a comprehensive school-wide approach. For creating safe and successful schools, school leaders should integrate services through collaboration, improve access to school-based mental health supports; integrate school safety and crisis/emergency prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery; balance physical and psychological safety; employ effective, positive school discipline; allow for the consideration of context; and acknowledge that sustainable and effective improvement takes patience and commitment (cowan and vaillancourt, 2013).

2.5.1. Building respectful and safe school

School leaders should ensure that the learning environment is healthy and safe; provide opportunities for students to engage in that promote a positive school climate and benefit the greater community; monitor and supervise all areas of the school to ensure the health and safety of all students, staff, families and visitors; create personalized and nurturing learning environments take immediate action to identify and address all acts of mean-spirited words

and actions including, but not limited to name calling, teasing, exclusion, harassment and bullying behaviors (Dart, 2006).

School leaders should, send clear and consistent messages to students regarding their individual responsibility to behave responsibly and respectfully toward others, enforce rules fairly and consistently and provide opportunities to develop and foster ethical reasoning, self-control and a generalized respect for others, maintain school environments that are welcoming and friendly (Bluestein, 2001). In support of this, school leaders' most important role is to be a culture builder who instills the values of concern for others, personal and group success, and continuous improvement (Mengistu, 2014).

2.5.2. Involve participatory school environment

To foster participatory school environment, school leaders should involve teachers, students, parents and community members in decision making in order to create opportunities for contribution and responsibility (Davis, 2000). Moreover, school leaders are responsible in organizing school events which highlight the value of social and cultural diversity; mobilizing the support of the community to secure learning environments; establishing a secure and confidential office system for filing, recording and reporting cases of violence in school settings; ensuring parents participate in school committees and in monitoring the safety of their children's school environment; and ensuring boys and girls are represented and actively participate in school committees (Andrés, 2007).

2.5.3. Ensuring physical security features of School

School leaders should employ environmental design techniques, such as ensuring that playgrounds and sports fields are surrounded by fences or other natural barriers, to limit visual and physical access by non-school personnel (Hunter, 2006). To promote the effective use of identified resources and strategies to address the physical and mental health needs of students and staff, school leaders are expected to allocate and utilize resources, including technology, to support student learning; supervise and evaluate all staff (MoE, 2013).

2.5.4. Ensure school rules and regulations

To enhance nurturing learning environment, school leaders are responsible to enforce rules fairly and consistently and provide opportunities to develop and foster ethical reasoning, self-control and a generalized respect for others(Moswela, 2004).To lead and manage school operations and resources, principals ensure that rules and regulations are consistently applied; communicate and reinforce rules and regulations to staff, student and parents; examine and modify routines, as needed, to ensure safety for all, treat all students, staff, parents and community members with respect; establish and reinforce rules, guidelines and operational procedures that enable staff to focus on teaching and learning (MoE, 2013).

2.6. Factors affecting School Leaders in Creating a Conducive School

Environment

School is very complex that it might be hindered by various impediments that challenge in order to make conducive for learning (Stoll and Fink, 1996). Leadership is a very important and a critical ingredient in the process of improving school performance. However, leadership challenges identified are resource, capacity, and management related and attitudinal. More specifically, lack of support, absence of incentives, lack of commitment, and lack of understanding, occupied with routine activities, failure to integrate school communities, weak collaboration of stakeholders and high expectation of parents identified as highest factors (Mulatu and Teketel, 2014). In support of this, there are barriers of challenges in schools that hindered the members of the schools from creating the good and healthy school cultures. Some of these are lack of understanding, lack of collaboration among the members of the school, external pressure and lack of support from community and district; and lack of good governance (Idris, 2012).

2.6.1. Leadership competency related factors

Learning can become more pleasant and effective if the school environment is more conducive and welcoming than hostile. This situation could be linked to the absence of the necessary

leadership skills and appropriate leadership styles. Even though there may be other factors contributing to this situation, one major factor that could be responsible is the school leaders' lack of the necessary leadership skills and appropriate leadership styles (Moswela, 2004).

According to Abiy (2014), schools encountered challenges in creating safe and healthy school environment as per SIP blue print due to lack of awareness of the school leaders; and principals are often laid off and replaced by new ones. Professional knowledge, skill and attitude have great impact on the achievement of organizational goals and objectives and lack of skills will create an obstacle to principals (MoE, 2005). In support of this, underperforming staff is an early challenge that requires decisive and consistent action (Fidler and Atton, 2004).

Lack of understanding was created by school leaders due to low level of interest to conceptualize school environment and changing and re-changing of guidelines by top educational officials (Mulatu and Teketel, 2014). Low understanding and awareness of school leaders regarding to policy documents and guide lines to support effective school safety leads to unsafe learning school environments (Cowan and Vaillancourt, 2013). The actions of students within classrooms and the creation of safe and productive learning environment are important for many schools and can be a challenging dimension of school leaders (Liu and Breit, 2013).

2.6.2. Management related factors

Pont et al. (2008) identified the following factors as challenges to school leaders in an attempt to improve quality education: school autonomy, accountability for outcomes, role expansion, role overload, insufficient preparation and training, and lack of clarity about the core roles of school leadership. Sungtong (2007) on his part identified three major challenges that school leaders face during school improvement: restructuring school administration and management system, financial management related and parental expectation and relation. One of the main challenges expected during ESDP IV was further improvement of the effectiveness of the educational administration at all levels, through capacity development and the creation of motivational work environments (MoE, 2010).

Less commitment of school leaders and fail to integrate implementation activities, the lack of commitment of teachers was manifested by failure to solve implementation related problems. Teachers push every piece of problem, upward and seek ready-made solutions from the school leadership. School leaders claim for the provision of incentives and the less effort of all concerned in creating awareness on the essence of the quality learning (Mulatu and Tekete, 2014). Effective school leaders recognize the potential they have to create a school environment where teachers thrive and students achieve their greatest potential in a safe and nurturing school setting (Johnston, 2001).

2.6.3. Support related factors

A strong support system is required for making the school environment conducive. The present study show the lack of support from all concerned stakeholders, mainly delays in the release of school block grants from governmental bodies (Mulatu and Teketel, 2014). In support of this, developing partnerships beyond the school to encourage parental support for learning and new learning opportunities are among the challenges facing school leaders for effective school improvement (Christopher and Pamel, 2013). Increased involvement of families and communities in school improvement activities and decreased gaps in the continuum of student support activities were problematic in secondary schools (Bluestein, 2001). Low support from top level officials and lack of involvement of the stakeholders are challenges facing school leaders (MoE, 2007b).

In order to make school improvement effective, the resources made available by the educational context are very important. Without these, schools are likely to experience difficulties in their improvement efforts (Stoll et al., 2005). Bell et al. (2003), also suggest that, in South Africa the initiatives of school improvement were faced by lack of material resources. Because of lack of facilities and organization problems, schools are not as such attractive and conducive for learning (Kifle and Tariku, 2014). In line with these, educational resources or inputs that run school forward for improvement are the highest challenges facing school leaders (Mulatu and Teketel, 2014). Therefore, the capacity of a school to grapple with

the problem of designing school-wide assessment policies and procedures is dependent on the resources available in the wider educational environment (Cheung and Evers, 2001).

The main constraints and challenges identified during review of ESDP IV implementation include: In most regions learning materials development was a challenge due to lack of budget, limited capacity among facilitators and facilitator trainers – and most did not have facilitators' guides or handbooks for learners due to budget constraints or ineffective resource allocation by regions (MoE, 2015).

In general, to promote the effective use of identified resources and strategies to address the physical and mental health needs of students and staff, school leaders are expected to allocate and utilize resources, including technology, to support student learning; supervise and evaluate all staff (MoE, 2013). School environment has relation with students' behavior and achievement. When the environment became conducive and well facilitated with the necessary facilities, it supports positively students learning, behavior and achievement. A positive school environment creates an optimal setting for teaching and learning (Solomon, 2014). On the other hand, physical environment of schools, students' responsibility and right, and other essential considerations of the school environment are vital in creating conducive school environment (Abiy, 2014).

3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. Description of the Research Site

North Shoa Zone is one of the 18 Zones in Oromia Regional State, where the capital of the zone, Fitcha is 112 Km North of Addis Ababa. The Zone shares boundary with Amhara Regional State in the North and East; Addis Ababa city to the South; and South West Shoa Zone in the South and Western part of the country. The Zone had 13 Woredas and 1 City administration in which there were 38 secondary schools. There are one Teachers Training College, 12 preparatory school and 853 primary schools in the Zone. According to 2015 Zonal report, the total population of the Zone was 1,427,600 of which 714,662 were males and 712,938 were females. Climatic condition of the Zone was categorized mainly into lowest lands of tropical, medium temperate and temperate zone. Regarding to socio-economic activities, almost all the population of rural area of Woredas in the Zone were homogenous in which their life depends on farming different types of crops like teff, wheat, beans and other non cash crops.

3.2. Research Design

In this study, descriptive survey method was employed. This research design was required because it aims to describe the current phenomena of the study. It helps to gather data at particular points in terms of the intensions of describing the nature of existing condition, or identifying standards against which existing condition can be compared or determined the relationship that exist between specific event (Jose and Gonzales, 2002).

Hence, such method was appropriate for the researcher to collect opinion of respondents regarding information about school leaders' efforts in creating conducive school environment for learning in General Secondary Schools of North Shoa Zone. Besides, it helps to draw valid conclusion about the events of target population. It also enabled him to gather data within a short period of time with minimum cost from wider area.

3.3. Sources of Data

For this study, two main types of data were used. These were primary sources of data and secondary sources of data.

3.3.1. Primary sources of data

The primary sources of data were teachers, SIC members, supervisors, PTA heads and observation checklist.

3.3.2. Secondary sources of data

The secondary sources of data for this study were the data that were collected through document analysis from school improvement plan, school budget plan, school facility plan, school guidelines, co-curricular activities, school minutes, school attendances, school reports and records, training manuals, and portfolios.

3.4. Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

According to 2015 North Shoa Zone Educational Bureau report, there were 38 secondary schools (9-10) distributed over 13 woredas and 1 City administration. Each woreda or City administration had two or more secondary schools. The total numbers of teachers in these schools were 895, of which 718 were males and 177 females. Each woreda and town administration had 1 secondary school supervisor to provide the school with continuous educational delivery support. Each school has 1 principal but, not all schools have vice principals due to limited number of students.

In this study, to select sample Woreda from 13 woredas and 1 City administration, 4 (31%) woredas namely Yaya Gulele, Hidebu Abote, Wuchale and Kuyu were selected by simple random sampling technique in order to provide equal chance for each woreda to be selected due to woredas in the zone were homogenous in socio- economic activities, and 1(100%) City

administrative (Fiche) was sampled purposively. The reason for its selection purposively is due to the City is serving as a center for the Zone.

In the sampled woredas including Fitcha City administrative, there were 14 Secondary schools. To select representative sample schools from each Woreda, first schools were stratified into newly established (below seven years) and school served above seven years. Thus, from each two strata, one secondary school was selected by simple random sampling techniques except Fitcha City administrative in order to have manageable size of sample secondary schools. Hence, 8 (66.7%) secondary schools were selected from four sampled Woredas and 2(100%) secondary schools were selected purposively from Fitcha City administrative; because they are found at the center on the Zone. Therefore, from the 14 secondary schools of sample woredas including Fitcha City administrative, 10 (71.4%) secondary schools were included in the study in order to secure manageability of the sample and representative secondary schools in the Zone.

The respondents of the study were selected using random and non- random sampling techniques. Depend on these; the researcher used availability sampling technique for selecting school supervisors, PTA heads and SICS members. This sample was engaged due to these respondents have detail and relevant information about the issues under the study. So, 5 supervisors, 10 PTA heads and 73 SIC members were sampled. In the SIC, since students were found as members and most schools in the Zone prefer from student council as a member of SIC, student council heads were included for the purpose of this study. In the school having vice principal, he or she was included in SIC members in secondary schools of the Zone.

Lastly, to select sample teachers, the researcher employed stratified random sampling technique. Since numbers of teachers in each school were not equal and have no the same experiences, the selections of teachers were done through stratified random sampling technique to allow all population groups to be represented in the final sample. The total population of the teachers was stratified according to their experience in their respective schools. Thus, researcher engaged three strata: 1 to 5 years, 5 to 11 years, and above 11 years

experience. Then, from strata 1-5 years, 5-11 years and above 11 years; 35, 36 and 36 teachers selected by proportional random sampling technique respectively.

Table 1. Population, sample size and sampling techniques

No	Schools	Teachers			SIC members		PTA heads		Supervisors	
		P	S	%	P	S	P	S	P	S
1	Fital	26	8	30	8	8	1	1	1	1
2	Dire Dalati	26	8	30	7	7	1	1		
3	General Taddesse Biru	55	16	30	8	8	1	1	1	1
4	Alemgena	11	4	30	6	6	1	1		
5	Muka Turi	33	10	30	7	7	1	1	1	1
6	Ginbuchu	21	6	30	6	6	1	1		
7	Gerbegurecha	78	23	30	9	9	1	1	1	1
8	Biriti	11	4	30	7	7	1	1		
9	Abdisa Aga	71	21	30	8	8	1	1	1	1
10	Fitche No 2	24	7	30	7	7	1	1		
	Total	356	107	30	73	73	10	10	5	5
	Sampling Techniques	Stratified Sampling Techniques			Availability		Availability		Availability	

Total P=444 Total S=195 Total %=44 P =population S =Sample %=percent

3.5. Data Collection Instruments

The choice of data collection method was determined by the needs of a given research project and research design in particular by the research questions confronted. Thus, to obtain the necessary data and information regarding basic questions of the study, questionnaires, interview guide questions, document analysis, and observation checklist were employed to obtain the necessary data.

3.5.1. Questionnaire

In order to gather the appropriate information regarding the study, close and open-ended questionnaire was set and distributed to teachers and SIC members to gather the relevant information both quantitatively and qualitatively in light of the research questions and the literature reviewed for the study. The questionnaire was adapted from SIP frame work. The questionnaires included general information about the study, back ground information of respondents, items regarding to extent to which school environment was conducive for learning, extent to which school leaders are exerting their efforts and factors affecting them in creating a conducive school environment for learning in Secondary Schools of North Shoa Zone.

The validity and reliability of instruments were checked by pilot testing in order to standardize questionnaires for the current study. The purpose of pilot test is to examine the quality or the appropriateness of the prepared instruments. Therefore, the clarity of the items to the respondents and the adequacy of time to respond the items were evaluated. Based on the pilot results items which have problems was amended. This was applied on peoples who are not from the sample and consultation of seniors.

The researcher conducted pilot test outside of the sampling schools of North Shoa Zone secondary schools. So, the pilot test was conducted on Hambiso secondary school by selecting 13 teachers by simple random sampling techniques and 9 SIC members by available sampling techniques. The reliability of the questionnaire was checked through Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The obtained result for alpha was 0.87. The observed correlation coefficient was a good indicator of the internal consistency of the items (See appendix C). Supporting this result, Kouze and Posner (2002) stated that the reliability coefficient higher than 0.7, indicate that an instrument is reliable.

Based on the pilot test and comments given, sequences of the items, vague questions and confusing items were modified and restructured to make the questionnaire clear and ready for the final study. Then the standardized questionnaire was distributed to 107 teachers and 73

SIC members in order to collect the required research data. The questionnaires were dully filled and completed by all respondents. In most cases, the questionnaires were filled out on face-to-face bases (in the presence of on the site the researcher oriented and clarified unclear items for the respondents). For SIC members, the questionnaires were prepared first in English and later on translated into “Afan Oroma” by expertise. This is mainly because to make the questionnaires more clear for those respondents who were unable to understand English and to make it simple.

3.5.2. Interview guide

If interview is conducted well it could produce in depth data not possible with a questionnaire and cross check the findings from the questionnaire. With this in mind, semi-structured interview was conducted with 5 supervisors and 10 PTA heads of secondary schools exhaustively with patience. Because, they have detail and relevant information about school environment and are front school leaders. Interview was conducted in Afan Oromo language and the researcher recorded the respondents manually by taking note. Then after the record data were categorized based on similarities of responses and then translated into English version by an expert for analysis and discussion.

3.5.3. Document review

The document review was undertaken by analyzing school improvement plans whether the plans were prepared properly and addressed a conducive learning school environment for learning or not. School budget plan, school facility plan, co-curricular activities, school guide lines, school minutes, school attendance, school reports and records, in staff training manuals and portfolios were analyzed.

