

THE TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP ROLES OF PRINCIPALS AT ETHIOPIAN  
SECONDARY SCHOOLS

By

BERHANU BELAYNEH, BEYENE

submitted in accordance with the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF LITERATURE AND PHILOSOPHY

in the subject

EDUCATION MANAGEMENT

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

SUPERVISOR: PROF P. MAFORA

NOVEMBER 2016

## **DEDICATION**

I dedicate this study to my father, the late Mr. BELAYNEH BEYENE, SEGARO

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I give honour to God for the grace to complete this research study. I would like to extend my deepest gratitude to my research supervisor, Professor Patrick Mafora. I am grateful to have had him supervising me through this study. He has been the moving force that has taken me to a higher level. I could not have done it without his driving force and patience.

A special thanks to my dear friends who in many ways contributed to this effort through their friendship, encouragement, and motivation. My profound thanks go to Dr. Worku Negash, Dr. Melese Asfaw, Dr. Alemayehu Debebe, Prof. Tesfaye Samela and Ato Nigusse Daba. They read chapters of this study and provided helpful comments.

Several staff members of ECSU have been instrumental in completion of this study. I am grateful to principals, teachers and supervisors who contributed to this research study with their time and thoughts. I also would like to thank Ato Shiferaw Shigute, Dr. Shiferaw Teklemariam, W/o Muferiat Kamil, Ato Alemayehu Asefa and Ambassador Hailemicheal Abera (Dr.) for giving strong moral and organizational support.

I thank Mr. Yosef (GEQAEA) for providing me with 10<sup>th</sup> grade school leaving examination data. I also want to extend my thanks to Ethiopian Ministry of Education (MoE), Dilla University (DU), Ethiopian Civil Service University (ECSU) and SNNPR Education Bureau.

Last but not least, I thank my family, my dearest wife Worknesh Tadesse, my daughter Temar and my sons Basena and Dara Berhanu, without whose support and love this study would not have been finished.

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this mixed methods research was to investigate the transformational leadership role of principals in Ethiopian secondary schools. The research examined the existence of transformational school leadership behaviours, strategies that leaders were employing and the relationship between transformational leadership roles of the principal and student achievement (10<sup>th</sup> grade GESLCE). Mixed methods involving qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection were used in order to triangulate the data and increase the validity of empirical material. The student achievement was assessed on the basis of on the percentage of passes in standardized assessments for the school year (2012/2005-2015/2007). Secondary schools in South Nations Nationalities and Peoples' Regional State (SNNPRS) whose principals had been the incumbent for three or more years were selected purposively. A total of 80 surveys were distributed to school principals and 680 survey questionnaires to teachers in identified schools. Seventy-six school principals and 642 teachers returned the surveys representing 95% and 94.4 % return rate for principals and teachers, respectively. Interviews and focus group discussions were conducted with supervisors and teachers who worked with principals. Participants were informed of the objectives of the study and assured of the confidentiality of the research both in formal letters and in person. Factor analysis, means, standard deviations, Pearson and Spearman rho correlations, t-test and standard multiple regression were used to analyse quantitative data. In contrast, qualitative data were analyzed by grouping together common themes in each category and constructing a description of the participants' views and perspectives. The findings revealed that transformational school leadership and its dimensions exist in secondary schools of SNNPR, Ethiopia. Among the six dimensions (namely; sharing school vision and building consensus, high performance expectation, individualized support, intellectual stimulation, modelling behaviour and building collaborative structure and strengthening school culture) three of them were ranked highly. These are, *building collaborative structure, strengthening school culture and sharing school vision*. On the other hand, *building consensus and modelling behaviour had moderate score whereas, individualized support* had relatively very low rank. Transformational leadership was accomplished through involving staff to be part of the mission, encouraging staff to come up with new initiatives, challenging the staff to meet beyond agreed standards, building trust, coach and support at individual level, sharing tasks as well as power, acting ethically and celebrating

achievements to make their school effective. The relationship between transformational school leadership and student achievement showed that there is positive and moderate relationship, although it was statistically not significant. Socio-demographic data such as number of students in a school showed a negative correlation with student achievement. It is concluded that there was relationship between the principals' transformational leadership role and student achievement in secondary school of SNNPRS of Ethiopia. Finally, the research calls for the principals to focus on more moral and material assistance to their staff's professional growth, significant attention to the preparation and development of principals and adoption of transformational school leadership model in secondary school. The findings of the study add to limited but growing body of research on student achievement and the role of the transformational school leadership of the principal in school effectiveness.

Key words: transformational leadership, transformational school leadership, school leadership, leadership role, principal transformational leadership, student achievement, school effectiveness, mixed methods, Ethiopian secondary schools, vulnerability, number of students.

## **DECLARATION**

I declare that the following thesis “THE TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP ROLE OF PRINCIPALS AT ETHIOPIAN SECONDARY SCHOOLS” is my own work and that all the sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

Berhanu Belayneh, Beyene

November, 2016

## CONTENT

DEDICATION .....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	ii
ABSTRACT .....	iii
DECLARATION .....	v
CONTENT .....	vi
LIST OF TABLES .....	ix
LIST OF FIGERS .....	xi
CHAPTER ONE .....	1
1.1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.2 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY .....	4
1.3 THE RESEARCH PROBLEM .....	6
1.4 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY .....	8
1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY .....	10
1.6 SCOPE OF THE STUDY .....	11
1.7 ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY .....	11
1.8 DEFINITION OF KEY CONCEPTS .....	12
1.9 ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY .....	13
1.10 SUMMARY .....	13
CHAPTER TWO .....	15
REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....	15
2.1 THE CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP .....	15
2.1.1 Trait Theory of Leadership .....	17
2.1.2 Behaviour Theory of Leadership .....	18
2.1.3 Contingency Theories .....	21
2.2 THE CONCEPT OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP .....	23
2.3 TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION .....	30
2.4 THE CONCEPT OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS .....	35
2.5 THE ROLE OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS .....	38
2.6 THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS' TOWARDS THEIR LEADER .....	45
2.7 SUMMARY .....	48

CHAPTER THREE .....	49
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....	49
3.1 RESEARCH APPROACH .....	50
3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN .....	52
3.3 STUDY POPULATION AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE .....	53
3.4 SAMPLING TECHNIQUES AND SAMPLE SIZE DETERMINATION .....	54
3.5 INSTRUMENTATION AND DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES.....	56
3.6 METHODS OF DATA ANALYSIS AND VALIDATION .....	58
3.7 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS .....	61
3.8 SUMMARY .....	62
CHAPTER FOUR .....	63
DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS .....	63
4.1 DEMOGRAPHIC DATA OF RESPONDENTS .....	63
4.2 RELIABILITY OF DATA .....	67
4.3 DISCUSSION OF SURVEY, INTERVIEW AND FGD RESULTS.....	68
4.4 SUMMARY .....	115
CHAPTER FIVE .....	116
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	116
5.1 INTRODUCTION .....	116
5.2 SUMMARY OF IMPORTANT FINDINGS.....	117
5.3 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	123
5.4 PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS .....	130
5.5 FUTURE RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS .....	132
5.6 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	133
5.7 SUMMARY .....	134
5.8 REFERENCES .....	135
5.9 APPENDICES .....	149
Appendix A: Letter to Regional Education Bureau.....	149
Appendix B: Letter to Woreda Education Office .....	151
Appendix C: Letter to Principal .....	153
Appendix D: Interview with School Supervisors .....	155



Appendix E: Focus Group Discussion with Secondary School Teachers .....	158
Appendix F: Questionnaire to School Principal.....	162
Appendix G: Questionnaire to Secondary School Teacher .....	178
Appendix H: Percentage of Pass in GESLCE (2005/2013-2007/2015) .....	187

## LIST OF TABLES

	<b>Pages</b>
Table 4.1. Socio-demographic Characteristics of School Leaders.....	64
Table 4.2 Socio-demographic Characteristics of Teachers.....	66
Table 4.3 Transformational Leadership Survey Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Result.....	68
Table 4.4 KMO and Bartlett's Test 24 items 6-factor Solution (N=76).....	69
Table 4.5 Total Variance explained (Varimax Rotation) 24 items 6-factor Solution (N=76).....	69
Table 4.6 Varimax Rotated Component Matrix for 24 item 6-factor Solution (n=76).....	70
Table 4.7 Descriptive Statistics of the TLR 6-factor Solution (n=76).....	71
Table 4.8 Transformational Leadership Roles Dimension Correlation.....	72
Table 4.9 Dimensions of TSL Role of Principals (interview and FGD).....	84
Table 4.10 KMO and Bartlett's Test 26 items 8-factor Solution (N=76).....	85
Table 4.11 Total Variance explained (varimax rotation) 26 items 8-factor Solution (N=76).....	86
Table 4.12 Varimax Rotated Component Matrix for 26 item 8-factor Solution (n=76).....	87
Table 4. 13 Principals Ratings of their Transformational School Leadership Descriptive Survey (N=76).....	97
Table 4.14 Pearson Correlation Results of Principals' Self-ratings.....	98
Table 4.15 Teachers Ratings of their Principals' Transformational School Leadership Styles Descriptive Survey (N=642).....	102

Table 4.16 Person Correlation Results of Teachers' Perceptions	
Ratings of their Principals' Transformational Leadership.....	103
Table 4.17 T-values, Standard Deviations (SDs) and Means scores	
of Teachers and Principals in Transformational Leadership	
Dimensions.....	104
Table 4.18 Leadership Styles of Principals (Interview and FGD).....	105
Table 4.19 Spearman's rho Correlation Results of Transformational	
Leadership and Student Achievement.....	106
Table 4.20 Spearman's rho Correlation Results of Transformational Leadership	
Dimensions and Student Achievement.....	107
Table 4.21 Multiple Regression Results: Transformational Leadership	
and Student Achievement.....	108
Table 4.22 Standardized Beta Weighting Coefficients for the Components	
of Transformational Leadership.....	108
Table 4.23 Person Correlation Results of Principals' Demographic	
Data and Student Achievement.....	112
Table 4.24 Multiple Regression Results: Principals' Demographic Data	
and Student Achievement.....	112
Table 4.25 Standardized Beta Weighting Coefficients for the Components	
of Principals' Demographic Data and Perceptions.....	113

**LIST OF FIGERS**

Page

Figure 4.1 Schools, Principals rated TSL by Teachers and Average

Percentage of Pass per year.....

111

# CHAPTER ONE

## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

The practice of leadership is as old as human history. From the beginning, different questions have come up on the concept of leadership, such as: “What is leadership? Does leadership really matter? What is successful or unsuccessful leadership? How do leaders behave? What is the role of leadership in organizational effectiveness?” (Mills, 2008: 39-40; Ladkin, 2010: 4-9) Scholars in educational leadership have been raising these timeless leadership questions in the context of school principalship. What is the role of principal leadership (Devos & Bouckenooghe, 2009: 174)? What is successful or unsuccessful principal leadership? How do successful or unsuccessful principals behave? And, does principal leadership have real impact on school effectiveness? (Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2011:3; Mills, 2008: 40); what do the effective principals do? (Kruger & Scheerens in Scheerens, 2012: 2), what are the determinants of leadership effectiveness? (Yukl, 2010: 20). Such questions have been raised frequently.

Leithwood et al. (2006: 14) argue that school leadership plays a vital role in the effectiveness of educational institutions. A school principal is effective when he/she helps others believe in themselves, see and use their own potential and jointly develop a vision and strategy for action (Mazurkiewicz, 2011:88). According to Day et al., (2011: 229), effective principals found to define core values of the institution that they head, set the vision to be translated into action which would let in rising the expectations of the stakeholders, also set direction, create conducive environment for teaching and learning process, restructure the organisational parts and remodel leadership roles and responsibilities.

According to Bass and Riggio (2006:4), inspiring followers to commit to shared vision and goals (Kirk & Terry, 2004:3) and continually highlighting the mission of the school to staff, students and parents are roles that effective school principals practice. Moreover, looking ahead and sharing the defined vision are qualities that differentiate effective leaders from non-effective ones. In this regard, Jordan (2009:27) agrees that if a government wants to have effective schools, it should look at the principals’ leadership roles. Consistent with this, Jordan (2009:27) went on to identify three roles that leaders should play, namely; path finding, alignment and empowering. In general, studies focusing on the roles of school principals as leaders, particularly

as transformational school leaders, underscore their significance as key actors in bringing about school effectiveness.