3.5.4. Observation

To triangulate the findings, the researcher employed observation as data gathering tool as per the checklist adapted from SIP manuals to observe the natural settings in secondary schools.

3.6. Procedures of Data Collection

The researcher first provided recommendation letter obtained from Haramaya University and discuss in face to face discussion with heads of woreda education office, school principals, and supervisors of each sample school to introduce the purpose of the study in order to facilitate conditions for cooperation to collect data. Next to this, the researcher arranged time and place to get the identified sample respondents. Before distributing the questionnaire, necessary information about the research objectives was provided for the sample respondents by researcher.

Then, questionnaires were distributed for sample respondents in the respective schools by the help of unit leaders and some other volunteer teachers. The participants were encouraged to increase the return rate. After questionnaires were filled by respondents, all copies of questionnaires were returned. With regard to interview, the researcher contacted with the sample respondents to facilitate suitable environment for interview. The researcher made face to face interview with 5 supervisors and 10 PTA heads of secondary schools for 40 seconds each respondent. Documents were reviewed and analyzed based on checklist prepared for this purpose. For observation, a check list was first prepared and observation was employed by the researcher by taking note under the guidance of school principals of sampled secondary schools.

3.7. Methods of Data Analysis

To analyze the data of the study, the researcher gathered all the information from the completed questionnaires, interviews, documents and observation both qualitatively and quantitatively. The data gathered through questionnaires were tailed and tabulated appropriately. The Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) software version 20 for windows was employed for data analysis. To analyze the tabulated data and arrive at conclusions, appropriate statistical tools such as frequency counts, percentages, mean score, average weighted mean, and independent sample t-test at $\alpha = 0.05$ was employed.

Descriptive statistics such as frequency and percentage were used to analyze about the background information of the respondents. Independent sample t-test was also used to investigate statistical significance mean differences between the two groups (teachers and SIC members; because they were familiar about school settings during SIP implementation) opinion for rating each item level of agreement; and in such cases as Kothari (2004) recommends, t-test is preferably used.

The calculated t-value was compared against the table value (1.96) at 178 degree of freedom and ($\alpha = 0.05$) confidence interval. When the calculated value is equal or greater than the table value, the difference between respondent groups was considered as statistically significant. Finally, the data that collected through open ended questions, interview guided, and document review, and observation were analyzed qualitatively by using narration.

3.8. Ethical Considerations

In social science research, ethical considerations are critical when researching people or animals. The ethical issues include: known benefits and risk of participant involvement in the research, exact description of the information to be delivered to the subjects of the study, when appropriate, indicate any special incentives of treatment that human subjects would receive through their participation in the study, indicate how the data collected in the study would be kept secured and confidential, discuss the procedure for informed consent by the study participants where applicable. Also anonymity, respect for the subjects, kindness and justice, whether the objectives of the study were ethically achievable, and the ethical soundness of the methods was considered by the researcher.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter deals with presentation and discussion of data obtained through questionnaires, interviews, and document review and observation checklist. The chapter is divided into five parts. The first part presents and deals with the characteristics of respondents. The second part discusses about the extent to which secondary school environments are conducive for learning. The third part discusses about the extent to which school leaders exert their efforts in creating conducive school environment for learning. The fourth part deals with factors affecting school leaders in creating conducive school environment for learning.

4.1. Background Information

All respondents of selected secondary schools were asked to indicate their background information in the questionnaire. Responses on their sex, age, and educational qualification, work experience in year, position, and trainings were summarized as indicated in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Background information of the respondents

No	Characteristics		Respondents									
			Teachers		PTA heads		SIC members		Supervisors		Total	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Sex	Male	75	70.1	10	100	55	75.3	5	100	145	74.4
		Female	32	29.9	-	-	18	24.7	-	-	50	25.6
		Total	107	100	10	100	73	100	5	100	195	100
2	Age	20-29 year	36	33.6	-	-	25	34.2	-	-	61	31.3
		29-40years	51	47.7	-	-	35	47.9	5	100	91	46.7
		40-50years	20	18.7	10	100	13	17.8	-	-	43	22
		50 and above	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	Educational qualification	certificate	-	-	2	20	2	2.7	-	-	4	2.1
		Diploma	-	-	2	20	7	9.6	-	-	9	4.6
		1 st degree	92	86	1	10	28	38.4	5	100	126	64.6
		Masters degree	15	14	-	-	5	6.8	-	-	20	10.3
		Any other	-	-	5	50	31	42.5	-	-	36	18.4
4	work Experience	≤ 5 years	18	16.8	1	10	19	26	-	-	38	19.5
		6-12 years	32	29.9	-	-	9	12.3	4	80	45	23.1
		12-17 years	30	28.0	-	-	36	49.3	1	20	67	34.3
		≥ 18 years	27	25.2	9	90	9	12.3	-	-	45	23.1
5	Experience in this school	1-5 years	35	32.7	2	20	23	31.5	-	-	60	30.1
		5-11 years	36	33.6	1	10	26	35.6	3	60	66	33.8
		11 years and above	36	33.6	7	70	24	33.8	2	40	69	35.3
6	Position	Teaching staff	107	100	-	-	10	13.7	-	-	117	60
		Principal	-	-	-	-	10	13.7	-	-	10	5.1
		Vice principal	-	-	-	-	10	13.7	-	-	10	5.1
		Student council	-	-	-	-	10	13.7	-	-	10	5.1
		supervisor	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	100	5	2.6
		Any other	-	-	10	100	33	45.2	-	-	43	22.1
7	Trainings	Leadership	-	-	-	-	3	4.1	-	-	3	1.5
		SIP	24	22.4	-	-	18	24.6	4	80	46	23.5
		TDP	19	17.7	-	-	10	13.7	1	20	30	15.3
		Others	64	59.8	10	100	42	57.6	-	-	116	59.5

- N=Number of Respondents, %=Percentage.

As indicated in table 2, 75 (70.1%) of teachers were male and 32(29.9%) of teachers were female. This revealed that most teachers in secondary schools were male and number of female teachers in secondary schools of the Zone is low. Similarly, 10 (100%) of PTA heads, 55 (75.3%) of SIC members and 5(100%) of supervisors were male where as only 18 (24.7%) of SIC members were female. This showed most respondents, 145(74.4%), in secondary school were male. So, female respondents were low and not equally participated as male.

Regarding to the age of respondents, 91 (46.7%) of respondents were aged between 29-40 years. This implies most respondents were youngsters. This can affect learning environment positively. Because, they were productive age group in creating conducive environment for learning.

When we see the educational background of the respondents, 92 (86%) of teachers were first degree holders. Whereas, the rest 15(14%) of them were master degree holders. As per MoE policy, a desired qualification of teachers for secondary schools is first degree holders. Therefore, teachers in secondary schools were qualified to the standard and above. Except PTA heads, the SIC members were significant to the level of first degree holders. However only 5(6.8%) of the total SIC members were master degree holders. This implies a few principal and vice principal in SIC members were master degree holders. But according to MoE policy, they should have master degree to lead secondary schools. As presented in ESDP V, during ESDP IV percentage of secondary schools with qualified school leaders in masters degree was low (MoE, 2015). Therefore, this negatively affects school leaders' effectiveness and efforts to create conducive school environment for learning in secondary schools.

When we see the work experience of the respondents, 18 (16.8%) of teachers, 1(10%) of PTA heads, 19(26%) of SIC members and none of supervisors had an experience of less than 5 years. On the other hand, 27 (25.2%) of teachers, 9 (90%) of PTA heads, 9 (12.3%) of SIC members and none of supervisors were experienced greater than 18 years. The rest 112 (57.4%) of respondents, were ranged between 6-17 years experience. This implies most of the respondents were experienced enough to run school activity functions. From the total respondents, 69 (35.3%) of them have an experience greater than 11 years in their respective

schools. Thus, most of the respondents were experienced enough and had awareness about their school nature and culture.

Regarding to position assignment of respondents, 107 (100%) of teachers were teaching staff. 10 (100%) of PTA heads were selected from community and they lead as head of PTA members in secondary schools. In the SIC members, 10 (13.7%) of teaching staff, 10(13.7%) Principal, 10 (13.7%) Vice principal, 10 (13.7%) student's councils were included. The others, 33(45.2%), had other positions in their respective sites. On the other hand 5(100%) of supervisors were served as supervision function to support secondary schools.

According to item 7 of table 2, 24(22.4%) and 19(17.7%) of teachers were trained in SIP and TDP respectively. But, only 18(24.6%) and 10(13.7%) of SIC members were trained in SIP and TDP respectively. Similarly, 4 (80%) and 1(20%) of supervisors were trained in SIP and TDP respectively. As presented in ESDP V, during ESDP IV percentage of secondary schools satisfied with their CPD program was low (MoE, 2015). Only 3 (4.1%) of SIC members were trained in leadership. Hence, this has implication that school leaders didn't get appropriate trainings for school activity function in order to create conducive learning environment in secondary schools.

4.2. Extent School Environment Conducive for Learning

Teachers and SIC members were asked to respond their level of agreement to what extent secondary school environment was conducive for learning. Based on the responses of teachers and SIC members indicated in tables 3 to 5, the responses was discussed accordingly as follows.

Each item was designed in the form of five rating scales. These are strongly disagree, undecided (moderate), agree and strongly agree. The values given were 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively. Thus, the average mean score is 3.00. In the interpretation, effort was put to show that what the mean score indicates. As forwarded by Fowler (1996), the result obtained from the score was interpreted as following. If $1.00 \leq \text{mean score} \leq 1.49$, it was interpreted as

highly disagreed, if $1.50 \leq \text{mean score} \leq 2.49$, it was interpreted as disagree, if $2.50 \leq \text{mean score} \leq 3.49$, it was interpreted as agreed in average/moderate, if $3.50 \leq \text{mean score} \leq 4.49$, it was interpreted as agree. If the mean score was ≥ 4.50 , it was interpreted as strongly agree.

Table 3: Teachers' and SIC members' views toward the extent to what school environment was conducive for learning regarding school facilities.

No	Items	Respondents	Mean	Total	SD	T	P
				mean			
1	My school has secured fence and attractive premises that enabled students to attend class regularly.	Teachers SIC members	3.14 3.47	3.30	1.39	-1.55	0.12
2	Favorable classroom contexts have enhanced students' learning motivation.	Teachers SIC members	2.46 2.42	2.44	1.32	0.16	0.86
3	My school has standard teaching-learning aides and materials which contribute to successful learning – teaching process (laboratory, library, pedagogical center, teachers' resting room, sport field etc.).	Teachers SIC members	2.31 2.36	2.33	1.14	0.26	0.78
4	School community benefited from adequate access to standard toilets particularly designated for ladies and gentles together with water facilities, which satisfied users; and behavioral changes have been observed.	Teachers SIC members	2.75 2.79	2.77	1.42	-0.21	0.83
5	My school has facilitated access and use of complete information and commutation technology for teaching purposes (plasma, computer, internet access, etc).	Teachers SIC members	2.36 2.47	2.42	1.26	-0.57	0.56
		Grand mean	2.65		1.31		

- No significance difference at $\alpha = 0.05$, SD = Standard Deviation. T = calculated t-value. P = p-value (sig. 2-tailed)

In item 1 of table 3, teachers and SIC members were asked to rate, whether their school environment had secured fence and attractive premises that enabled students to attend their class regularly or not. Accordingly, the mean score of the teachers and SIC members were 3.14 and 3.47 respectively. This shows secondary schools had moderate level of secured fence and attractive premises that enabled students to attend their class regularly. The independent sample t-test was employed to test whether there is significance mean difference or not between the responses of the two groups (the teachers and SIC members). However, the average calculated t-value (1.55) was less than the table value and ($P = 0.12 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level, and 178 degree of freedom. So, it is concluded that, there is no significant difference between the responses the two groups. From the analysis of school improvement plan document, students' absenteeism was not significant in all selected schools. According to observation made by the researcher, school fences were somewhat secured in all observed schools.

Regarding to item 2 of table 3, the respondents were asked to rate whether favorable and inspiring classroom contexts have enhanced students' learning motivation in their schools or not. The mean scores of teachers (2.46) and SIC members (2.42) show both the two groups (teachers and SIC members) disagreed to the specified item. Since the calculated t-value (0.16) was less than the table value and ($P=0.86 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of teachers and SIC members.

Majority of the supervisors said that: "*classroom's contexts did not enhance learning motivation of students*". The researcher observed that, classrooms in some schools were not attractive enough to retain students in class regularly. The most prevalent criteria used to define learning environment are probably the physical arrangement of the classroom, discipline and routines, organization of learning activities, and the engagement of students with tasks, among others (Hamre, 2005). According to (Tsigereda, 2014), students are not motivated to sustain their learning encouragement in the teaching learning process.

According to item 3 of table 3, the means score of teachers (2.31) and SIC members (2.36) shows, both teachers and SIC members disagreed to the item specified. The total mean values (2.33) supplement the opinion of both teachers and SIC members. The calculated t-value (0.26) was less than the table value and ($P=0.78 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom. So, there is no significant difference between the responses of teachers and SIC members.

From the review of document analysis of most schools, budget plan did not incorporate appropriate budget for teaching and learning and no school facility plan were available in most selected schools. Most of supervisors replied that “*secondary schools were not facilitated with standard teaching –learning aids and materials; no laboratory furnished with chemicals and apparatus*”. The researcher observed that most secondary schools were not with laboratory at all. Libraries were not standardized and no enough updated reference books were available. These all above, leads to the conclusion that secondary schools has low standard teaching-learning aids and materials which contribute to successful learning – teaching process.

In government sector libraries are not present for teachers and students. Laboratories are essential at secondary school level especially for science students, but in government schools facilities and equipments related to experiments do not exist adequately (Ihuoma, 2008). In support of this, the libraries and laboratories of the schools could not provide the service to students due to lack of attention the administration to assign trained personnel (Abiy, 2012).

In item 4 of table 3, the mean scores (2.75), (2.79) and (2.77) of teachers, SIC members and total mean respectively shows the respondents moderately agreed that school community benefited from adequate access to standard toilets particularly designated for ladies and gents together with water facilities satisfying users. The calculated t-value (0.21) was less than the table value and ($P=0.83 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom. So, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. During conducting interview, one of PTA heads replied that: “*however there were toilets for ladies and gents, no water was available for the toilet purpose alone in secondary schools*”. According to observation made by the researcher, most sample schools had toilets designed for ladies and

gentles. Even though there was tap water, no water facility was designed and available for toilet purpose. Separate latrine by standing alone blocks is very limited, in which case girls are forced to use the same blocks and efforts to facilitate hand washing facilities, including water and soaps, are available in schools (MoE, 2010). Hence, adequate toilet and with water facilities in secondary schools was not designed properly to satisfy users.

As it is revealed in above item 5 of table 3, teachers and SIC members were asked to rate the extent to which access and use of information and commutation technology was facilitated for teaching purposes. The mean score of teachers and SIC members were 2.36 and 2.47 respectively. The two groups disagreed with the specified item. Since the calculated t-value (0.57) was less than the table value and ($P=0.56 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. Hence, the mean scores of the two groups show that secondary school had inadequate facility of access and use of complete information and commutation technology for teaching purposes.

Interview conducted with PTA heads and supervisors revealed that: *“access and use of information and commutation technology were not facilitated adequately, for example computers, plasma and internet services, that aid leaning and teaching”*. From the document review, no adequate budget were planned to facilitate access and use of technology. The observation conducted by the researchers as a supplement indicated that, plasma televisions were not functional and almost no internet services were available in most secondary schools. This shows that there was no adequate access and use of information and communication technology in secondary schools.

Table 4. Teachers' and SIC members' views toward the extent to what school environment was conducive for learning regarding students empowerment.

No	Items	Respondents	Mean	Total mean	SD	T	P
1	There is culture of student participation in decision making process that enhanced students' willingness to take responsibility and self-disciplined culture	Teachers	3.21	3.12	1.24	0.87	0.38
		SIC members	3.04				
2	My school provides opportunity for gender equality of students to participate in school leadership (e.g., clubs)	Teachers	2.32	2.19	0.98	1.23	0.95
		SIC members	2.07				
3	Issues related to family life education have been integrated in my school.	Teachers	2.55	2.46	1.05	1.13	0.26
		SIC members	2.37				
4	Students demonstrated acceptable behavioral change.	Teachers	2.64	2.60	1.14	0.48	0.63
		SIC members	2.56				
5	Students demonstrate acceptable sense of responsibility in the teaching-learning process.	Teachers	3.38	3.34	1.28	0.42	0.67
		SIC members	3.30				
Grand mean			2.74		1.14		

- No significance difference at $\alpha = 0.05$, SD = Standard Deviation. T = calculated t-value. P = p-value (sig. 2-tailed).