School effectiveness generally refers to the ability of a school to achieve or exceed its goals. The goals should reflect the outcomes a school expects to achieve (Creemers & Kyriakides, 2008:40). However, the literatures in the field suggest different ways of looking at school effectiveness. For instance, Griffith (2004: 257) looks at effective schools in terms of high student achievement. Scheerens (2000:23) proposes that leadership, acquisition of basic skills, a secure environment, high student expectations, and frequent performance assessment are critical elements of effectiveness. According to Blair (2002:180), effective schools exhibit strong leadership, positive learning environment, high expectations, order, structured teaching, and positive relationship between students, parents and communities. Equally, Teddlie and Reynolds (2000: 10) indicate that a principal's strong leadership skills, instructional focus; safe and orderly teaching-learning environment and high expectation for students' achievement are common factors of effective schools.

School effectiveness is closely tied to effective principalship. According to Harris (2010:16), principal's effectiveness can have a positive effect on students' achievement, organizational management and staff development. Moreover, building positive relation and empowering others to lead are key characteristics of an effective leader. Furthermore, Leithwood and Jantiz (2000: 16) after exploring the relative effects of transformational leadership practices on selected schools concluded that transformational leadership has significant effects on school conditions and on students' achievement.

Doyle and Rice (2002:32) add that to achieve excellence in teaching and learning takes more than a strong and skilful principal with technical expertise. For the principal to have an effective school with motivated teachers, he/she should not only seek to motivate teachers directly on the quality of the curriculum and instruction, but also directly influence their behaviour by using a transformational approach to leadership (Leithwood & Jantiz, 2006: 223; Nguni, Slegers, & Denessen, 2006: 800).

Taking the secondary school contexts, Eyal and Kark (2004:228) highlighted the important functions of transformational school leaders in improving education. Roles and concrete

practices associated with transformational leadership approach have been consistent research topic for many studies leading to a number of theoretical paradigms which among others include Leithwood, Aitken and Jantiz's (2001) Transformational School Leadership (TSL) model, Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) proposed by Kouzes and Posner's (1995), Principal's Transformational Leadership Inventory developed by Chong-Hee No (1994), and Bass and Avolio's (1995, 2000) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). A comparative analysis of these studies demonstrates many common and similar sets of transformational leaders practices performed within effective schools (Sun & Leithwood, 2012: 427).

It is specifically argued that transformational leadership helps in shaping principals' perceptions and attitude which results in improving their schools (Marzano, Waters, & McNully, 2005; Balyer, 2012: 588; Northouse, 2001). Transformational leadership is viewed as being composed of four factors: (1) Idealized or charismatic influence, which views leaders as role models for followers; (2) inspiring and motivating followers through a vision of a brighter future; (3) intellectual stimulation of members through the questioning of organizational assumptions and willingness to innovate; and (4) individualized consideration of organizational members through coaching and mentoring that attends to their needs, including the need to achieve and grow (Bass, 2002: 419). It is considered that principals who demonstrate these major characteristics of transformational leadership have effects on satisfaction among teachers and better performance at school (Rose & Gray, 2006: 799; Nguni et al., 2006: 168-169; Castro Perinan & Bueno, 2008: 1842).

Based on the literature mentioned above, we can understand that among the many leadership styles, transformational leadership is most suitable to enhance school's outcomes. The reason behind this assertion is that the focus of transformational leadership is to influence followers' behaviour positively to be committed to their schools' effectiveness (Hallinger, 2003:339). When a principal practices transformational leadership, teachers are transformed from followers to leaders within the school. On the other hand, in transformational leadership, the followers develop affinity with the leader and the team that is being led (Leithwood & Sun, 2012: 388). Again, the constructs of transformational leadership (charisma, inspiration, individual consideration and intellectual stimulation) and leadership practices that demand to make schools' effective; there is strong link between transformational leadership and school effectiveness (Bass

& Riggio, 2006:5). Thus, the purpose of this study is to investigate the transformational leadership role of principals at Ethiopian secondary schools.

## **1.2 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY**

The history of school leadership in Ethiopia goes back to the introduction of modern education in 1908 with the opening of Minilik II School. Until the 1940s, the history of school leadership in Ethiopia focused on foreign principals from countries such as France, Britain, Sweden, Canada, and Egypt. According to Ministry of Education (MoE, 2002:38), prior to 1962, expatriates filled most of the leadership posts in both elementary and secondary schools across the provinces of Ethiopia. Based on their experience and academic level, Indians used to get ample opportunities to lead schools as principals.

It was after 1964 that Ethiopia started replacing foreign principals with Ethiopians. Besides school leadership, these new Ethiopian principals were also responsible for managing education-related issues in their district. At that time school principals were appointed by the Federal Government appointed school principals primarily on the basis of their educational credentials and work experience (MoE, 2002:42). Until recent years, though for a few years, principals were selected by their school staff and the placement of a school principal was by open competition.

Beginning from 1994, the government of Ethiopia decentralized the educational system by devolving the decision-making and the service functions from the Federal Government to Regional States and then down to school level. This reform affected management practices in the education sector. Programmes like Education Sector Development Programme (ESDPs, I-V) gave strong emphasis to strengthening the capacity of the system. In addition, improving the school effectiveness and management is one of the goals of these programmes. The main aim of ESDP is to improve the educational quality and expand access to education with special emphasis on primary education in rural and underserved areas, and to promote girls' education (MoE, 2005:4).

Different directives and regulatory frameworks on how to govern a school system are produced by the federal and regional states. To mention some of them, Education and Training Policy (ETP, 1994), Strengthening of the Management and Administration of Schools (amendment) Proclamation 217/2000, Directive for Educational Management, Organization, Public



Participation, and Finance (MoE, 2002) and other number of directives are developed by regional state education bureaus which were aimed at strengthening the decentralization of the school system.

The Education and Training Policy (ETP, 1994:30) stipulates that education management will be democratic, professional, coordinated, efficient, effective and encourage the participation of women. The policy also describes that an overall coordination under democratic leadership of committees consisting of members from the community.

Moreover, Proclamation 217/2000 outlines the transfer of power on management and supervision, curriculum development and employment of teachers from Federal level to Regional Education Bureaus. Directive for Educational Management, Organization, Public Participation, and Finance (MoE, 2002: 5-53) clearly outlines the duties and responsibilities of various bodies in education management from the office of Ministry of Education down to local governors of schools and school principals. Moreover, the directive further specifies the duties and responsibilities of schools and school leaders. Schools, particularly secondary schools, are accountable to Woreda/District Education Office in rural areas, and to City Administration Education Office in urban areas. School Boards or Parent Teacher Associations (PTAs) that are elected from parents, teachers and students provide the higher governing body of a school. The secondary school principal is also accountable to Woreda or City Administration Education Office, depending on location, and to PTA.

The Education and Training Policy (ETP, 1994:30) gives more emphasis to educational organization and management, particularly the role of the principal on school effectiveness. MoE states that efficient school leadership and management systems shall be established in schools in order to enhance the quality of instruction and thereby improve learning outcomes (MoE, 2005:36).

Today, the movement for reform at national and regional levels has gained momentum. Educational reforms such as General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP) is comprehensive covering most of the critical components of quality improvement, including: revising and upgrading the national curriculum; development and provision of new textbooks across all grades and subjects (in local and national languages) based on the new curriculum;

improved pre-service teacher education; strengthened continuing professional development (in-service) for incumbent teachers; capacity development for head teachers to improve school leadership and management; training for stakeholders in school improvement planning; training for regional and federal ministry officials to improve their planning and budgeting skills and development of national assessment programmes, in particular at post-primary levels (MOE, 2008: 11 ).

The increased public demand for effective schools has helped to improve not only the content of the educational processes but also the leadership of school systems (MoE, 1994: 29-30; 2008: 51-58; 2010: 48-50). Policy directions and guidelines prepared at each level show that the role of school principals is critical for successful implementation of educational reforms.

The school effectiveness approach is particularly suitable for GEQIP given the politically and financially decentralized structure of the Ethiopian education system. Quality improvement within the Ethiopian education system depends on the capacity of school leadership to work with teachers, parents, and students to diagnose constraints and implement changes to improve results.

One of the most important challenges of GEQIP is how well schools integrate all the various components of the programme, and aligns them to key performance indicators of the programme, namely: increased learning outcomes, primary school completion rates and secondary entrance (MoE, 2008/09: 12). It is believed, by officials and the community at large, that the main responsibility to resolve these challenges falls on school principals.

### **1.3 THE RESEARCH PROBLEM**

In Ethiopia, the duties and responsibilities of secondary school principals are described in a handbook entitled: “School Organization and Management” (MoE, 1994: 32-36) as well as other policy documents such as ETP (1994: 30). The responsibilities currently assigned to Ethiopian secondary school principals correlate with four dimensions of transformational leadership described in Bass and Riggio (2006:6-7). The striking similarities are described here: Creating and sharing vision goes *with charismatic leadership which provides vision and a sense of mission*; exemplary practices goes with the *leader should act as a role model for subordinates to inspire them*; empowering and developing followers’ potential goes with the idea of *individual*

*consideration*; and initiation goes with the idea of *intellectually stimulating followers toward new ideas* that are supposed to stimulate rethinking of old ways of doing things.

Moreover, the roles of secondary school principal are described in the duties and responsibilities in the above documents and they match with transformational leadership constructs. In alignment with the constructs, Ethiopian principals are expected to bring academic success in secondary schools in line with the theoretical assumptions underlying transformational leadership.

However, Federal and Regional reports reveal that secondary schools are not meeting expectations placed by government and the public. For instance, the annual statistical abstracts of the MoE (2009: 48-49; 2010: 48-50; 2011: 49-51) as well as Education Bureau of SNNPRS (REB, 2009: 45; 2010: 38-51; 2011: 40-48) showed that the student learning outcomes of secondary school students is declining continuously. As a result, dropout and retention rates are also getting higher. According to the MoE (2010b: 92), secondary schools are performing below expected efficiency levels targeted in ESDP IV. The dropout rate in Grade 9 and 10 was 10.4% respectively and 10.1% in Grade 11 and 12 in 2009/10. Similarly, the repetition rate goes 9.2 % in Grade 9 and 10, and 8.75 % in Grade 11 and 12. Simple inference that can be drawn from the forgoing data is that the learning achievement would seem to be questionable in general.

What is worrisome is that data found from National Educational Assessment and Examination Agency (NEAEA, 2010: 48-50 ) show that though the minimum passing score set by MoE is 50%, underachievement of students particularly in key subjects (% of students scoring below 50 %: English 82.2, Mathematics 85.3, Physics 89.9, Chemistry 82.9, and Biology 75.2) requires improving teaching and learning. Regional and Federal Governments blame principals for non-performance of their duties and failure to demonstrate expected leadership to solve these problems (SNNPREB, 2011:22-23; GEQIP, 2008: 1).

Despite investment at a colossal level on education and the number of programmatic changes made by the Government of Ethiopia, most schools are not registering what is expected from effective schools or they have improved very slightly. The observed improvement is negligible. To make change interventions meaningful, schools' leadership practices must be redesigned to meet the needs of individual students. It is the transformational leadership that can address the needs of the individual - *individual consideration*. Transformational leadership provides a

leadership paradigm for changing educational organizations and making them more productive (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006:232). Leadership theories suggest that transformational leadership is the best way to achieve the goals of schools in the 21<sup>st</sup> century (Sun & Leithwood, 2012:430; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006:223; Ross & Gray, 2006: 801).

Transformational leadership plays a significant role directly or indirectly in influencing its followers by promoting and managing school development. There has been empirical evidence that indicate a link between transformational leadership of the school and student ability to succeed academically (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2007:190 and Leithwood et al. 2004: 12). However, no previous study has been conducted within Ethiopia to examine the relationship between the transformational leadership of school principals and school effectiveness particularly taking the General Education School Leaving Certificate Examination (10<sup>th</sup> grade) aggregate result as measurement of school effectiveness. Though Tesfaw (2014) and Yemer (2009) studied transformational leadership, the methodology, variable and context that they used were different from this study. While Tesfaw (2014:903) focused on the relationship between transformational leadership of principals and teachers' job satisfaction in public secondary schools, Yemer (2009: 32) looked at whether transformational leadership could be successfully implemented in Ethiopia, as a country. Tesfaw (2014: 909) used Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Form 5X (MLQ-Form 5X) as a data collection tool, whereas Yemer employed qualitative case study using semi-structured interviews.