In item 1 of table 4, teachers and SIC members were asked to rate the extent to what there was participation of students in decision making process. The mean scores of teachers and SIC members were 3.21 and 3.04 respectively. This shows that both groups agreed moderately to the specified item. The calculated t-value (0.87) is less than the table value and ($P = 0.38 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ and 178 degree of freedom. So, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. One of the respondents in an open ended question forwarded that there was school plan for promotion students' participation in decision making like students' council, parliaments and class meeting. However, the result from their participation in decision making was not tangible.

Interview conducted with PTA heads and supervisors revealed that: “*student’s participation in decision making in secondary schools was moderate*”. Document review of students’ minutes in some school shows, students participated in decision making for progressing school success and discipline culture. Students who are given responsibilities and opportunities to lead and contribute build competencies and self-confidence. The delegation of responsibility signals to students and teachers that their opinions were valuable, and it transmits the expectation that they were capable of problem solvers (Andrés, 2007).

In item 2 of table 4, teachers and SIC members were asked to rate their level of agreement regarding secondary schools provision of opportunity for gender equality of students to participate in school leadership. The mean scores of teachers, SIC members and total mean were (2.32), (2.07) and (2.19), teachers and SIC members disagreed to the item. Since the calculated t-value (1.23) was less than the table value and ($P=0.95 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

During interview conducted with one of the supervisors, he said: “*however there were gender issue club which was working for gender equality in secondary schools, real provision of equal opportunity to participate in school leadership was not significant*”. From document review of co-curricular activities, it was noticed that majority of clubs leaders were male students. The researcher observed nothing when female students were leading class meetings and serve as a class monitor. These all above sum up to show, the extent secondary schools provide opportunity for gender equality of students to participate in school leadership was poor. Providing opportunities for students to engage in activities (clubs, leadership activities, service learning and peer mentoring) that promote a positive school environment and benefit the greater community was challenging in government schools (Robert, 2005). In support of this, students had the right to express their opinion and take part in decision making activities; however, they were not empowered to lead clubs through which co-curricular activities were carried out (Abiy, 2012).

In item 3 of table 4, teachers and SIC members were asked to rate the extent to which issues related to family life education have been integrated in school. The mean score of teachers (2.55) shows, teachers agreed moderately to the specified item. While the mean score of SIC members (2.37) shows, SIC members disagreed with the item. The total mean score (2.46) shows both teachers and SIC disagreed with the item. Since the calculated t-value (1.25) was less than the table value and ($P=0.21 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

As per the document review, no training manuals and documentation related to issues related to family life education, even about HIV/AIDS, were available. One of the respondents during conducting interview replied that: “*experts from woreda health sector give nothing awareness about reproductive health and family life education in secondary schools*”. Hence, issues related to family life education were questionable in secondary schools. Access to school-based mental health services and supports directly improves students’ physical and psychological safety, academic performance, and social–emotional learning. However, no adequate school-employed mental health professionals (school counselors, school psychologists, school social workers, and in some cases, school nurses) were available to ensure that services are high quality, effective, and appropriate to the school context (Wilson, 2003). To sum up, fully enrichment of curriculum with modules on children rights, women’s rights, peace education, tolerance, sexual and gender-based violence, HIV and AIDS and reproductive health were problematic in diversified schools (Duncan, 2013).

Regarding to item 4 of table 4, teachers and SIC members were asked to rate extent students demonstrated acceptable behavioral change. The mean scores of teachers and SIC members were 2.64 and 2.56 respectively. Both the two groups moderately agreed with the specified item. The calculated t-value (0.48) was less than the table value and ($P=0.63 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom. So, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. So, students demonstrated acceptable behavioral change moderately in secondary schools.

From the analysis of school minutes, it was found that some students were forced to bring their parents and advised for their misbehavior. When students believe that their teachers care about them, see them as competent, respect their views and desire their success, they tend to work toward fulfilling those high expectations. Unfortunately, many schools have not fostered such positive student-teacher relationships (Johnston, 2001). This implies that students demonstrated acceptable behavioral change moderately; but not to the high expectation in secondary schools.

In item 5 of table 4, teachers and SIC members were asked to rate their level of agreement regarding to the extent to what students demonstrate acceptable sense of responsibility in the teaching-learning. The mean scores of teachers, SIC members and total mean were (3.38), (3.30) and (3.34), show teachers and SIC members moderately agreed to the item. Since the calculated t-value (0.42) was less than the table value and ($P=0.67 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. During document review of classroom meeting minutes of students, it was found that students raised their responsibility in taking academic risk and teaching- learning process. The involvement and commitment of the whole school community is required to achieve a culture in which safe and respectful schools are everyone's concern and responsibility (Nansel and Overpeck, 2001). Students are not confident enough to share their ideas and accept comments even though their teachers and classmates respect their perceptions (Tsigereda, 2014).

Table 5. Teachers' and SIC members' views toward the extent to what school environment was conducive for learning regarding student support.

<u>N</u>	Items	Respondents	Mean	Total mean	SD	T	P
1	All students have equal opportunities to realize their potential and my school has paid special attention particularly for female students.	Teachers SIC members	2.64 2.67	2.65	0.87	-0.3	0.76
2	My school provides all rounded support to students, which helped to minimize wastage of educational resources.	Teachers SIC members	2.20 2.37	2.28	0.89	-1.11	0.27
3	My school's rules and procedures properly implemented to avoid unacceptable behavior such as hostility, stigma and discrimination, violence, threat, brawling and any other misconduct.	Teachers SIC members	2.37 2.47	2.41	1.02	-0.91	0.36
5	Special needs education has been integrated in continuous professional development (CPD) program	Teachers SIC members	2.51 2.41	2.46	0.98	0.69	0.49
5	The school has implemented special needs education program supported by the provision of trained teachers required for leadership of the program where adequate materials and facilities are fulfilled.	Teachers SIC members	2.03 2.16	2.09	0.71	-1.25	0.21
		Grand mean	2.38		0.98		

- No significance difference at $\alpha = 0.05$, SD = Standard Deviation. T = calculated t-value. P = p-value (sig. 2-tailed).

In item 1 of table 5, teachers and SIC members were asked to rate the extent to which all students were given equal opportunities to realize their potential and schools paid special attention particularly for female students. The mean score of teachers (2.64) and SIC members (2.67) shows, both groups agreed moderately with the item. Since the calculated t-value (1.34) was less than the table value and ($P=0.18 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

Interview conducted with PTA heads and supervisors revealed that: “*there was plan to support and encourage female students to realize their potential in secondary schools and all students were given tutorial to support them*”. Up on document review, attendance of female students given tutorial to support them was available in some schools. The researcher observed when female students were given tutorial lesson in most secondary schools. Education staff served as models and advocated for the equitable treatment of girls and women in school (Duncan, 2013). These all above show equal opportunities were provided for students to realize their potential and special attention particularly for female students were given in secondary schools moderately.

Regarding to item 2 of table 5, the mean scores of teachers, SIC members and total mean were (2.20), (2.37) and (2.28) respectively. This shows both teachers and SIC members disagreed that secondary schools provide all rounded support to students, which helped to minimize wastage of educational resources. Since the calculated t-value (1.11) was less than the table value and ($P=0.27 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. Hence, supports were not given for students to minimize wastage of educational resources. One of the respondents in an open ended item revealed that, educational wastage was significant and the number of students dropped out increases from year to year; the school only report number of students dropped out than to work hard for minimizing it.

During document analysis, secondary schools reports showed that absenteeism and high dropout rate were significant and problematic. The researcher observed that the number of students attending class varies from day to day in secondary schools. Hence, absenteeism was significantly observed which can bring educational wastage. In spite of the efforts made, child-friendly schools did not show progress in reducing dropout and repetition rates over the program years (UNICEF, 2010).

According to item 3 of table 5, both teachers and SIC members were asked to hold their position regarding to proper implementation of school's rules and procedures to avoid

unacceptable behavior. The mean scores of teachers (2.37) and SIC members (2.47) show respondents ratified their position with disagreed to the item. This indicates that the school's rules and procedures were underway. As it is indicated in the above table, calculated t-value (1.38) was less than the table value and ($P=0.17 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom. So, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. One of the respondents from interviewees replied: *"the school does not implement rules and procedures properly per the blue print"*.

The document analysis showed that school guidelines were not available in most secondary schools to regulate schools functions. Children may also be abused and exploited on their way to and from school, either because they are far from the relative safety of the school environment (especially in rural areas) or because of general insecurity in their vicinity. In the latter case, they may fall prey to gang violence, attacks by armed groups or sexual harassment (Saxon, 2005). All schools have been provided with a well-articulated code of conduct to be observed by teachers, students and the school community at large (UNICEF, 2010). These all above show proper implementation of rules and procedures secondary schools was not significantly observed.

In item 4 of table 5, both teachers and SIC members were asked to hold their position regarding to integration of special needs education in CPD program in their school. The mean scores of teachers and SIC members were 2.51 and 2.41 respectively. This shows teachers moderately agreed with the item specified and that of SIC members disagreed. The total mean (2.46) indicates that both teachers and SIC members disagreed in rating the item. Since the calculated t-value (0.69) was less than the table value and ($P=0.49 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. Therefore, special needs education was not integrated in CPD program in secondary schools. During interview conducted, most of the supervisors replied that: *"no practical integration of special need education was observed during CPD works in secondary schools"*. From document analysis, no issue of special needs education in teachers' portfolios. The researcher observed that there were no concerns regarding to special need

education in teachers' portfolio. Hence, these all above show integration of special need education in CPD program in secondary schools was over sighted.

As indicated in item 5 of table 5, both teachers and SIC members were asked to hold their position regarding to implementation of special needs education program supported by the provision of trained teachers required for leadership of the program where adequate materials and facilities are fulfilled in secondary schools. The mean values of teachers (2.03), SIC members (2.16) and total mean (2.09) show both teachers and SIC members disagreed with the specified item. Since the calculated t-value (1.25) was less than the table value and ($P=0.21 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. To an open ended item, one of the respondents revealed that nobody rise, even informally, about special need education program in secondary schools.

One of supervisors seriously replied that: "*no attention was given for special need students*". The researcher observed no trained teachers, materials and facilities facilitated for special need students. As presented in ESDP V, poor school infrastructure, facilities and adapted teaching and learning materials for special need education – along with the absence of standards and guidelines (MoE, 2015). Hence, based on the above arguments, secondary schools didn't implement special needs education program.

Over all, the grand mean scores of teachers and SIC members in rating items with respect to school facilities, students empowerment and students support were (2.65), (2.74) and (2.38) respectively. This shows that secondary school environment was moderately conducive for learning regarding to school facilities and students empowerment. However, the extent to which students were supported in schools was underway in secondary schools. Good students' achievement and behavior requires conducive environment such as healthy, safe, well facilitated, care and support based relationship and participatory environment, so as to let students to achieve the worth learning goals including appropriate academic achievement and behavior. However, schools were unable to manage and properly utilize the necessary facilities

that they have and fail to create harmonious relationship between students and teachers (Solomon, 2014).

4.3. Extent School Leaders Exert their Efforts in Creating a Conducive School Environment for Learning

School leaders should lead and manage school operations and resources. In this case they establish and maintain a safe and secure school environment, create a nurturing learning environment that addresses the physical and mental health needs of all students and staff. Moreover they mobilize, allocate and utilize resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning (MoE, 2013). Fully integrated learning supports (e.g., behavioral, mental health, and social services), instruction, and school management within a comprehensive, cohesive approach facilitates multidisciplinary collaboration (Addinton, 2009). School leaders should strive to increase access to mental health services, increase the number of school employed mental health staff, and ensure that measures to improve school safety balance physical safety with psychological safety (Bluestein, 2001).

Teachers and SIC members respondents were asked to respond their level of agreement about the extent to which school leaders are exerting their effort in creating a conducive school environment for learning. Based on the responses of teachers and SIC members indicated in tables (6), (7), and (8), their responses were discussed accordingly as follows.

Each item was designed in the form of five rating scales. These are very low, low, moderate, high and very high. The values given were 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively. Thus, the average mean score is 3.00. As forwarded by Fowler (1996), in the interpretation, effort was put to show that what the mean score indicates. The result obtained from the score was interpreted as following. If $1.00 \leq \text{mean score} \leq 1.49$, it was interpreted as very low, if $1.50 \leq \text{mean score} \leq 2.49$, it was interpreted as low, if $2.50 \leq \text{mean score} \leq 3.49$, it was interpreted as moderate, if $3.50 \leq \text{mean score} \leq 4.49$, it was interpreted as high. If the mean score was ≥ 4.50 , it was interpreted as very high.

Table 6. Teachers' and SIC members' views to what extent school leaders exert their efforts in creating a conducive school environment regarding to school facilities.

No	Items	Respondents	Mean	Total mean	SD	T	P
To what extents school leaders:							
1	Formulate and communicate a common vision in school to make school environment attractive premises.	Teachers	3.11	3.08	1.23	0.29	0.76
		SIC members	3.05				
2	Prepare school facility plan.	Teachers	1.78	1.72	1.02	0.76	0.45
		SIC members	1.66				
3	Allocate budget for school facilities those aid learning.	Teachers	2.54	2.53	0.97	0.15	0.88
		SIC members	2.52				
4	Endeavor their effort in creating school environment whereby all the necessary facilities are provided for teachers and students to enable learning.	Teachers	2.15	2.14	1.28	0.06	0.95
		SIC members	2.14				
5	Involve partners (Parents, NGOs, etc) to fulfill school facilities	Teachers	2.18	2.16	0.86	0.31	0.76
		SIC members	2.14				
6	Maintain and manage school facilities properly	Teachers	2.79	2.87	1.18	-0.86	0.39
		SIC members	2.95				
Grand mean			2.40			1.03	

- No significance difference at $\alpha = 0.05$, SD = Standard Deviation. T = calculated t-value. P = p-value (sig. 2-tailed).

As indicated in item 1 of table 6 above, the mean scores of teachers (3.11) and SIC members (3.05) show school leaders exert their efforts moderately in formulating and communicating a common vision in school to make school environment attractive premises. Since the calculated t-value (0.29) was less than the table value and ($P=0.76 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups (teachers and SIC members). One of respondents from supervisors replied that: “*school leaders articulate a vision focused on high levels of learning for all students*”. Moreover most respondents during interview conducted with PTA heads replied that: “school leaders somehow monitor the degree to which beliefs, behaviors and

practices are consistent with the vision and effect changes accordingly. Additionally most of them replied that: *“school leaders made school environment attractive and healthy when they were supposed to do for the sake experience exchange purposes”*.

During document analysis, school improvement plan showed that there was vision and mission for students learning motivation. According to observation made by the researcher, there were vision and mission of the schools and students posted in some secondary schools and school environment was somewhat attractive. Principals and administrators create the vision, establish the agenda, communicate the goals and lead by example. The best leaders are well organized; task oriented and well informed (Earley and Weindling, 2004). Hence, school leaders exerted their effort moderately order to formulate and communicate a common vision in school to make school environment attractive premises.

Regarding to item 2 of table 6, the mean scores of teachers (1.78), SIC members (1.66) show efforts made by school leaders in preparing school facility plan was low. The calculated t-value (0.76) was less than the table value and ($P=0.45 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom. So, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. According to one of the respondents to an open ended question, there is no school facility plan prepared by school leaders in order to facilitate materials and equipments those aid learning in secondary schools. According to interview conducted with one of the supervisors, school leaders oversight agenda regarding to preparation of school facility plan in secondary schools. During document analysis there is no available school facility plan prepared by school leaders in most secondary schools. So, these all implies school leaders made low effort in preparing school facility plan in secondary schools.

In item 3 of table 6, teachers and SIC members were asked to rate the extent to which school leaders allocate budget for school facilities those aid learning. The mean scores of teachers (2.54) and SIC members (2.52) and total mean (2.53) show school leaders' made low efforts in allocating budget for school facilities those aid learning. As it is indicated in the table, the calculated t-value (0.15) was less than the table value and ($P=0.88 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$

significance level and 178 degree of freedom. So, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

During interview conducted, one of the supervisors said: *“however school leader exert their effort to allocate budget for reference books and school pedagogical center, they failed to allocate budget for information and communication technologies (computers, internet service, plasma, etc), laboratory with chemicals and apparatus, sport fields and others”*. During document review, most school budget plans do not focus on facilitating school facility. The researcher, from his observation, confirmed this. Therefore, the extent school leaders strive their effort in allocating budget aiding learning was low.

As depicted in item 4 of table 6, respondents were asked to rate extent school leaders endeavor their effort in creating school environment whereby all the necessary facilities are provided for teachers and students to enable learning. Accordingly, the mean scores of teachers (2.15) and SIC members (2.14) show low efforts made by school leaders regarding the item. Since the calculated t-value (0.06) was less than the table value and ($P=0.95 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

During conducting interview, one of the respondents from supervisors replied: *“school leaders were unable to facilitate teaching-learning aides and materials which contribute to successful learning – teaching process practically; specially laboratory and library are underway and over sighted by school leaders”*. In support of this, teachers and the school don't provide enough tools to facilitate the learning process as per perceived by students (Tsigereda, 2014). Hence, the extent school leaders endeavor their effort in creating school environment whereby all the necessary facilities are provided for teachers and students to enable learning was low in secondary schools.

As presented in item 5 of table 6, respondents were asked to rate to what extent school leaders involve partners (Parents, NGOs, etc) to fulfill school facilities, The mean score of teachers (2.18), SIC members (2.14) and total mean (2.16) show that the extent school leaders to

involve partners (parents, NGOs, etc) to fulfill school facilities was low. Since the calculated t-value (0.31) was less than the table value and ($P=0.76 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of teachers and SIC members. School leaders as communicators in the community have dual, not necessarily compatible roles: presenting themselves positively and promoting links with, and understanding among, with parents (Stephen, 2009). To conclude, the extent school leaders exert their efforts in involving partners to fulfill school facilities was low.

Table 7. Teachers' and SIC members' views to what extent school leaders exert their efforts in creating a conducive school environment regarding to students empowerment.

No	Items	Respondents	Mean	Total mean	SD	T	P
To what extents school leaders:							
1	Allow students to know school guidelines that govern students conduct.	Teachers	2.50	2.47	1.24	0.28	0.78
		SIC members	2.44				
2	Involve students in decision making process to make it democratic and participatory.	Teachers	3.07	2.98	0.98	1.08	0.28
		SIC members	2.90				
3	Empower students to maintain discipline in school.	Teachers	3.04	3.16	1.23	-0.78	0.43
		SIC members	3.19				
4	Endeavor their efforts to participate students fairly in school leadership activities.	Teachers	2.38	2.31	1.26	0.71	0.48
		SIC members	2.25				
5	Ensure students' sense of responsibility so that they feel free to express their opinions in school fairly.	Teachers	2.63	2.61	0.64	0.24	0.81
		SIC members	2.60				
6	Initiate students for their successful learning.	Teachers	2.60	2.63	0.86	-0.49	0.62
		SIC members	2.67				
Grand mean			2.69			1.03	

- No significance difference at $\alpha = 0.05$, SD = Standard Deviation. T = calculated t-value. P = p-value (sig. 2-tailed).

In item 1 of table 7, the mean score of teachers (2.50) shows school leaders moderately allow students to know school guidelines that govern their conduct. The mean score of SIC members (2.44) shows low efforts were attempted by school leaders regarding to the item

specified. The total mean (2.47) shows low efforts were made by school leaders regarding to the item. Since the calculated t-value (0.28) was less than the table value and ($P=0.78 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. During document analysis no short trainings manuals were available on school guidelines in most secondary schools. These lead to conclude that low efforts were attempted by school leaders to allow students to know school guidelines that governs students conduct.

In item 2 of table 7, the mean score of teachers (3.07), SIC members (2.90) and total mean (2.98) show school leaders involve students to participate in decision making process moderately. Since the calculated t-value (1.08) was less than the table value and ($P=0.28 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. One of the respondents from supervisors said that: *“school leaders put in place several strategies that enable the students to participate in the decision making process of the school; for instance, student council, children’s parliament and class meetings could be mentioned among others”*. From document review, there were evidences of school minutes showing that students were encouraged and participated in decision making regarding to their needs. The researcher observed when students created meeting for discussion on teaching –learning process. Hence, these all above infer school leaders moderately participate students in decision making process in different angles mentioned so far.

As presented in item 3 of table 7, teachers and SIC members were asked to rate the extent school leaders empower students to maintain discipline in school. The mean score of teachers (3.04) and SIC members (3.19) show moderate efforts were strived by school leaders toward the item specified. Since the calculated t-value (0.78) was less than the table value and ($P=0.43 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. One of PTA heads replied that: *“school leaders sometimes advice students to develop their social skills, self-discipline, compassion and ethic and so they are responsible for their behavior”*. Hence, school leaders

empower students to maintain discipline problem moderately. School leaders generate norms for discipline, behavior and partnerships in cooperative learning (Andrés, 2007).

As presented in item 4 of table 7, teachers and SIC members were asked to rate the extent school leaders endeavor their efforts to participate students fairly in school leadership activities. The mean scores of teachers (2.38) and SIC members (2.25) show low efforts were strived by school leaders toward the item specified. Since the calculated t-value (0.71) was less than the table value and ($P=0.48 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. During document review of curricula activities, there was gender disparity of students in leading clubs and committee. So, extent school leaders endeavor their efforts to participate students fairly in school leadership activities was low.

In item 5 of table 7, the mean score of teachers (2.63) and SIC members (2.60) show school leaders exert their effort moderately in order to ensure students' sense of responsibility so that they feel free to express their opinions in school fairly. Since the calculated t-value (0.24) was less than the table value and ($P=0.81 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. During conducting interview, one of the supervisors said that: *“school leaders encourage students to raise their idea freely when they were encountered with problems in teaching- learning process”*.

Regarding to item 6 of table 7, the mean score of teachers (2.60) and SIC members (2.67) show that, school leaders exert their efforts moderately in order to initiate students for their successful learning. Since the calculated t-value (0.49) was less than the table value and ($P=0.62 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. One of the interviewees said that: *“school leaders sometimes encourage students to be successful in their education and reward best performed students”*. Students are not motivated enough to sustain their learning encouragement in the teaching learning process (Tsigereda, 2014). So, moderate efforts were exerted by school leaders in initiating students for their successful learning.

Table 8. Teachers' and SIC members' views to what extent school leaders exert their efforts in creating a conducive school environment regarding to students support

No	Items	Respondents	Mean	Total mean	SD	T	P
To what extents school leaders:							
1	Monitor and ensure provision of equal opportunities for students to realize their potential.	Teachers SIC members	2.64 2.52	2.58	0.72	1.04	0.29
2	Broadly involve and collaborate with families to address environment that supports student achievement and well-being.	Teachers SIC members	2.42 2.48	2.45	0.96	-0.22	0.83
3	Adopt a vision and action plan for building and sustaining safe, respectful and healthy environment.	Teachers SIC members	2.40 2.32	2.36	0.89	0.63	0.53
4	Allocate and utilize budget appropriately for designed expenditure in students' healthy and safety.	Teachers SIC members	2.38 2.33	2.35	1.02	0.35	0.73
5	Ensure that the school rules and regulations are uniformly observed.	Teachers SIC members	2.68 2.59	2.64	0.78	0.77	0.43
6	Work collaboratively for implementing professional development of the staff.	Teachers SIC members	2.50 2.48	2.49	0.78	0.13	0.78
7	Treat students with special needs.	Teachers SIC members	2.17 2.08	2.13	0.52	1.08	0.27
Grand mean				2.43	0.81		

- No significance difference at $\alpha = 0.05$, SD = Standard Deviation. T = calculated t-value. P = p-value (sig. tailed).

In item 1 of table 8, teachers and SIC members were asked to rate extent school leaders monitor and ensure provision of equal opportunities for students. The mean score of teachers (2.64), and SIC members (2.52) show school leaders moderately exerted their effort to the specified item. The calculated t-value (1.04) was less than the table value and ($P=0.29 > 0.05$)

at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom. So, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. Most of the respondents from supervisors confirmed that school leaders encourage students of both sexes in devising and disseminating codes of conduct. During document review, school leaders have a format to monitor whether they were delivered tutorial lesson or not. According to observation made by the researcher, there was a check list to monitor whether female students were supported by teachers in giving tutorial lessons. Hence, school leaders highly strive their effort in providing equal opportunities for students to realize their potential in secondary schools.

As indicated in item 2 of table 8, teachers and SIC members were asked to rate extent school leaders broadly involve and collaborate with families to address environment that supports student achievement and well-being. The mean score of teachers (2.42), SIC members (2.48) and total mean score (2.45) shows responses of the two groups fall on the position “low” in rating the specified item. Since the calculated t-value (0.22) was less than the table value and ($P=0.83 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

No adequate school minutes were available regarding to this issue in most secondary school. In support of this, the researcher observed when few numbers of families discuss on their children with school leaders. During conducting interview, one of PTA heads replied that: *“school leaders work with and support families to identify and address their critical role to assist in providing a safe and healthy productive learning environment occasionally”*. To this end, low efforts were strived by school leaders toward co-operation with families in creating a welcoming school environment. Parents and community members should feel that their school has a welcoming environment. Barrier to effective communication and collaboration of school leaders with parents and the community affects students’ out comes negatively (Hamre, 2005).

As depicted in table 8, in item 3 respondents were asked to rate extent school leaders adopt a vision and action plan for building and sustaining safe, respectful and healthy environments. Accordingly, the mean score of teachers and SIC members were 2.40 and 2.32 respectively. Since the calculated t-value (0.63) was less than the table value and ($P=0.53 > 0.05$) at $\alpha =$

0.05 significance level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. This means the mean scores supplement each other and it implies low efforts were employed by school leaders regarding to the item.

According to observation made, efforts made by school leaders in implementing action plans that systemically seek to incorporate health and safety of all students into existing school improvement efforts and evaluating the effectiveness of the implementation of the plans was poor. Promoting relationships among teachers by establishing common planning time, interdisciplinary work teams and collaborative work opportunities were problematic for most school leaders (Earthman, 2004). These leads to the conclusion, low efforts were made by school leaders regarding to vision and action plan for creating and sustaining safe and healthy environments in secondary schools.

Regarding item 4 of table 8, teachers and SIC members were asked to rate extent school leaders exert their effort to allocate and utilize budget appropriately. The mean scores of teachers and SIC members were 2.38 and 2.33 during rating the specified item. Since the calculated t-value (0.35) was less than the table value and ($P=0.73 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. This shows that, both mean scores supplement each other and reflect efforts made by school leaders is low in allocating and utilizing budget appropriately.

According to interview conducted with PTA, they said that: “*school leaders fail to generate budget so that no significant budget was allocated for students’ healthy and safety*”. During document review of school budget plans, inadequate budget was allocated for designed expenditure in students’ health and safety. From the observation made, no evidence observed to activities, like HIV/AIDS clubs, cross red and first-aid kits, in school regarding to students’ health and safety. Strategic planning and budgeting system practiced in secondary schools cannot adequately benefited for better improvement (Sileshi, 2015). Hence, attention school leaders gave regarding to budget allocation and utilization for designed expenditure in students’ health and safety was low in secondary schools.

As indicated in item 5 of table 8, teachers and SIC members were asked to rate the extent to which school leaders were exerted their effort in order to ensure that the school rules and regulations are uniformly observed. The mean scores of teachers, and SIC members were (2.68), (2.59) respectively. Hence, their opinion implies, school leaders moderately ensure school rules and regulations. Since the calculated t-value (0.77) was less than the table value and ($P=0.43 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of teachers and SIC member. Interview conducted with respondents revealed that, school leaders occasionally enforce rules fairly and consistently and provide opportunities to develop and foster ethical reasoning, self-control and a generalized respect for others. In some schools, school guidelines were available to ensure rules and regulation of schools. School discipline policies are ultimately the responsibility of the school leaders; however, all school staff plays a role in their effective development and implementation (Addington, 2009).

As presented in item 6 of table 8, teachers and SIC members were asked to rate extent school leaders work collaboratively for implementing professional development of the staff. Accordingly, the mean score of teachers (2.50) shows teachers ratified moderate opinion regarding to the item. Whereas, the mean score of SIC members (2.48) shows low efforts employed by school leaders regarding to the specified item. The total mean score (2.49) show the extent to which school leaders work collaboratively for implementing professional development of the staff was low. The calculated t-value (0.13) was less than the table value and ($P=0.78 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom. So, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. To an open ended item, one of the respondents replied that most of CPD work in school was paper value and not functionally implemented properly.

As per the interview conducted with one of supervisors, he said that: *“sufficient professional development that will enable school personnel to create and maintain positive and supportive learning settings was not provided properly and this issue was over sighted by school leaders”*. As per the observation made, teachers’ and school leaders’ CPD plans and portfolios were not observed sufficiently in secondary schools. As presented in ESDP V, one the main

challenges concerning teachers' and leaders' development were CPD was not given enough attention by significant number of school leaders and teachers (MoE, 2015). To this end, one can conclude that, the extent school leaders provide planned, ongoing and systematic professional development, technical assistance and resources for program implementation in collaboration with partners to increase the health and safety for all students was low and needs serious attention.

In item 7 of table 8, teachers and SIC members were asked to rate the extent school leaders treat students with special needs. Accordingly, the mean scores of teachers (2.17) and SIC members (2.08) show low efforts were attempted by school leaders in treating students with special needs. Since the calculated t-value (1.08) was less than the table value and ($P=0.27 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significant level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. One of the respondents from supervisors said that: *“teachers were not encouraged to report students with special needs by school leaders for their treatment”*. During document review, issues regarding to students with special needs were over sighted in school reports. As presented in ESDP V, no clear structure for coordination and administration of special needs education issues from federal to woreda and school levels (MoE, 2015). So, one can conclude that, the extent school leaders treat students with special needs was low.

To sum up this section, the grand mean scores of teachers and SIC members in rating the extent school leaders exert their efforts regarding to school facility, students empowerment and students support were (2.40), (2.69) and (2.43) respectively. This shows low efforts were exerted by school leaders in creating conducive school. In support of this, school leaders didn't create a friendly environment in all efforts to improve the instructional climate and students' sense of connectedness to the learning-teaching (Kedir, 2015).

4.4. Factors Affecting School Leaders' Efforts in Creating a Conducive School Environment for Learning

School leaders become more responsible and know how to build a conducive school environment. This is one of the most problematic and critical issues for some school leaders to make it happen. More than anything, a quality learning school environment matter a lot more than other school factors (Freiberg, 2001).

There are so many factors those made school leaders fail to discharge their effort to create a conducive learning school environment and uphold responsibility and perform school activities respectively to achieve the intended school goals. To identify these factors, the researcher had prepared 12 items for teachers and SIC members which were categorized into three tables: (9), (10) and (11) below. Both groups (teachers and SIC members) were asked to rate their level of agreement to what extent these factors really hinder school leaders' efforts in creating a conducive learning environment in their schools using a five point Likert scale ranging from very low (1) to very high (5).

Table 9. Teachers' and SIC members' views toward leadership competency related factors affecting school leaders' efforts in creating a conducive school environment for learning.

No	Leadership competency related factors	Respondents	Mean	WM	SD	T	P
1	Low leadership competency, technical skill and experience of school leaders.	Teachers SIC members	4.14 4.29	4.22	0.94	-0.97	0.33
2	Lack of appropriate training on SIP and CPD.	Teachers SIC members	3.63 3.85	3.74	1.33	-1.12	0.26
3	Low understanding and awareness about safe, healthy and protective school environment.	Teachers SIC members	3.30 3.07	3.19	1.36	1.13	0.26
4	Problem of planning.	Teachers SIC members Grand Mean	3.49 3.85	3.67 3.70	1.01 1.16	1.62 1.21	0.11 0.24

- No significance difference at $\alpha = 0.05$, SD = Standard Deviation. T = calculated t-value. WM = Weighted Mean. P = p-value (sig. 2-tailed).