Therefore, the gap that was mentioned above and the search for effective leaders warrants investigating how transformational leadership is characterised and implemented in secondary schools of South Nations, Nationalities and Peoples' Regional State (SNNPRS), Ethiopia. Hence, this study focuses on principals' roles in providing and executing transformational leadership and measuring the effect these leadership constructs may have on student achievement using the aggregate result of General Education School Leaving Certificate Examination (10<sup>th</sup> grade).

#### **1.4 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The aim of this study is to examine the transformational leadership roles of secondary school principals in order to establish if there is relationship with student achievement. In order to

achieve this aim, the researcher will explore the existence and manifestation of the transformational leadership, perceptions of principals and teachers and recommend strategies that have contribution to practice and research.

#### **1.4.1 Specific Objectives**

In line with the above aim and general objectives, the study intended to meet the following specific objectives.

1. To determine what constitutes the transformational leadership role of school principals at Ethiopian secondary schools;
2. To explore how principals in SNNPRS of Ethiopian secondary schools implement transformational leadership;
3. To assess how principals perceive their transformational leadership roles in SNNPRS of Ethiopian secondary schools;
4. To examine teachers' perceptions of their principals' transformational leadership in selected SNNPRS secondary schools;
5. To explore the nature of the relationship between the transformational leadership role of school principals and student achievement; and
6. To make recommendations that may serve as strategy for secondary schools leadership based on the findings of the study.

#### **1.4.2 Basic Research Questions**

To main research question of this study is *what is the transformational leadership role of principals in Ethiopian secondary schools?* The following are specific research questions:

1. What constitutes the transformational leadership role of school principals at Ethiopian secondary schools?
2. How do principals in SNNPRS secondary schools implement transformational leadership?
3. How do principals in SNNPRS secondary schools perceive their transformational leadership?

4. What are teachers' perceptions regarding their principals' transformation leadership in selected SNNPRS secondary schools?
5. What is the nature of the relationship between the transformational leadership role of school principals and student achievement?
6. What recommendations can be made that may serve as strategy for secondary schools leadership?

### **1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

Several studies have been conducted on transformational leadership roles (such as Hallinger, 2003: 339; Doyle & Rice, 2002:32; Rose & Gray, 2006:798; Tesfaw, 2014: 90; Yimer, 2009). However, no similar research has been conducted focused on the Ethiopian context, particularly on the secondary school principals in South Nation, Nationalities, and Peoples' Regional State (SNNPRS) using the aggregate result of General Education School Leaving Certificate Examination (10<sup>th</sup> grade) as school effectiveness measurement.

Therefore, this research is significant for the following reasons:

1. It will provide information that may be used to understand the transformational; leadership roles of school principals in SNNPRS of Ethiopia and its manifestation;
2. It will also shed light on the question of the relationship between transformational leadership and student achievement;
3. It will help the researcher in increasing his knowledge, analytical skill and make meaningful contribution to the academic world;
4. It will contribute knowledge to the existing research gap regarding transformational leadership in secondary schools of Ethiopia, more specifically to the SNNP region;
5. It will suggest strategies that may enhance the effectiveness of school principals' transformational leadership practices; and
6. Research findings may serve as stepping-stone for further investigation regarding specific issues of transformational leadership roles of the principal.

## **1.6 SCOPE OF THE STUDY**

This study is restricted to secondary schools in Southern Nations, Nationalities, and Peoples' Region State. The context of the study focused only on public secondary schools and standard examination called GESLCE as a student achievement. Principals who have three and above three years' experience as a principal were only included as research participant. Moreover, this study mainly considers transformational school leadership (TSL) constructs that are defined by Burn and Bass (2006) and operationalized by Leithwood and Jantiz (1999, 2001; 2006). Transformational School Leadership (TSL) model has three categories and six dimensions.

## **1.7 ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

This study was based on the following assumptions:

1. The administration of the study area would allow the study to be conducted;
2. The sample considered in this study represent the entire population of the study area;
3. The response elicited by the respondents represent the facts and enumerators administer the questionnaire without any prejudice; and
4. The response from the respondents would be adequate in serving the questions framed under this study.

Notwithstanding human behavioural issues attached to their gender, religion, friendship etc traits the researcher expects the respondents to be fair and honest in their response. Moreover, using teachers' perceptions of their principals' transformational leadership role to measure student achievement was a limitation of the study. However, this limitation was filled by using interview with supervisors and FGD with teachers. The final limitation to be considered was a delimitation involving principals who only had a minimum of three years' experience as a principal in the studied schools as a requirement.

The major challenges and some of the constraints encountered in carrying out the research were lack of adequate finance, time (the researcher is full time employee) and frequent meetings at all levels that hampered to get respondents particularly for interview and FGD as scheduled. The problem was alleviated using telephone in case of few interviews and arranging meetings after working hours.

## 1.8 DEFINITION OF KEY CONCEPTS

*School Effectiveness* is performance of the school that focused to bring impact on learners' academic outcome. The learning outcome is measured by examination results obtained during formal assessment (Ololube, 2006: 76).

*School Principal* is a person who is executive leader of a secondary school and who is responsible for goal attainment and success of a school.

*Secondary Schools* in this study are public secondary schools in SNNPRS; schools that give education in four years duration (Grade 9-12) consisting of two years of general education (Grade 9 & 10) and two years of preparatory (11 & 12) which will prepare students for higher education and world of work (MoE, 2013:4).

*South Nations, Nationalities and Peoples' Regional State (SNNPRS)* is one of the nine Federal Governments/States in Ethiopia. The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia is divided in nine Regional States and two City Administrations.

*Transformational Leadership* is leadership behaviour that centres on the development of followers by raising their individual needs to a higher level and seeking to meet those higher needs. In this study, transformational leadership dimensions include the four/five constructs of Idealized Influence/Attributed Influence, Intellectual Stimulation, Inspirational Motivation, and Individualized Consideration (Bass & Riggio, 2006: 5).

*Transformational school leadership* is a model developed by Leithwood et al. (1999;2006) to measure transformational leadership behaviours based on three categories (Setting direction, helping people and redesigning the organization) and six dimensions, namely: building collaborative structure and strengthening school culture, sharing school vision and building consensus and modelling behaviour, high performance expectation, intellectual stimulations and individualized support (Leithwood & Jantiz, 2007:179).

*Woreda* is, in South Nations Nationalities & Peoples' Regional State, the lowest administrative level where all government offices are located.