Regarding to item 1 of table 9, the mean scores of teachers (4.14) and SIC members (4.29) show that school leaders were highly affected by low leadership competency, technical skill and experience of school leaders. The average weighted mean (4.22) value of teachers and SIC members supplements the opinions of the two groups (teachers and SIC members). The independent sample t-test was employed to test whether there is significant mean difference or not between the responses of the two groups. However, the average calculated t-value (0.97) was less than the table value and ($P = 0.33 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom. So, it is concluded that, there is no significant difference between the responses of teachers and SIC members.

One of the supervisors during conducting interview replied that: “*school leaders are not competent enough to lead such a diversified school community, and leading school was problematic*”. In most parts of the country, the problem is not a shortage of certified administrators, but a shortage of well qualified administrators who are willing to work in the

places of highest demand, especially in underserved communities and schools where working conditions are most challenging (Sanders and Simpson, 2005). So, low leadership competency, technical skill and experience of school leaders highly affect school leaders' effort in creating conducive school environment for learning in secondary schools.

In item 2 of table 9, the mean score of teachers (3.63) and SIC members (3.85) show lack of appropriate training on SIP and CPD highly affected school leaders to create a conducive learning environment. The average weighted mean (3.74) value of teachers and SIC members supports their opinion. The independent sample t-test was employed to test whether there is significance mean difference or not between the responses of the two groups. However, the average calculated t-value (1.12) was less than the table value and ($P = 0.26 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom. So, one can concluded that there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. During conducting interview, majority of supervisors said: *“there were inadequate trainings for school leaders to develop their leadership competency; and no adequate manuals and materials related to school leadership available in most secondary schools”*.

As indicated in item 3 of table 9, the mean score of teachers (3.30) and SIC members (3.07) show low understanding and awareness about safe, healthy and protective school environment moderately affect school leaders effort for creating conducive learning environment. The average weighted mean (3.19) value of the two groups indicated that school leaders in sampled schools were moderately affected regarding to the item. The independent sample t-test was employed to test whether there is significant mean difference or not between the responses of the two groups. However, the average calculated t-value (1.13) was less than the table value and ($P = 0.26 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom. So, it is concluded that, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

During document review, no in staff training manuals related to the safe, healthy and protective school environment was observed. The actions of students within classrooms and the creation of safe and productive learning environment are important for many schools and can be a challenging dimension of school leaders (Liu and Breit, 2013). Hence, low

understanding and awareness about safe, healthy and protective school environment moderately affect school leaders' effort in creating conducive learning school environment.

As presented in item 4 of table 9, the mean score of teachers (3.49) shows moderate and SIC members (3.85) show high to problem of planning. The average weighted mean (3.67) value of teachers and SIC members indicated that school leaders in sampled schools were highly affected by problem of planning. The independent sample t-test was employed to test whether there is significance difference or not between the responses of the two groups. However, the average calculated t-value (1.62) was less than the table value and ($P = 0.11 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level, and 178 degree of freedom. So, it is concluded that, there is no significant difference between the responses the two groups. Majority of PTA heads and supervisors said: "*preparation of school plans was not participatory*". During document review, no evidence showing school self-evaluation observed in school improvement plans of most secondary schools. To this end, problem of planning highly affect school leaders' effort in creating conducive learning environment negatively.

In general, table 9 indicates that the grand mean score of respondents (teachers and SIC members) regarding to leadership competency related factors affecting school leaders in creating a conducive learning environment was 3.70 with a standard deviation of 1.16. This show, the problems in the table affect school leaders highly. But as seen from the table, low leadership competency, technical skills and experience of school leaders and lack of appropriate training on SIP and CPD seriously influenced school leaders with the magnitude of weighted mean value (4.22) and (3.74) respectively.

To improve the management of the education system so that decisions are made and implemented which improve institution performance and student achievement, capacity development for improved management was problematic (MoE, 2015). Hence, leadership competency was not achieved to the remarkable level and did not enhance school leaders in creating conducive learning environment in secondary schools.

Table 10. Teachers' and SIC members' views toward management related factors affecting school leaders' efforts in creating a conducive school environment for learning.

No	Management related factors	Respondents	Mean	WM	SD	T	P
1	Limited school autonomy.	Teachers	2.60	2.46	1.21	1.54	0.12
		SIC members	2.32				
2	Lack of commitment and stand	Teachers	3.35	3.35	1.06	0.02	0.98
		SIC members	3.34				
3	Lack of communication and interaction with external organ such as religious organizations, NGOs and cluster group trainers	Teachers	3.58	3.59	1.17	-0.05	0.96
		SIC members	3.59				
4	Failure to integrate school improvement implementation activities.	Teachers	3.56	3.63	1.14	-0.84	0.40
		SIC members	3.71				
Grand Mean				3.26	1.14	0.62	0.61

- No significance difference at $\alpha = 0.05$, SD = Standard Deviation. T = calculated t-value. WM = weighted Mean. P = p-value (sig. 2-tailed).

As depicted in item 1 of table 10, the mean score of teachers (2.60) shows limited school autonomy affects school leaders' efforts in moderate. Whereas the mean score of SIC members (2.32) shows low to the specified item. The average weighted mean (2.46) value of teachers and SIC members indicated that school leaders were not affected by limited school autonomy significantly. Finally, the independent sample t-test was employed to test whether there is significance mean difference or not between the responses of the two groups. However, the average calculated t-value (1.54) was less than the table value and ($P = 0.12 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom. So, it is concluded that, there is no significant mean difference between the responses of the two groups. One of the respondents during interview replied that: *"unnecessary external organs intervention in school functions sometimes affects school leaders' efforts in creating learning school environment"*.

According to item 2 of table 10, the mean score of teachers (3.35) and SIC members (3.34) shows, lack of commitment and stand moderately affect school leaders effort for creating conducive learning environment. The average weighted mean (3.35) value of teachers and SIC members indicated that school leaders in sampled schools were moderately affected by lack of commitment and stand. Finally, the independent sample t-test was employed to test whether

there is significant mean difference or not between the responses of the two groups. However, the average calculated t-value (0.02) was less than the table value and ($P = 0.98 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom. So, it is concluded that, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. Effective school leaders recognize the potential they have to create a school environment where teachers thrive and students achieve their greatest potential in a safe and nurturing school setting (Johnston, 2001).

As depicted in item 3 of table 10, the mean score of teachers (3.58) and SIC members (3.59) show, lack of communication and interaction with external organ such as religious organizations, NGOs and cluster group trainers highly affects school leaders to create conducive school environment for learning. In support of this, the average weighted mean (3.59) value of teachers and SIC members indicated that school leaders were highly affected by the specified factor. Finally, the independent sample t-test was employed to test whether there is significant difference or not between the responses of the two groups. However, the average calculated t-value (0.05) was less than the table value and ($P = 0.96 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom. So, it is concluded that, there is no significant mean difference between the responses of the two groups. During conducting interview, one of supervisors seriously replied that: *“school leaders’ efforts for effective schooling were affected by low communications of school leaders with donors like NGOs and other voluntary organs”*. To conclude, lack of communication and interaction with external organs highly affects school leaders to create conducive school environment for learning in secondary schools.

In item 4 of table 10, the mean scores of teachers (3.56), SIC members (3.71) and the weighted mean (3.63) indicated that school leaders were highly affected by their failure to integrate school improvement implementation activities. Finally, the independent sample t-test was employed to test whether there is significant difference or not between the responses of the two groups. However, the calculated t-value (0.84) was less than the table value and ($P = 0.040 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom. So, one can conclude that there is no significant difference between the responses the two groups. During document review, SIC members’ minutes were not observed adequately in most secondary schools. So,

failure to integrate school improvement implementation activities highly affects school leaders' effort to create conducive learning environment in secondary schools.

In general, table 10 indicates that the grand mean score of respondents' (teachers and SIC members) response regarding to management related factors affecting school leaders in creating a conducive learning environment was 3.26 with a standard deviation of 1.14. This shows that the problems in the table affect school leaders moderately. But as seen from the table, failure to integrate school improvement implementation activities seriously influenced school leaders' efforts with the magnitude of weighted mean value 3.63.

One of the main challenges expected during ESDP IV was further improvement of the effectiveness of the educational administration at all levels, through capacity development and the creation of motivational work environments (MoE, 2010). Hence, effective educational management was not achieved to the remarkable level and this negatively affects school leaders' efforts in creating a conducive learning environment in secondary schools.

Table 11. Teachers' and SIC members' views toward support related factors affecting school leaders' efforts in creating a conducive school environment for learning.

No	Support related factors	Respondents	Mean	WM	SD	T	P
1	Shortage of resources and delay in the release of budget.	Teachers	3.90	3.98	0.98	-1.00	0.31
		SIC members	4.05				
2	Absence of adequate school partners involvement (parents, NGOs and community) to support school.	Teachers	3.46	3.43	1.24	0.33	0.75
		SIC members	3.40				
3	Weak in- built supervision system for educational delivery support.	Teachers	3.49	3.61	1.12	-1.35	0.17
		SIC members	3.73				
4	Low communication of school leaders with families of students	Teachers	3.74	3.86	1.29	-1.19	0.23
		SIC members	3.97				
Grand Mean				3.72	1.16	0.97	0.37

- No significance difference at $\alpha = 0.05$, SD = Standard Deviation. T = calculated t-value. WM = weighted Mean. P = p-value (sig. 2-tailed).

As indicated in item 1 of table 11, teachers and SIC members were asked to rate the extent to which shortage of resources and delay in the release of budget affects school leaders in

creating a conducive learning environment. The mean score of teachers (3.90) and SIC members (4.05) shows their opinion hold high to the specified item. The average weighted mean value (3.98) of the two groups indicated that, school leaders were highly influenced due to shortage of resources and delay in the release of budget. The independent sample t-test was employed to test whether there is statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups. Since the calculated t-value (1.00) was less than the table value and ($P = 0.31 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

One of supervisors during interview replied that: “*there was no adequate school budget for the designed expenditures to aid nurturing learning environment in secondary school*”. As presented in ESDP V, for any organization to be effective, it is not sufficient that it has an appropriate structure and staff with the right profile. It also needs a minimum level of material and financial resources, which also act as sources of motivation to staff through providing motivating working conditions (MoE, 2015). Hence, lack of resources and delay in the release of budget highly influenced school leader’s efforts in creating conducive learning environment in secondary schools.

Regarding to item 2 of table 11, the mean score of teachers (3.46) and SIC members (3.40) show absence of adequate school partners involvement (parents, NGOs and community) to support school affects school leaders moderately. The average weighted mean of teachers and SIC members were 3.43 shows school leaders are moderately affected by the factor identified earlier. The average calculated t-value (0.33) was less than the table value and ($P = 0.75 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

One of PTA heads during conducting interview replied that: “*even though school leaders require corporation of partners, they were not voluntary to support secondary schools and it was challenging*”. Document review revealed that no adequate evidences regarding to community involvement guidelines and minutes were available in secondary schools. Many schools have limited access to community supports making over reliance on community

partners as primary providers of mental health services potentially problematic (Cowan and Vaillancourt, 2013). So, absence of adequate school partners' involvement affects school leaders moderately in creating conducive school environment for learning in secondary schools.

In item 3 of table 11, the mean score of teachers (3.49) shows weak in- built supervision system for educational delivery support affected school leaders' efforts moderately. Whereas the mean score of SIC members (3.73) shows high to the specified item. The average weighted mean (3.61) value of teachers and SIC members indicated that school leaders were highly affected by weak in- built supervision system for educational delivery support. The independent sample t-test was employed to test whether there is significance difference or not between the responses of the two groups. However, the average calculated t-value (1.35) was less than the table value and ($P = 0.17 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom. So, it is concluded that, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

One of supervisors during interview replied that: *“traditional supervision (inspection) was dominant and no appropriate supervision functions were delivered for education delivery supports to enhance students' learning which in turn affects school leaders' effectiveness negatively in creating conducive school environment”*. Document analysis revealed that adequate compiled files and observation checklist regarding to supervision delivery support from secondary school supervisors were not available for school leaders in creating a conducive learning school environment. School leaders are employed from teaching staffs without having administration training. Hence, these factors negatively influenced them so as to enhance quality of learners (UNICEF, 2010).

In item 4 of table 11, the mean score of teachers (3.74), SIC members (3.97) and the weighted mean (3.86) show low communication of school leaders with families of students affect school leader's efforts highly to create conducive learning school environment. The independent sample t-test was employed to test whether there is statistically significant difference or not between the responses of the two groups. However, the average calculated t-value (1.19) was

less than the table value and ($P = 0.23 > 0.05$) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level and 178 degree of freedom. So, it is concluded that, there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. One of the respondents during interview replied that: *“barrier to effective communication of school leaders with families of students brought students not to be disciplined and follow school rules”*. During document analysis, no school leader- family minutes were available in most secondary schools.

In general, table 11 indicates that the grand mean score of respondents' (teachers and SIC members) response regarding to support related factors affecting school leaders in creating a conducive learning environment was 3.72 with a standard deviation of 1.16. This shows that the problems in the table affect school leaders highly. But as seen from the table, shortage of resources and delay in the release of budget and low communication of school leaders with families of students seriously influenced school leaders with the magnitude of weighted mean value (3.98) and (3.86) respectively.

According to an interview conducted with supervisors and PTA heads, they replied that: *“educational delivery supports were not systematic and no adequate block grant budget was allocated as per the number of students in secondary schools and schools by themselves were not resourceful”*. One of the main challenges expected during ESDP IV was further improvement of the effectiveness of the educational administration at all levels, through capacity development and the creation of motivational work environments (MoE, 2010). Hence, effective educational management was not achieved to the remarkable level and this negatively affects school leaders' efforts in creating conducive learning environment in secondary schools.

A strong support system is required for making the school environment conducive. Developing partnerships beyond the school to encourage parental support for learning and new learning opportunities are among the challenges facing school leaders for effective school improvement (Christopher and Pamel, 2013). Low support from top level officials and lack of involvement of the stakeholders are challenges facing school leaders (MoE, 2007b).

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter deals with summary, conclusions 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 analyze school leaders' efforts in creating a conducive learning school environment in North Shoa Zone. The researcher attempted to answer the basic questions:

- To what extent secondary school environment is conducive for learning in North Shoa Zone;
- To what extent do school leaders exert their efforts in creating a conducive school environment for learning in secondary schools of North Shoa Zone;
- What are factors affecting school leaders' efforts in creating a conducive school environment for learning in secondary schools of North Shoa Zone and;

The study was conducted at zonal level, which includes 4 woreda and one City administration. Two secondary schools were selected from each woreda and the City administration. The number of sample respondents were 107 teachers, 73 SIC members, 10 PTA heads and 5 supervisors in government secondary schools of the zone. The data were collected from both primary and secondary sources. The primary sources of data were opinions that were collected from teachers and SIC members using close ended and open ended questionnaires and those collected through interview from general secondary school supervisors and PTA heads, and observations. Secondary data were from document analysis of secondary schools.

To analyze data and arrive at a conclusion, appropriate statistical tools such as frequency, percentage, and mean score, weighted mean and independent sample t-test at $\alpha=0.05$ will be employed. Based on the analysis made, the following major findings were identified.

This study indicates that the extent to which secondary schools environment were conducive for learning was moderate regarding to school facilities (grand mean = 2.65) and students empowerment (grand mean = 2.74). Regarding to students support (grand mean = 2.38), secondary schools environment were underway. Regarding to school facilities, schools lacked adequate facilities. Laboratories, genders sensitive latrine with water facility and access and use of information and communication technology were problematic in secondary schools.

In terms of student empowerment, secondary schools' environments were moderately conducive for learning. Provision of opportunity for gender equality of students to participate in school leadership (total mean score 2.19) was under way and questionable. Additionally, students' behavioral change has not reached to the appropriate level. Moreover, reproductive healthy related factors were not integrated in school program.

Supports provided for students in order to minimize education wastage with the total mean score 2.28 were low. Implementation of rule and procedures (total mean score = 2.41) was problematic. Additionally, safety and security of school environments were below the standard. Moreover, special need education was not integrated in CPD program and no supports were given for students with special needs and special need education were over sighted in secondary schools.

The extent school leaders were exerting their efforts in creating school environment conducive for learning regarding to school facility (grand mean score = 2.40), and students support (grand mean score = 2.43) in secondary schools was low. Regarding to empowering students, the grand mean score 2.69 shows, moderate efforts were exerted by school leaders. The total mean score of teachers and SIC members (2.14) shows, low efforts were exerted by school leaders in facilitating school facilities to enable learning. Additionally, school leaders failed to prepare school facility plan and involve partners in order to fulfill school facilities for learning in secondary schools.

Regarding to empowering students, school leaders exert their efforts moderately in order to create learning school environments. However, the total mean score of teachers and SIC

members (2.31) shows, the extent they endeavor their efforts to participate students fairly in school leadership activities was low. Moreover, the extent school leaders allow students to know school guidelines that governs students conduct was low.

The extent school leaders adopt a vision and action plan for creating and sustaining safe and healthy environments, (total mean score = 2.35), was low. Budget allocation and effective communication were observed as a drawback of school leaders for safety and healthy school environment. More over low efforts were attempted by school leaders regarding students with special needs to suit their learning in secondary schools.

A number of hindering factors affected school leaders effort in creating conducive learning environment can be listed. So, from the expected factors provided for respondents, low leadership competency, technical skill and experience of school leaders (WM = 4.22); shortage of resources and delay in the release of budget (WM = 3.98), low communication of school leaders with families of students (WM = 3.86); lack of appropriate training on SIP and CPD (WM= 3.74), and failure to integrate school improvement implementation activities(WM = 3.63) were among the factors highly affecting school leaders in creating a conducive school environment for learning in secondary schools of North shoa Zone.

5.2. Conclusions

Regarding to educational back ground, all teachers were first degree holder and above. Therefore, teachers in secondary schools were qualified to the standard and above. Except PTA heads, most of the SIC members were first degree holders. From the implication of the study, a few principal and vice principal in SIC members were master degree holders. But according MoE policy, they should be qualified with master degree to be competent leader in secondary schools. Therefore, this negatively affects school leaders' effectiveness and efforts to create conducive school environment for learning in secondary schools.

From the total respondents, most of them have an experience greater than 11 years in their respective schools. Thus, most of the respondents were experienced enough and had

awareness about their school nature and culture. However, most of the respondents were not trained in leadership, SIP and TDP. Hence, this affects creating conducive learning environment in secondary schools negatively.

According to this study, secondary school environment was moderately conducive for learning regarding to school facilities and students empowerment. However, the extent to which students were supported in schools was underway in secondary schools. But this is not a remarkable level for students to learn effectively because there were inadequate facilities like standard laboratories and libraries, lack of access and use of technology like internet and adequate computers. This, therefore, implies students did not get adequate facilities to learn in secondary schools. Regarding to empowerment of students, secondary schools were moderately conducive for learning. But it is under way and not to the remarkable level. In this case, gender equality of students to participate in school leadership was low. Provisions of supports for students were underway.

To bring changes in schools, enabling school leaders was necessary. However, they exerted low efforts in creating conducive school environment. This implies school leaders didn't apply their leadership role effectively in secondary school in order to enhance learning environment. To make learning effective school leaders should pay attention for facilities to enhance learning. However, the degree they strive their efforts in facilitating school facilities to ensure conducive school environment was poor.

Even though school leaders empower students, remarkable activities were not observed in maintaining a welcoming school atmosphere that recognizes the relevant transitions and mobility of students and families that occur throughout the school year.

Supports provided for students for learning were poor in secondary school environments. Schools should give special attention in identification of the needs of their students who deserve special support. But, students with special needs were ignored which needs nearby support. School leaders failed to support students with special needs.

From the research findings, one can list a number of factors affecting school leaders in order to create conducive learning school environment. However, leadership competence and support related factors highly influenced school leaders in creating conducive learning school environment in secondary schools.

Hence, to sum up, low efforts were employed by school leaders in order to create a conducive and nurturing learning school environment that address the physical and mental health needs of all students and staff.

5.3. Recommendations

Based on the finding of the study and conclusion drawn, the following recommendations were forwarded.

This study showed, secondary schools' environment were not conducive not to the remarkable level. Hence, stakeholders are responsible to ensure compliance with all health and safety standards pertaining to the school building and outdoor facilities so that every student has the maximum opportunity to learn in conducive school environment. Hence, school leaders should involve families in planning, development and implementation of programs and policies supporting conducive school environment, and mobilize community to generate resources both in cash and in kind in order to foster school facilities. On the other hand, they should provide opportunities for students to engage in leadership activities (e.g., clubs, peer mentoring) in shouldering responsibilities.

Moreover, schools should provide students with a safe environment in which to share their questions or concerns on matters concerning sexuality, violence, gender dynamics, and abuse and family issues. The school should assess the need of students and staff for the betterment of nurturing learning school environment.

The study showed that low leadership competency of school leaders highly affects for creating conducive learning environment. So, MoE in collaboration with regional education bureau should bring competent and trained personals to the leadership position.

School leaders have to use their understanding of SIP to enhance conducive school environment for learning. Stakeholders, including MoE together with Regional Educational Bureau (REB), have to support school leaders on how to apply their understanding in creating a conducive learning environment for increasing students' performance. Additionally, MoE and REB should provide training for school leaders in professional development activities that address health and safety concerns of all school community members. Moreover, REB should organize continuous training program to update the awareness of school leaders about school improvement programs in general and how to create conducive school environments in particular. School leaders should notify through staff meeting to teachers, to students, to parent and community representative quarterly. Woreda Education Bureau (WEB) and school should provide continuous and short-term training, technical support, and reward best performing schools, school leaders, teachers, students and school community representatives.

School principals should mobilize community and involve partners (parents, NGOs and community) to generate budget in order to facilitate educational materials that aid learning. Moreover, REB and Woreda administrative should allocate budget to furnish schools with classrooms, laboratories, and other materials that aid learning. Special attention should be given for cross-cutting issues like gender, special needs and inclusive education and HIV/AIDS by all stake holders and better if prioritized in education policy.

6. REFERENCES

- ACT. 2009. *School Improvement Frames Work :Better Schools...Better Futures Raising Quality and Achieving Excellence in ACT Puplic Schools*. Canberra: Department of Education and Training.
- Abiy Abebe. 2014. *Pracitices and Challenges in Creating Safe and Healthy School Environment in Second Cycle Primary Schools of Harari Region*. Un published MA Thesis. Haramaya University, Haramaya, Ethiopia.
- Addington, L. A.2009. Cops and cameras: Public school security as a policy response to Columbine. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 52, 1424–1446.
- Andrés, A. 2007. *Creating and Sustaining Environments to Support Teaching and Learning*. Business Press, Bostan, USA.
- Bell, L.R.Bolan,and Cabrillo. 2003. *A Systematic Review of the Impact of School Head Teachers and Principals on Student Outcomes*: Institute of Education, London, England.
- Bennis,W.and Nannus, B. 2008. *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. NY: Harper and Row. Harper: NY.
- Bluestein, J.2001.*Creating Emotionally Safe Schools: A Guide for Educators and Parents*. Deerfield Beach, FL: Health Communications, Inc.
- Cheung and Evers. 2001. *Leadership for Quality Schooling: International Perspectives*: Routledge Falmer, London, England.
- Christopher, D.and Pamel, S. 2013. *Successful leadership: a review of the international literature*. Hong kong, China.
- Coles and Southworth. 2002. *Developing Leadership: Creating the schools of tomorrow*. Open university Press, London, Enland.
- Cowan, K., Vaillancourt, K. 2013. *A framework for safe and successful schools*
- Dart, J. 2006. Developing a Learning Environment Conducive to Active Learning and Participation: Group Presentations and Formative Assessment at Level One, *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism Education*,
- Davis, D. 2000. *Supporting Parent, Family, and Community Involvement in Your School*: NWREL, Portland, Oregon.

- Demoze Degefa. 2007. The current practice of instructional leadership in enhancing the quality of education in the government primary school of Addis Ababa. Un published MA Thesis. Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Duncan, A. 2013. *Supporting the Academic Success of Pregnant and Parenting Students*. Retrieved September 8, 2015, from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/dos/pregnancy.pdf>
- Earley, P. and Weindling, D. 2004. *Understanding School leadership*. Paul Chapman Publishing, London, England.
- Earthman, G.I. 2004. *Prioritization of 31 Criteria for School Building*. Retrieved September 8, 2015, from http://www.aclu-md.org/facilities_report.pdf.
- EIC. 2000. *School Improvement Planning a Hand book for Principals, Teachers and School Councils*. EIC ,Toronto, Canada.
- Fidler and Atton. 2004. *The Headship Game: The Challenges of Contemporary School Leadership*.: Routledge Falmer, London, Enland.
- Findley, B. 2006. Creating a Conducive Classroom Environment: Classroom Management Is the Key, *College Teaching Methods & Styles Journal* – Third Quarter Vol. 2, No. 3
- Fran and Gaddy. 2001. *Leadership for School Improvement*. McREL, Alexandria, USA
- Freiberg, H. J.2001. Measuring school climate: Let me count the ways. *Educational Leadership*, 56(1), 22-26.
- Fowler, J.1996. *Introduction to Statistics a Non-parametric Approach for the Social Sciences*. New York, John Willy.
- Fuller, A. 2009. *From Surviving to Thriving: Promoting Mental Health in Young People*, Australian Council for Educational Research, Melbourne.
- Garcia, C.A. 2003. School safety technology in America: Current use and perceived effectiveness. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Policy*, 14(3), 30-54.
- Gelsthorpe, T. and West-Burnham, J. 2003. *Educational leadership and the community: Strategies for school improvement through community engagement*. Pearson Education: London, England.
- Hamre, B. 2005. Can instruction and emotional support in the first-grade classroom make a difference for children at risk of school failure? *Child Development*, 76(5), 949-967.

- Harris and Muijs. 2005. *Improving Schools through Teacher Leadership*. Open University New York, USA.
- Higgins, S, Hall, E. and Wall, K. 2006. *The Impact of School Environments: A literature review*, Routledge Falmer, London, England.
- Hopkin. 2005. *The Practice and Theory of School Improvement: International:Hand Book of Educational Change*, Springer, Netherland.
- Hunter, A. 2006. *Public school facilities: Providing Environments that Sustain Learning* Columbia University, Columbia.
- Idris Abdulkadir. 2012. An Assessment of School Culture in Secondary schools of Liban Zone, Somali Region. Unpulished MA Thesis , Haramaya University, Haramaya, Ethiopia
- Ihuoma, P. 2008. *The Need for Effective Facility Management in Schools in Nigeria*, Imo State University, Owerri, Nigeria
- Jaap Scheeres. 2000. *Improving school effectiveness*. UNESCO, Paaris,France.
- John, K. 2008. *What do leaders really do?In harvard Business Review On Leadership*. Cambridge Business Press, Bostan, USA.
- Johnston, G. 2001. *Framework for student support service in Victoria secondary schools*. Published by the Department of Education, Victoria, Australia.
- Jose, F.and Gonzales. 2002. *Method of research and Thesis writing*. Acebost, Paris, France.
- Kedir Yusuf. 2015. Instructional Leadership Practices and Challenges in Secondary Schools of Jigjiga Town, Somali Regional State. Unpulished MA Thesis , Haramaya University, Haramaya, Ethiopia.
- Kifle Danisol and Tariku Sime. 2014. Investigating Factors That Afface the implementation of Schol improvement Programm in Gambeltu Cluster. *International Journal of Innovative and Applied Research,Institute of Education and Professional Development Studies* , Volume 2,Issue(5):179-184.
- Kingshott, B. F. and Mckenzie, D. G. 2013. Developing crisis management protocols in the context of school safety. *Journal of Applied Security Research*, 8(2), 222-245.
- Kothari,C.R.2004. *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*; New Age International Limited publishers, New Delhi.

- Kouqing, L. 2009. *Leadership:-theory and practice:Asian-pacific Finance and DevelopmentCenter*. PRC, Shangai, China.
- Kouze, J. and Posner, B. 2002. *Leadership Challenges*. Jossey Bass San, Francico.
- Lambert, L. 2003. *Building leadership capacity in schools.*, VA: ASCD, Alexandria.
- Leslie, A. 2000. *Strategies for Success: Implementing a ComprehensiveSchool Reform Program*. Austi.
- Linda, L. 2003. *LeadershipCapacityforLasting School Improvement*. ASCD: Alexindria.
- Liu, S. and Breit, R. 2013. Empowering and Engaging Students in Learning Research Methods: *Educational Research and Perspective*, 40 (2): 150-168.
- Markos Mamo. 2011. Major Factors that influence the effectiveness of School leadership: The case of Kampata- Tambaro Zone. Unpulished MA Thesis , Haramaya University, Haramaya, Ethiopia.
- Marks, H. and Printy, M. 2003. Principal Leadership and School Performance: An Integration of Transformational and Instructional Leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, ,39(3):370-397.
- Martinez, P. 2001. *The UCLA School of Management program. Address presented at the Association of California School Administrators' Superintendent's Symposium*. Moestry California, CA ,USA.
- Mcmahon, M. 2011. *School Improvement Frame workand Process*.Routledge Falmer, London, England.
- Mengistu Shiferaw. 2014. The roles of School Leaders I building School Culture in Government Secondary Schools of Harari Regional Stae. Unpulished MA Thesis , Haramaya University, Haramaya, Ethiopia.
- MoE. 2015. Education Sector Development Programme V (ESDP V).*Programme Action Plan*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- _____. 2013. *National Professional Standard for School principals*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- _____. 2011a. *Government Guideline for the Implementation of the School Improvement Program*. Retrieved June 20, 2015, from www.nae.gov.et.
- _____. 2011b. *School improvement program Frame Work,the revised*. Retrieved June 20, 2015, from www.nae.gov.et.

- _____.2010. *Education Sector Development Program IV (ESDP IV)*. Andnet Printe, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- _____. 2007a. *General Education Quality Implementation Program Document*. Federal. St.george Printing Press.Addis Ababa.Ethiopia.
- _____. 2007b. *School Improvement Frame Work*. VSD, Addis Ababa,Ethiopia.
- _____. 2005. *National professional standard Competence of school leaders*. Mega Publisher,Addis Ababa,Ethiopia.
- _____. 2002. *The Education and Training Policy and Its Implementation*. Andnet Publisher,Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Moswela, B. 2004. Discipline in Botswana Secondary Schools. *Journal of Sociology and Education in Africa*, 3(2): 1711-192.
- Mulatu Dea and Teketel Basha. 2014. Leadership challenges facing school principals in implementation of general quality education improvement program: the case of Wolaita Zone Town Administration. Wolaita Sodo University. *Wudpecker Journal of Educational Research*. 3(4): 059-069.
- Nansel, T., Overpeck, M.,2001. Bullying behaviors among US youth-Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 285: 2094-2100.
- Nasubuga,Y.2003. *Development and examination of secondary in Uganda: Experieance and challenges*. Kamplala,Uganda.
- Northouse, G. 2007. *Leadership theory and practicethousand Oaks*. Saga pblication, CA.
- Nuthall, G. 2007. *The hidden lives of learners* NZCER Press, Wellington. New Zealand.
- OECD. 2007. *How the world's best-performing school systems come out on top*. Retrieved September8, 2015, from <http://www.How-the-worlds-best-performing-school-systems-come-out-on-top-sept-072.pdf>.
- Pont, B., Nusche,Y. and Moorman, K. 2008. *Improving School Leadership Volume 1: Policy and* . OECD publishing, Paris, France.
- Rigby, K. 2010. *Building Respectful and Safe Schools: A resource for school communities*. Published by the communication students wellbeing division, Melbourne, Victoria.
- Saifullah, S. 2011. *A Study to Evaluate the Effect of Environment on the Performance of Grade-I Students*. Department of Education, University of Gujrat, Gujrat, Pakistan

- Salahuddin, A. 2009. *Challenges to effective leadership of urban secondary schools in Bangladesh: A critical study*. Dhaka, Bangladesh.
- Samson Tesfaye. 2011. Potential and Constraints of Leadership on the Achievement of Quality Education: The case of Secondary Schools in Harari Region. Unpublished MA Thesis. Haramaya University, Haramaya, Ethiopia.
- Sanders, N. M., and Simpson, J. 2005. State policy framework to develop highly qualified administrators. Washington, DC: CCSSO.
- Sarah, G. 2009. *Relationship between School Climate and School Performance*. Carolina.
- Saxon, D. 2005. School Bullying; Changing the Problem by Changing the School. *School Psychology Review*, 32(3):431–444.
- Sileshi Lemma. 2015. The practices of strategic planning and budgeting system in secondary schools of Arsi Zone. Unpublished MA Thesis. Haramaya University, Haramaya, Ethiopia.
- Solomon Mengesha. 2012. The major factors that affect SIP at secondary schools in Shone Woreda of south Nationalities and peoples Regional State”. Unpublished MA Thesis. Haramaya University, Haramaya, Ethiopia.
- Solomon Woldegerima. 2014. Assessment on the Effects of school environment on Behavior and Achievements of High School Students in Kolfe Keranio sub City Government High Schools. Unpublished MA Thesis Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Stephen, G. 2009. *School Leadership – International Perspectives, Institute for Management and Economics of Education*. University of Teachers Education Central Switzerland ZUG, Switzerland.
- Stoll, L.and Fink, D. 1996. *Changing Our Schools: Linking School Effectiveness and schoolImprovement*. Open University Press, Philadelphia, USA.
- Stoll, L.,Creemers, B.and Reezgt, G. 2005. *Effective school improvement. Similarities and differences in improvement in eight European countries*.
- Sungtong, E. 2007. *Challenges to public secondary school principals in the era of education reform*. University of Missouri, Colombia.