*Zone* is an administrative level between Region and Woreda. All government agencies in Woredas report to their respective offices in Zones, and Zones in turn report to Region.



## **1.9 ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY**

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter One provides the basis for the study. It introduces the argument (cf. 1.1), stated background of the study (cf. 1.2), the research problem (cf.1.3), aims and objectives of the study (cf. 1.4), significance of the study (cf. 1.5), scope (cf. 1.6), assumptions and limitations of the study (cf. 1.7), definition of key concepts (cf. 1.8), and the chapter organization of the study (cf. 1.9). Chapter Two provides a review of the literature regarding the concept of leadership (cf. 2.1), the concept of transformational leadership (cf. 2.2), transformational leadership in education (cf. 2.3), the concept of school effectiveness (cf. 2.4), the role of transformational leadership in school effectiveness (cf. 2.5) the perceptions of teachers towards their leaders (cf. 2.6). Chapter Three discusses the research methodology including the research approach (cf. 3.1), research design (cf. 3.2), the study population and sampling procedure (cf. 3.3), sampling techniques and sample size determination (cf. 3.4), instrumentation and data collection techniques (cf. 3.5), methods of data analysis and validation (cf. 3.6), and ethical consideration of the study (cf. 3.7). Chapter Four presents the results and analysis of the collected data. It presents the demographic data of respondents (cf. 4.1), data analysis procedure (cf. 4.2), and discussion of survey, interview and FGD results (cf. 4.3). Chapter Five summarizes the findings (cf. 5.3), and provides discussion and conclusions based on the findings (cf. 5.4), implications to social change (cf. 5.5), future research implications (cf. 5.6), and recommendations (cf. 5.7). Each chapter has its own introduction and summary.

## **1.10 SUMMARY**

Leadership, particularly school leadership, has been seen as a determining factor to school effectiveness. Researchers who study school effectiveness agree on the critical role of the school principal (Day et al. 2011: 229; Kirk & Terry, 2004:3; Lezotte, 2001:3). Though not all *leaders have* the same methods of convincing others to follow them, Rose and Gray (2006: 800) Sun and Leithwood (2012:418), and Leithwood and Jantiz (2007:186) recommend transformational leadership as one of the best models to make schools effective. This research study investigated and described the nature and manifestations of the transformational leadership role of the principal in SNNPRS, Ethiopian secondary schools and measured the relationship principal leadership constructs have with student achievement.

Literature on leadership behaviours, concept of transformational leadership and school effectiveness, perceptions of teachers and the role of transformational leadership in school effectiveness is reviewed in the next chapter (Chapter Two).

## CHAPTER TWO

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the literature on the concept of leadership spanning from trait theory to transformational leadership style. It also focuses on the concept of transformational leadership and school effectiveness. The practices of principals employing transformational leadership in schools, teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership style and the role of principals' transformational leadership style in school effectiveness are thoroughly discussed.

#### 2.1 THE CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP

Leadership is a construct whose conceptualization is often shaped by the nature of theoretical traditions advocated by its researchers. Hence, depending on schools of thought, researchers offer different definitions of leadership. For instance, scholars like Yukl (2010), McManus (2006), Koestenbaum (2002) and Blanchard (2007) variously define the term leadership in accordance with their perspective. Yukl, after a comprehensive review of the literature, stated that leadership is a way of influencing an individual to work toward the personal or organizational goals or objectives willingly. It is also a process of bringing people together to strive to achieve shared goals (2010:20). While willingness to be influenced and shared objectives are key issues to Yukl, McManus (2006:12), on the other hand, argues that leadership is a process of establishing a team, and team spirit using empowerment as a tool to get positive outcomes.

Northouse (2001: 3) presented that a potential leader is such that one can influence others and ensure that they follow him/her. Leadership is a process in which we find the involvement of both leaders and followers. Nevertheless it is the leader who initiates this process to be feasible more than their followers. It is one of this characters that distinguishes a leader from his followers. According to Plunkett, Attner, and Allen (2008: 434-435), leadership comprises three sets of variables, namely: the leader, followers, and the conditions and state of affairs in which both the leader and the follower are interacting and continuously altering. Both the leader and those being led are human beings with various proficiencies, traits, understandings, and attitudes developed through experiences that shape their personalities, personal viewpoints, and ethical

beliefs. These factors can contribute to or detract from the leader's ability to influence others. They are the sources of the individual's strengths or weaknesses.

To the researcher, leadership makes people feel important and then inspire them to exert their maximum effort to achieve the purpose. Koestenbaum (2002:19-21) states that leadership is greatness in all one does. Greatness is a style that leaders practice in their daily activities such as: innovativeness, foresight, effectiveness, and flexibility giving high value for people and their willingness to take risk. Blanchard (2007:3) notes that leadership is the process of touching the 'thoughts and actions of others'. Likewise, Sashkin and Sashkin (2003:39) define leadership as the art of transforming people and organizations with the aim of improving the organization's performance. Moreover, Jean Marie (2004: 49) defines leadership as a selfless desire to both serve and prepare others.

Leaders are expected to encourage followers and present clear vision to them. They also need to generate a willingness within followers to follow them along a socially accountable and commonly beneficial course of action toward the set target.

Leadership is not just the territory of officials at the highest position. It can arise at different echelons and by any person. Higher level leaders are also expected to create leadership in those leaders beneath them. This view is at the centre of transformational leadership. What is essential to effective leadership is beliefs such as classroom instruction and, prominently, to issues of change in social life (Bass & Riggio, 2006: 17).

Leadership and its potential outcome on organizational performance and enduring experience are at the front position of the agenda of organizations of the world. Hence, in this era of globalization, all organizations, be it profit making or not-for-profit, need high-quality leadership at all tiers. There is also growing evidence that senior leaders can play a crucial role in the design and success of service delivery and employment to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse population.

Leadership is the ability to influence a group toward achievement of goals. It is considered as the centre of group change and activity, and embodies the willingness of the group. Leadership is also conceptualized from a personality perspective. According to Creighton (2005), this perspective considers personality, social, physical, or intellectual traits that differentiate leaders

from others. Leadership has been defined in terms of the power relationship that exists between leaders and followers. From this viewpoint, leaders have power to affect change in others (Northouse, 2013:5). While leadership is as an act or behaviour, or change in a group that we observe as a consequence of leadership initiatives, Bonaros (2006: 14), Munoz (2013: 6-7) and Stone and Patterson (2005: 1) find leadership as an instrument in facilitating the followers achieve their goals. It is nothing but enabling their followers translate their vision into reality.