- Tsigereda Belete. 2014. Assessment of Government and Private Primary Schools Environment and its Relationship with Students' and Teachers' Self-Esteem. Unpublished MA Thesis Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- UNICEF Ethiopia.2010. '*Child friendly schools*', Education sector programme division, Addis Ababa.
- Upadhyaya, P. 2003. *School Improvement Plan and its implementation*. Retrieved September 8, 2015, from [http://www.Formative-cerid51503a0fcfe22\(1\).pdf](http://www.Formative-cerid51503a0fcfe22(1).pdf).
- Wallace.2002. Modeling DistributedLeadership and ManagementEffectiveness: Primary School SeniorManagement Teams in England andWales. *School. International Journal of Effectiveness and School Improvement* , 13(2):163-186.
- Wilson, S. 2003. The effects of school-based intervention programs on aggressive behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 71, 136–149.
- World Bank .2008. *General Education Quality Improvement Program*. Project appraisal document, Addis Ababa.
- Yukl, G. 2002. *Leadership in organizations(4th Edition)*. Prentice Hall, Englewood cliffs NJ ,USA.

7. APPENDICES

Appendix A-1

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY
POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Questionnaire to be filled by Teachers and SIC members

Dear, Teachers and SIC members:

I am a graduate student at the University of Haramaya, working on a Master of Arts in School Leadership. Currently I am conducting a study on a research entitled “**School Leaders’ Efforts in Creating a Conducive School Environment for learning in Secondary Schools of North Shoa Zone, Oromia Regional State**” for which I warmly invite you to complete this survey questionnaire. Your participation in this study will not affect your present status in anyway. You will remain anonymous and your answer will be kept strictly confidential and the data is used only for the research purpose. The success of this study directly depends upon your honest and genuine response to each question. Filling the questionnaire will take approximately **30** minutes.

Directions:

- Please read the instructions and each item carefully before you give response.
- Write your brief response in the blank spaces provided for open-ended items.
- Give only a single answer to each close-ended item.
- Writing your name in any part of this questionnaire is not required.
- Please try to make your answer **legible** and **brief**.
- Return the questionnaire as soon as possible after completion.

Note: **School leaders** refer to secondary school supervisors, principals, Vice-principals, Parent- Teacher Association (PTA) heads, unit leaders, department heads and student councils.

Part 1: Background Information

This part of the questionnaire contains personal information; thus, please fill the necessary answers for each item properly by circling the alternatives under each item.

1.1. Name of your Secondary School : _____

1.2. Sex: A. Male B. Female

1.3. Age in Years

A. 20-29 B. 29-40 C. 40-50 D. 50 and a above

1.4. Educational Qualification

A. Certificate B. Diploma C. 1st Degree D. Master's Degree

E. Any other specify _____

1.5. Work Experience in year

A. 1-5 B. 5-12 C. 12-17 D. 18 and above

1.6. Work experience in this school in years

A. 1-5 B. 5-11 C. 11 and above

1.7. Your current position

A. Teaching staff B. Principal C. Vice principal D. Student council

E. Supervisor F. Any other specify _____

1.8. Have you trained in one or more of the followings?

A. Leadership B. School Improvement Program C. Teachers' professional development

D. Non-Pedagogical (Non-Teaching) Training

E. Any other specify _____

Part 2: Questionnaire related to extent to which school environment is conducive for learning.

Please read each item carefully and hold your position by putting a check mark “√” in to the response that best reflects your opinion about extent to which your school environment is conducive for learning based on the following statements using a scale of 1-5. The number indicates: 1=Strongly Disagree (SDA), 2=Disagree (DA), 3= Un Decided (UD), 4= Agree (A), and 5= Strongly Agree (SA).

All your answer will be respected.

No	Items regarding to School Facility	Scale				
		1 SD	2 DA	3 UD	4 A	5 SA
2.1	My school has secured fence and attractive premises that enabled students to attend class regularly.					
2.2	Favorable and inspiring class room contexts have enhanced students’ learning motivation.					
2.3	My school has standard teaching-learning aides and materials which contribute to successful learning – teaching process (laboratory, library, pedagogical center, teachers’ resting room, sport field etc.).					
2.4	School community benefited from adequate access to standard toilets particularly designated for ladies and gentles together with water facilities, which satisfied users; and behavioral changes have been observed.					
2.5	My school has facilitated access and use of information and commutation technology for teaching purposes (plasma, computer, internet access, etc)					
	Items regarding to empowerment of Students	1 SD	2 DA	3 UD	4 A	5 SA
2.6	There is culture of student participation in decision making process that enhanced students’ willingness to take responsibility and self-disciplined culture					

2.7	My school provides opportunity for gender equality of students to participate in school leadership(e.g., clubs)					
2.8	Issues related to family life education have been integrated in my school.					
2.9	Students demonstrated acceptable behavioral change.					
2.10	Students demonstrate acceptable sense of responsibility in the teaching-learning process.					
	Items regarding to student support	1 SD	2 DA	3 UD	4 A	5 SA
2.11	All students have equal opportunities to realize their potential and my school has paid special attention particularly for female students					
2.12	My school provides all rounded support to students, which helped to minimize wastage of educational resources..					
2.13	My school's rules and procedures properly implemented to avoid unacceptable behavior such as hostility, stigma and discrimination, violence, threat, brawling and any other misconducts.					
2.14	Special needs education has been integrated in continuous professional development (CPD) program					
2.15	The school has implemented special needs education program supported by the provision of trained teachers required for leadership of the program where adequate materials and facilities are fulfilled.					

2.16. Please, write your comment the extent to which your school environment is conducive for learning regarding school facility, students empowerment and student support briefly here under.

2.16.1. School Facility

2.16.2. Students Empowerment

2.16.3. Students support

Part 3: Questionnaire related to the extent to which school leaders are exerting their effort in creating conducive learning school environment

A. Items regarding to school facilities

Please read each item carefully and rate from very high to very low and put a check mark “√” in to the response that best reflect school leaders’ efforts in creating a conducive school environment for learning regarding to school facilities in your school using a scale of 1-5. The number indicates: 1=Very Low (VL), 2= Low (L), 3= Moderate (M), 4 = High (H), 5= Very High (VH). All your answer will be respected.

No	The extent to which school leaders:	Scale				
		1 VL	2 L	3 M	4 H	5 VH
3.1	Formulate and communicate a common vision in school to make school environment attractive premises.					
3.2	Prepare school facility plan					
3.3	Allocate budget for school facilities those aid learning.					
3.4	Endeavor their effort in creating school environment whereby all the necessary facilities are provided for teachers and students to enable learning.					
3.5	Involve partners (Parents, NGOs, etc) to fulfill school facilities					
3.6	Maintain and manage school facilities properly					

3.7. What can you say about efforts school leaders are exerting in creating a conducive school environment **regarding to school facilities** in your school? Write down briefly.

B. Items regarding to empowerment of Student

Please read each item carefully and rate from very high to very low and put a check mark “√” in to the response that best reflect school leaders’ effort in creating a conducive school environment for learning **regarding to empowerment of Students** in your school using a scale of 1-5. The number indicates: 1=Very Low (VL), 2= Low (L), 3= Moderate (M), 4 = High (H), 5= Very High (VH).

	The extent to which school leaders:	Scale				
		1 VL	2 L	3 M	4 H	5 VH
3.8	Allow students to know school guidelines that govern students conduct.					
3.9	Involve students in decision making process to make it democratic and participatory.					
3.10	Empower students to maintain discipline in school.					
3.11	Endeavor their efforts to participate students fairly in school leadership activities.					
3.12	Ensure students’ sense of responsibility so that they feel free to express their opinions in school fairly.					
3.13	Initiate students for their successful learning.					

3.14. What can you say about efforts school leaders are exerting in creating a conducive school environment **regarding to empowerment of Students** (Students’ sense of responsibility, good behavior, role model...) in your school? Write down briefly.

C. Items regarding to Student support

Please read each item carefully and rate from very high to very low and put a check mark “√” in to the response that best reflect school leaders’ effort in creating a conducive school environment for learning **regarding to Student support in** your school using a scale of 1-5. The number indicates: 1=Very Low (VL), 2= Low (L), 3= Moderate (M), 4 = High (H), 5= Very High (VH).

All your answer will be respected.

	The extent to which school leaders:	Scale				
		1 VL	2 L	3 M	4 H	5 VH
3.15	Monitor and ensure provision of equal opportunities for students to realize their potential.					
3.16	Broadly involve and collaborate with families to address environment that supports student achievement and well-being.					
3.17	Adopt a vision and action plan for building and sustaining safe, respectful and healthy environment.					
3.18	Allocate and utilize budget appropriately for designed expenditure in students’ healthy and safety.					
3.19	Ensure that the school rules and regulations are uniformly observed.					
3.20	Work collaboratively for implementing professional development of the staff.					
3.21	Treat students with special needs					

3.22. What can you say about efforts school leaders are exerting in creating a conducive school environment **regarding to Student support** (students’ safety, security, healthy and protective) in your school? Write down briefly.

Part 4: Questionnaire related to factors affecting school leaders' efforts in creating conducive school environment for learning.

Please read each item carefully and hold your position by putting a check mark “√” in to the response that best reflects your opinion **about factors affecting school leaders' efforts in creating conducive school environment for learning in your school** based on the following statements using a scale of 1-5. The number indicates: 1=Very Low (VL), 2= Low (L), 3= Moderate (M), 4 = High (H), 5= Very High (VH).

All your answer will be respected.

No	Expected factors	Scale				
		1 VL	2 L	3 M	4 H	5 VH
	Leadership competency related factors					
4.1	Low leadership competency , technical skill and experience of school leaders.					
4.2	Lack of appropriate training on school improvement program and continuous professional development					
4.3	Low understanding and awareness about safe, healthy and protective school environment.					
4.4	Problem of planning.					
	Management related factors					
4.5	Limited school autonomy.					
4.6	Lack of commitment and stand.					
4.7	Lack of communication and interaction with external organ such as religious organizations, NGOs and cluster group trainers.					
4.8	Failure to integrate school improvement implementation activities.					
	Support related factors					
4.9	Shortage of resources and delay in the release of budget					
4.10	Absence of adequate school partners involvement (parents, NGOs and community) to support school					
4.11	Weak in- built supervision system for educational delivery support.					
4.12	Low communication of school leaders with families of students.					

4.13. If there are any other factors that affect school leaders' efforts in creating a conducive school environment for learning in your school, please write them briefly.

4.14. What should be the possible measures to enhance school leaders' efforts in creating a conducive school environment for learning in your school? Please write down briefly.

Appendices A-2

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY
POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT**

Semi- structured interview guideline for supervisors and PTA heads.

The main objectives of this interview guideline are to collect extensive information about **“School Leaders’ Efforts in Creating a Conducive School Environment for learning.** Thus, your genuine participation to give necessary data has great importance for effectiveness of the research.

Interview Questions

1. Is your school environment conducive for learning? What can you say regarding school facilities, student empowerment and student support in your school?
2. How do you explain efforts of school leaders are exerting in creating your school environment conducive for learning regarding facilitating school facilities, empowering students (in their sense of responsibilities, behavioral change, self-confidence and enjoy freedom) and student support (students’ safety, healthy and protection) in your school?
3. How do you encourage and support school leaders to strive their effort in creating their school environment conducive for learning?
4. What factors do you think that are affecting school leaders in creating conducive school environment for learning in your school?
5. What possible measures do you think that can maximize school leaders’ efforts in creating conducive school environment for learning in your school?

Appendices A-3

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY
POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

School Document Review Checklist

Name of the school _____

Date _____

No	Documents	Remark
1	school improvement plan	
2	School budget plan	
3	School facility plan	
4	co-curricular activities	
5	school guide lines	
6	Materials related to school leaders	
7	school minutes	
8	School attendances	
9	school reports and records	
10	Portfolios	
11	In staff training manuals	

Appendices A-4

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY
POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

School observation Checklist

Name of the school _____

Date of observation _____

Time: From _____ to _____

No	Student Facilities	Remark
1	Attractiveness of the school compound.	
2	Pedagogical center with teaching aids.	
3	Laboratory with chemicals, apparatus and lab-technician	
4	Library with updated reference books.	
5	Clean toilet rooms for male and female students and teachers with water facilities respectively.	
6	Standard class rooms with student desk and facilitated tutorial classes.	
7	ICT room with computer and internet access, and plasma	
8	Sport fields, recreation area and cafeteria.	
	Student empowerment	
9	Promotion of the school the participation of students in school decision making. E.g., school council, student parliament and class meetings.	

10	Involvement of students in school leadership (e.g. in clubs) to develop a sense of responsibility.	
11	Promotion of gender equality and self discipline of students and its monitoring.	
12	Student's behavior and self-confidence.	
	Students support	
13	Activities in school focus on students needs and their performance improvement	
14	Encouraging female students and special attention given for them in schools.	
15	Students opinions surveys being classrooms are positive and safe learning environment where students are motivated to learn	
16	School documentation about:	
	Expectation of respect for others and property.	
	An ethos in which violence, discrimination, harassment or bullying is not tolerated, Procedures for peaceful resolution of conflicts.	
	Expectation of safe behavior and compliance with school rules.	
	Special need education issue and supports for special need students, teachers' and school leaders' portfolios.	

Appendices B-1

YUUNIVARSIITII HAROMAYAATTII SAGANTAA BARNOOTA DIGIRII LAMMAFFAA MUUMMEE KAROORAA FI BULCHIINSA BARNOOTAA

Gaafannoo Barsiisotaa fi miseensota koree fooyya'insa mana barnootatiin guuttamu

Kabajamoo Barsiisotaa fi Miseensota koree fooyya'insa mana Barumsaa :

Ani barataa digrii 2^{ffaa} yuunivarsiitii Haramayaati. Kanin baradhu bulchiinsa mana barruumsaati. Matadureen qorannoo kootii, *“Tattaaffii Gaggeessitoonni manneen barnootaa Humna isaanii Cuunfanii Naannawa Mana Barumsaa Barachuuf oolu Manneen Barnoota Sadarkaa 2^{ffaa} Goodina Shawaa Kaabaa, Naannoo Oromiyaa keessatti Mijata Uumuuf Carraaqan”* ibsa. Milkaa'inni qorannaa kanaa deebii isin gaaffiilee tokkoon tokkoo irratti naaf kennitan irratti hundaa'a. Ragaan isin nuuf kennitan hundi isaa kan barbaaddamu dhimma qorannaa mataduree kanaaf qofa. Odeeffannoon isin naaf kennitan qorannoo koo qaaccessuuf bu'aa ol'aanaa qaba. Gaafannoo kana guutudhaaf hanga daqiiqaa **30** ni fudhata.

Kallattii waliigalaa:

- Deebii guutuun dura gaafannoo dhiyaate sirritti dubbisi.
- Deebii ifa ta'e iddoo duwwaa siif kenname irratti barreesi .
- Gaaffii tokkoof deebii tokko qofa guuti.
- Gaafannoo irratti maqaa kee barressuun hin barbaachisu.
- Deebiin kee ifaa fi gabaabaa yaa ta'u.
- Akkuma guuttee fixxeen gaafannicha naaf deebisaa.