Thus, from the above literature, leadership may be considered a process of influencing and leading followers and situations. It is impossible to provide detailed summary on leadership in this chapter considering the voluminous literature available. However, since the focus of this study is on leadership styles of secondary school principals, it is logical to examine the evolution of principal leadership spanning from trait theory to the current model of transformational leadership.

### **2.1.1 Trait Theory of Leadership**

Trait Theory is one of the earliest leadership theories. It assumes that leaders share certain inborn personality traits, or that some people are born with certain traits that others do not have. This approach dominated the study of leadership up until the 1950s, but failed to produce evidence that personal characteristics influence leadership success (Yukl, 2010:31). Maritz (2003: 243) found in his research that distinguishing leaders from non leaders as per their traits, personality, and social, physical or intellectual attributes dates back to early 1930s.

Traits are unique characteristics of a leader, such as intelligence, values, self-confidence, and appearance. These approaches focus on traits and skills with the assumption that some people are endowed with certain physical qualities such as height and appearance, aspects of personality which include self-esteem, dominance, conscientiousness, and emotional stability, and aptitudes which comprise general intelligence, verbal fluency, and creativity (Hargis, 2011:7; Lewis, Packard, & Lewis, 2007:321-322; Daft & Marcic, 2006: 413; Plunkett et.al., 2008: 435). The early research focused on leaders who had achieved a level of greatness and, hence, the phrase 'the greatman approach' was coined. The great man theory focuses on the leader as the primary element of leadership that contends to focus mainly on the leader by excluding or down grading of other variables that are part of leadership process. Most importantly, the idea was to investigate what made those people great, and select future leaders who exhibited the same traits

or could be trained to develop them. In recent years, there has been a revival of concern in assessing leadership traits. In addition to personality traits, physical, social, and work-related distinctiveness of leaders have been examined.

Traits such as weight, fluency of speech, intelligence, height, appearance, extroversion, introversion, industriousness and dominance were the main emphasis in a Trait theory (Kruger & Sheerens, 2012: 3). In addition, Maritz (2003: 243) in congruence with his peers such as above authors and augments attributes such as enthusiasm, charisma, and courage. According to Kruger and Sheerens (2012:3), personality traits appear to play a rather deterministic role in leadership. The suitability of a trait or set of traits depends on the situation of leadership. However, the same traits may not apply to all leaders or situations.

Each situation may have particular requirements that make one trait or skill more important in one situation than in another. A different trait or skill, or a set of them, may be more important in another situation. Leaders do not have to be intellectual, geniuses or prophets, but they do need to have certain capabilities and the capacity to use their skills. However, a certain set of traits and skills, does not guarantee successful leadership. Leadership is considered as a combination of special traits or characteristics that an individual possesses and that enables him or her to induce others to accomplish tasks. But it is not a matter of passive status or of the mere combination of traits, rather a working association among members of a team, in which the leader gets rank through active participation and demonstration of his or her ability to carry supportive tasks to end. From the late 1940s to mid-1960s emphasis shifted to the behavioural styles that leaders demonstrated in schools and non-school contexts (Maritz, 2003: 243).

### **2.1.2 Behaviour Theory of Leadership**

Since the 1950s, dissatisfaction and discouragement with trait theories led scholars to search for new ways on what leaders do and how they do it (Kruger & Scheerens, 2012:4). Behavioural studies of leadership emerged and aimed to identify behaviours that differentiated leaders from non-leaders and effective from ineffective leadership. The failure to describe successful leadership by focusing only on traits led to a concern of searching for the behaviour of leaders and how this can facilitate or impede leadership success. Therefore, they changed their direction of study from leaders' traits to behavioural approaches of leadership and consequently different patterns of behaviour were categorized collectively and labelled as styles.

Unlike trait theories, behavioural theory focuses on leaders' effectiveness, and not on the emergence of an individual as a leader. Moreover, this theory focuses on how leaders behave and how the way leaders behave affected their performance (Yukl, 2010: 31). This theory laid the foundation for studies on what constitutes effective principals and give new insight on tasks and activities of school principals. The primary role of the principal focuses on teaching and learning while the secondary task revolves around preparing input to instruction (Kruger & Scheerens, 2012:4). Such typologies help to appreciate the complex duties of principals in schools. Most research results show that principals spend their time on administrative issues rather than on teaching and learning (Hornig, Klasik & Loeb, 2009: 24). Kruger and Scheerens (2012:4) argue that students' achievements will improve and schools will become effective if the principal give the lion's share of his/her time to school vision. Leadership style studies such as the Ohio State Leadership Studies on participatory or directive leadership and the Managerial Grid Studies suggest that there are specific behaviours through which leaders could be identified.

Ohio State Leadership Studies developed leadership concepts in two dimensions, namely; task orientation and relationship or consideration orientation. While the task-oriented school principals mainly focus on making the organizational goals successful by any means, relation-oriented principals give more attention to the needs of teachers, students and other staff members through respect and trust to achieve organizational goals. By blending these dimensions, the study proposes four different leadership styles. The first style depicts a principal who gives high attention to both dimensions. A principal who practices this blended style uses relationship as a means to achieve organizational goals. The second style gives high value to relationships and less attention to tasks. School principals who adhere to this style try to attain their schools' learning performance through interpersonal behaviour. The third style gives less notice to relational orientation and high attention to task. Principals who use such style give priority to the existence and successful implementation of instructional programmes and procedures. The fourth style is described by lower attention on both dimensions. Such principals are characterized by enormous focus on administrative matters and neglect of academic issues (Kruger & Scheerens, 2012:6-7).

Another study associated with Ohio State Leadership Studies is called Managerial Grid. The credit for developing this model is given to Blake, Mouton and Williams (2003). In a similar

study by Bolman and Deal (2003: 340), they found Blake and his colleagues' developing a dichotomous approach to leadership by indicating a grid during 1960s that proposed a grid-based approach on the dimensions of "concern for task/production" and "concern for people". This approach emanated from an understanding that the leaders can mainly be divided into two while one prioritises tasks of the organisation whereas the other on employees side of the organisation. In addition, Bolman and Deal (2003: 340) noted that principals does not constantly maintain a singular style of leadership but choose alternatives to suit their discourse though they begin by applying most dominant one in their practice. Bolman and Deal (2003: 340-41) state that, "Managerial Grid principally embodies the Ohio State dimension of consideration and initiation structure or the Michigan Dimension of employee and production oriented". Though the grid contains 81 cells, Blake and Mouton (2003) focused on the most salient five, namely: 1) little concern both for task or people, 2) concern for people but little for task, 3) concern for task but not for people, 4) balance for both task and people, and 5) integrate both task and people.