HUB: Gaafannoo kana keessatti gaggeessitoonni mana barumsaa jechuun suupparvaayizaroota sadarkaa lammaffaa, dura bu'oota fi ittiaantoota dura bu'oota sadarkaalaffaa, walitti qabaa gamtaa maatii barsiisotaa, duursitoota garee, dura bu'oota muummewwanii fi duursaa kaawunsilii barattootaati.

Kutaa I: Kutaan kun odeeffannoo waliigalaa waa'ee deebistoota gaaffilee kanaa kan qabate waan ta'eef deebiftoonnis suuta dubbisuun gaaffiilee hundaa naaf guutaa.

Deebii keessan qubee filannoo keessaniitti maraa.

1.1. Maqaa mana barumsaa Sadarkaa 2^{ffaa} Keetii: _____

1.2. Saala: A. Dhiira B. Dhalaa

1.3. Umrii Waggaan

A. 20-29 B. 29-40 C. 40-45 D. 50 fi ol

1.4. Sadarkaa Barnootaa

A. Sartifikeeta B. Digirii Duraa C. Digirii Lammaffaa

B. Kan biraa yoo jiraate _____

1.5. Tajaajila waggaadhaan

A. 1-5 B. 5-12 C. 12-17 D. 18 fi ol

1.6. As mana barumsaa kanatti hanga tajaajilte waggaadhaan

A. 1-5 B. 5-11 C. 11 fi ol

1.7. Ammatti kan ittiin aangeffamte

A. Barsiisummaa B. Dura taa'aa M/B C. Itti Aanaa Dura taa'aa M/B

D. kaawunsilii barattootaa E. Suupparvaayizara F. Kan biraa yoo jiraate _____

1.8. Kanniin gadii keessaa kamirratti leenjite?

A. Hoggansa

B. Sagantaa Fooyya'insa M/barumsaa

C. Dagaagina Ogummaa walitti fufaa barsiisotaa

D. Kan biraa yoo jiraate

Kutaa 2: Gaafannoo sadarkaan halli mijataa naannawa m/barumsaa barachuuf oolu irra jiru.

Himoota armaan gadii sirriitti dubbisuutiin akkaataa yaada keetitiin haalli mijataa mana barumsa keetii barachuuf oolu sadarkaa maalii irra akka jiru iskeelii 1-5 fayyadamuun mallattoo “√” bakka itti waliigaturratti kaa’i. Lakkoofsi : **1**=Gonkumaa Itti Walii Hin Galu (GWH), **2**=Itti Walli Hin Galu (IWH), **3**= murtesuu hin danda’u (MH), **4**= Ittan Walii Gala (IWG) fi **5**= Sirriittan Itti Walii gala (SWG).

Deebii Kee hundi ni Fudhatama.

No	Faasiliitii Mana barumsaa ilaalchisee	Iskeelii				
		1 GWH	2 IWH	3 MH	4 IWG	5 SWG
2.1	Manni barumsaa kiyya dallaa kan qabuu, kan nama hawwatee barattoonnii guyyaa guyyaan mooraa keessatti argamtee barnoota akka baratan kan godhu dha					
2.2	Kutaaleen barnootaa barattoota barnootaaf kan kakaasan naannawa barnootaaf mijaawaa dha.					
2.3	Manni barumsaa kiyya meeshaalee deeggarsa barnootaa baruuf barsiisuu mijeessuuf oolu (Mana yaalii, mana dubbisa kitaabaa, H/gabbisa barnootaa, iddoo haara galfii barsiisotaa, dirree ispoortii fi kkf) istaandardii isaa eeggate qaba.					
2.4	Hawaasni mana barumsa kiyyaa mana fincaanii sadarkaa isaa eeggatee dhiiraa fi dhalaan adda bahee fi tajaajila bishaanii irraa fayyadamaa ta’ee jira					
2.5	Manni barumsaa kiyya faasiliitii odeeffannoo teekinooloojii barsiisuuf oolu(Pilaazmaa, koomiitara, intarneetaa, fi kkf) gahaa qaba.					
	Barattoota Gawoomsuu ilaalchisee					
2.6	Mannii barumsaa kiyya aadaa adeemsa kennisa murti dhimma mana barnoota irratti					

	hirmaanaa barattoota guddisee jira					
2.7	Manni barumsaa kiyya walqixxummaa saalaa mirkaneessuun barattoonni hoggansa mana barumsaa (gumiilee..) keessatti akka hirmaatan ni godha.)					
2.8	Sagantaaleen fayyaa, hormaataa fi walitti dhufeenyi kanneen wajjiin wal qabatan qaama sagantaa kutaalee sadarkaa hundaa irratti argamaniti.					
2.9	Amali – Barattoota sadarkaa fudhatama qabu irra akka jiru haalota adda addaan ifattii mul’atee jira.					
2.10	Adeemsa barachuu keessatti barattootnii itti Gaafatamummaan kan itti dhagahamu dha					
	Deegarsa barattootaaf godhamu ilaalchisee					
2.11	Barattootni hundi carraa bu’a qabeessa ta’uuf isaan dandeessisu qabu , akkasumas xiyyeeffannoon addaa barattoota shamarraniitiif ni godhamu.					
2.12	Manni barumsaa kiyya gama hundaan barattootaaf deeggarsa gochuudhaan qisaasa’inni barnootaa akka hir’atu ni godha.					
2.13	Seerrii fi hojimaanni mana barumsaa kiyyaa amala hin barbaachifne kan akka qoodinsaa, loogummaa, arrabsoo, hakuuccaa fi amallan gadhee biro dhorkuurratti ni hojjeta.					
2.14	Barnootni fedhii adda sagantaa fooyya’insa ogummaa walittii fufaa (CPD) of keessatti qabatee jira.					
2.15	Mannii barumsaa kiyya sagantaa fedhii adda hoganuu akka danda’uu barsiisootnii leenji fi meeshaaleen barbaachisa ta’e guutuuf hojii irra olchee jira.					

2.16. Haalli mijataa naannawa mana barumsa keetii barachuuf oolu sadarkaa maalii irra jira jettee yaadda? gabaabbinaan barreessi.

2.16.1. Faasiliitii Mana barumsaa ilaalchisee

2.16.2. Barattoota Gawoomsuu ilaalchisee

2.16.3. Deegarsa barattootaaf godhamu ilaalchisee

Kutaa 3: Gaafannoo Tattaaffiin Gaggeessitoonnii mana barumsaa naannawa mana barumsaa barachuuf mijataa ta'e uumuuf hojjetan.

Himoota armaan gadii sirriitti dubbisuutiin akkaataa yaada keetitiin Gaggeessitoonni mana barumsa keetii haala mijataa mana barumsa keetii barachuuf oolu uumuuf hangam humna isaanii cuunfanii mana barumsaa kee keessatti hojjechuuf tattaafatan iskeelii 1-5 fayyadamuun mallattoo “√” bakka itti waliigaturratti kaa’i. Lakkoofsi 1=Baayyee Xiqqaadha (BX), 2= Xiqqaadha (X), 3= Giddu galeessa (GG), 4= Guddadha (G), fi 5= Baayyee Guddaadha (BG).

Deebii kee hundi ni Fudhatama.

A. Faasiliitii mana barumsaa ilaalchisee (School facility)

No	Tattaaffiin gaggeessitoonni mana barumsa kootii :	Scale				
		1 BX	2 X	3 GG	4 G	5 BG
3.1	Oddoo mana barumsaa miidhagaa godhuuf muullata uumee ni dhageechisu.					
3.2	Karoora faasiliitii ni qopheessu					
3.3	Faasiilitti hojii barnootatiif oolu baajata ni qabatu					
3.4	Meeshaalee hojii barnootatiif oolu guutuuf ni tattaafatu					
3.5	Deeggartoot (maatii fi NGO) faasiilittii akka guutaniif ni gaafatu					
3.6	Qabeenya mana barumsaa ni kunuunsu					

3.7. Akka yaada keetti hangam tokko gaggeessitoonni mana barumsa haala mijataa naannawa mana barumsaa mijataa barachuuf oolu uumuuf faasiliitiiwwaan adda addaa guutuuf tattaafatan? Gabaabbinaan deebii kee barreessi.

B. Barattoota Gawoomsuu Ilaalchisee (Empowering students):

	Tattaaffiin gaggeessitoonni mana barumsa kootii :	1 BX	2 X	3 GG	4 G	5 BG
3.8	Barattoonni akka amala godgatan qajeelfamoota mana barumsaa barattoota ni hubachiisu					
3.9	Murtii kennuu keessatti barattoota ni hirmaachisu					
3.10	Naamusa mana barumsaa itti fufsiisuuf barattootarratti ni hojjetu					
3.11	Hoggansa mana barumsaa keessatti barattoonni akka hirmaatan ni godhu					
3.12	Miirri itti gaafatamummaa barattoota biratti akka dhufuu fi soda tokko malee yaada isaanii akka ibsatan ni taasifamu.					
3.13	Barnoota isaanitiin akka milkaa'an barattoota ni jajjabeessu					

3.14. Akka yaada keetti hangam tokko gaggeessitoonnii mana barumsa keetii haalla naannawa mana barumsa mijataa uumuuf barataa miira itti gaafatamummaa fi amala gaarii qabu horachuuf tattaafatan? Gabaabbinaan deebii kee barreessi.

C. Deegarsa barattootaaf godhamu ilaalchisee (students support)

	Tattaaffiin gaggeessitoonni mana barumsa kootii:	1 BX	2 X	3 GG	4 G	5 BG
3.15	Barattoonni hundi dandeettii isaanitii akka ibsatan hordoffii ni					
3.16	Deeggarsa barattootatiif jecha maatii barattootaa ni hirmaachisu.					
3.17	Manni barumsaa fayyaalessa akka ta'u fi fayyadamummaa barattootaa mirkaneessu muullanni ni kaa'ama.					
3.18	Fayyaa barattootaa eeguug baaaja ni qabatu					
3.19	Seerri mana barumsaa hojiirraa oolaa jiraachuu ni mirkaneeffatu					
3.20	Gahumsa isaanii akka cimsatan qindoominaan ni hojjetu.					
3.21	Barattoota fedhii addaa ni jajjabeessu					

3.21. Akka yaada keetti hangam tokko gaggeessitoonni mana barumsa haala naannawa mana barumsaa mijataa baracuuf oolu uumuuf yaaddolee fi soda garagaraa irraa barattoonni bilisa taatee akka baratan deeggarsa godhuuf tattaafatan?.Deebii kee gabaabbinaan barreessi.

Kutaa 4: Gaafannoo dhimmoota gaggeessitoonni mana barumsaa humna isaanii cuunfanii haala mijataa naannawa mana barumsaa barachuuf oolu akka hin uumnerratti dhiibbaa godhan.

Himoota armaan gadii sirriitti dubbisiitii akka yaada keetiitiin gaggeessitoonni mana barumsa keetii haala mijataa naannawa mana barumsa keetii barachuuf oolu akka hin uumneef dhimmoota gurguddoo dhiibbaa ni godhan jedhamanii yaaddamaniin mallattoo “√” bakka ati irratti waliigaturratti iskeelii 1-5 fayyadamuun mallattoo “√” bakka itti waliigaturratti kaa’i. Lakkoofsi 1=Baayyee Xiqqaadha (BX), 2= Xiqqaadha (X), 3= Giddu Galeessa (GG), 4= Guddadha (G), fi 5= Baayyee Guddaadha (BG).

Deebii kee hundi ni Fudhatama.

No	Dhimmoota dhiibba ni fidu jedhamanii yaaddaman	Iskeelii				
		1 BX	2 X	3 GG	4 G	5 BG
	Gahumsa Hoggansaatiin kan walqabatu					
4.1	Gahumsa gaggeessummaa mana barumsaa xiqqaa ta’uu hoggantootaa fi dandeettiin teeknika isaanii xiqqaa ta’uu					
4.2	Hanqina leenjii gahaa ta’e dhimmaa fooyya’insa mana barumsaa fi dagaagina ogummaa walitti fufaa dhabamuu					
4.3	Hubannoo xiqqaa ta’e waayee fayyaalessummaa naannawa mana barumsaa irratti qabaachuu qabuu					
4.4	Karoorsuu sirrii qopheessuu dhabuu irraa					
	Bulchiinsaan kan walqabatu					
4.6	Angeffamni mana barumsaa xiqqaa ta’uu					
4.7	Kutannoo fi ejjennoo dhabuu.					
4.6	Odeeffannoo fi walitti hidhamiinsa qaamolee alaa akka dhaabbilee mit-mootummaa fi amantaa akkasumas qaama leenjii kennu waliin dhabuu					
4.8	Kufaatii gochaaleen hojiirra oolmaa fooyya’insa mana barumsaa.					

	Deeggarsaan Kan walqabatu					
4.9	Hanqina leecaloo dha .					
4.10	Hirmaannan deeggartoota mana barumsaa (Maatii, NGO, Hawaasaa) gahaa ta'e dhabamuu.					
4.11	Tajaajilli deeggarsaf daawwannaan jiru barnootarratti laafaa ta'uu.					
4.12	Odeeffannooni fi quunnamtiin hoggantoonni mana barumsaa maatii barataa waliin godhan xiqqaa ta'uu.					

4.13. Dhimmoonni biraa gaggeessitoonni mana barumsaa humna isaanii cuunfanii haala mijataa naannawa mana barumsaa kee barachuuf oolu akka hin uumne godhu yoo jiraa gabaabbinaan barreessi.

4.14 Akkamiin gaggeessitoonni mana barumsa keetii humna isaanii cuunfanii akka manni barumsaa barachuuf oolu haala mijataa uumuu danda'an jettee yaadda? Gababbinaan barreessi.

Appendices B-2

YUUNIVARSIIHII HAROMAYAATTII SAGANTAA BARNOOTA DIGIRII LAMMAFFAA MUUMMEE KAROORAA FI BULCHIINSA BARNOOTAA

Af-gaaffii caaseffamaatiin kan duursame Suupparvaayizarootaa fi dura bu'oota Gamtaa Maatii barattootatiif kan dhiyaatu.

Kaayyoon gooree Af-gaaffii kanaa odeeffannoo ga'aa waa'ee gaggeessitoonni mana barumsaa haala naannoo mana barnootaa barachuuf olu mijataa ta'e uumuu keessatti hangam humna isaanii cuunfanii hojjechuuf manne barnootaa sadarkaa 2ffaa keessatti tattaafachaa akka jiranii fi haalli mijataa mana barumsaa maal akka fakkaatu argachuu dha. Kanaafuu hirmaannaan deebii isin nuuf kennitan raga qulqulluu qorannoo keeyyaatiif bu'aan isaa ol'aanaa dha.

Gaaffiilee af-gaaffii

1. Naannofti mana barumsa keetii barachuuf akka oolutti mijataa dha? Maal jechuu dandeecha waayee faasiliitii mana barumsaa, barattoota gawoosuu fi barattoota deeggaruu ilaalchisee?
2. Tattaaffiin gaggeessitoonni mana barumsaa humna isaanii cuunfanii mana barumsaa barachuuf oolu mijataa akka ta'uu godhan(faasilittii mana barumsaa guutuu, barattoonni miira itti gaafatamummaa fi ofitti amanamummaa akka qabaatan, gamadaa akka ta'an akkasumas deeggarsa faayyalessummaa fi eeggumsa barattootoo taasisan) akkamitti ibsita?
3. Naannofti mana barumsaa keetii mijataa ta'ee barachuuf akka ooluuf gaggeessitoonni mana barumsa akkamitti jajjabeessita, akkamitti deeggartas?
4. Mana barumsaa kee keessatti dhimmoonni gaggeessitoonni mana barumsaa humna isaanii cuunfanii haala mijataa naannawa mana barumsa barachuuf oolu akka hin uumne godhan maal faayi jettee yaadda?
5. Gaggeessitoonni mana barumsaa humna isaanii cuunfanii haala mijataa naannawa mana barumsa barachuuf oolu akka uuman tarkaanfii maalitu fudhatamuu qaba jettee yaadda?

Appendices C

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY
POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Reliability coefficient for pilot test

No	Items	n	α (Cronbach alpha)
1	The current status of conducive learning school environment.	8	0.88
2	Extent school leaders exert their effort in creating conducive learning school environment.	8	0.83
3	Factors affecting school leaders' effort in creating conducive learning school environment.	8	0.91
	Total	24	0.87

n =number of items