According to Maritz (2003: 245), the two approaches associated with Ohio State Leadership were before the era of globalisation which was stable and predictable. Consequently researchers from Finland and Sweden explored other approaches to the leadership if any. It resulted in the discovery of third approach which is related to leader's effectiveness. Development-oriented leaders enable their employees to be innovative, generate new ideas, and will be willing to be dynamic and let their followers to be so. Nevertheless, this statement may be further supported by further evidence. However, development-oriented have more contented employees and are seen as more capable by those staffs.

Effectiveness of leadership was studied at the University of Michigan and found out that the most effective superiors were those who focused on the followers' human needs to establish strong teams with high performance targets. The Michigan researchers coined the terms such as "employee-centred leaders" and "job-centred leaders". While the first one is used in reference to those who established high performance goals and displayed supportive behaviour toward subordinates the later is intended to refer to those tended to be less concerned with goal achievement rather focus on secondary matters that include cost minimization and production efficiency (Daft & Marcic, 2006: 415).



It is in this context, that one may conclude that the implications of behavioural theories, unlike trait theories, are that there exist possibilities to train leaders and stimulate changes by developing their behaviour and improve the quality of their leadership. They can develop flexibility in their leadership style, which would enable them to adapt their leadership style to suit the context in which they find themselves. However, according to Bonaros (2006:19), scholars identified the limitations of behavioural theories and the studies focused the situations in which leadership takes place. It is known that the leadership styles changes from circumstance-to-circumstance. “Processes by which leaders emerged in different circumstances became the main direction of research for some while others turned to the way in which leaders and followers viewed each other in various contexts” (Bonaros, 2006:19). This led to the emergence of situational theory of leadership that focused on the combination of factors that affect effective leadership.

### **2.1.3 Contingency Theories**

The contingency theory on leadership attempts to identify which of these situational factors is most important and to predict which leadership style will be more effective in a given situation (Yukl, 2006:32). The contingency theory is often referred to as the ‘it depends’ approach to effective leadership. It assumes that there is not one best approach to leadership and stresses the influence of the total set of conditions or circumstances in which the leader must function. Contingency theory suggests that the situation determines which leadership approach will be better rather than saying that one of the two (or a combination) of the approaches is most valuable. According to Scheerens (2012: 9), three important situational factors emerge from this view. The first one includes leader-subordinate association, which mainly includes a common belief between them. The second factor is task structure, which mainly comprises the question of whether and to what degree a manager understands what must be performed in order to make the most of the job. The last element is concerned with the mechanisms on hand to a leader for managing benefits and sanctions. Contingency theory proposes that leaders do not just act, but that they also react to specific situations.

Hersey and Blanchard’s Situational Leadership Model proposes a contingency theory in which a leader’s use of differing leadership behaviours depends upon two interrelated maturity factors, namely: job and psychological maturity. A teacher who has high level of knowledge and skill in

his/her subject matter and is self-confident requires little principal leadership, while a teacher who has low level of knowledge and skill in his/her subject matter and is not self-confident demands principals' direct supervision and mentoring (Yukl, 2006:32). Such leadership style relies on employees who are willing to lean (Bolman & Deal, 2003: 341). Hersey and Blanchard Model aims to dwell into facilitator-follower behaviour, which helps develop strategies to ensure that the leaders' behaviour would stand up to the expectations (Coetzee & White, 2004:107).

The proponents of contingency theories believe that approaches of leadership would change from situation-to-situation. As a result, leaders are expected to perform their duties in different situations and adapt different styles to fit the situations in which they operate. Fiedler made a prevalent effort to mix leadership style and organizational circumstance into a complete theory of leadership. The essential thought is to "match the leader's style with the situation most favourable for his or her success" (Daft & Marcic, 2006: 417). By analysing the style of leadership and the situation of the organization, the right suit can be set. The base for situational approaches is the belief that individual capacities should go with the context if leadership is to appear. Although these assumptions had lived for some time, the major advance did not occur until the 1970s, when Fiedler established the 'contingency theory' (Scheerens, 2012: 9).

Fiedler developed a contingency model in which three major situational variables function to determine whether a given situation is favourable to the leader or not. These include a leader's personal relationship with members of their group (leader-member relations), the degree of structure in the task their group has been assigned to perform (task structure), and the power and authority their position provides (position power). Fiedler's contingency theory proposed that leader effectiveness is not determined by leader's ability to adapt to the situation, but by the ability to choose the right leader for the situation. This implies that some principals are simply better for specific situations than others are and the situation determines the identified principals' success (Stone & Patterson, 2005:5). Principals must find the style and structures most suited to their own local situation (Hallinger, 2003: 345). Moreover, in order to lead a school effectively, the principal must understand the context in which a school operates. Student background, community make-up, school culture and structure, teacher experience and competency could be contextual variables that a principal may consider (Hallinger, 2003: 346). Recent thinking about effective leadership has supplemented the situational approach with emphasis on the leaders'

charisma, ability to develop and implement the vision of the organization, and the ability of each worker to act as self-motivated employee. This is transformational leadership where the leader influences others such that they lead themselves.

## **2.2 THE CONCEPT OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

The search for effective leadership style is a continuous process. The summary of how leadership theories evolved indicates how it developed from the earlier trait theory to the transformational leadership style. The pioneer work of the transformational leadership concept as a leadership theory emanates from the study of James McGregor Burns (1978). Burns (1978) introduced the concept of transforming leadership. It was historically great leaders' leadership quality that led Burns to raise questions. For Burns (1978), transformational leadership was basically setting aside self-interest from both the leader and follower such that goals are achieved for the benefit of all. Later, Burns' book motivated Bass and his friends to develop the transformational leadership model that subdivided leadership into a two-pronged theory, namely: transformational leadership and transactional leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006: xi). Bass (2002) argues that leaders could be both transformational and transactional and they could complement each other. Burns (1978) made a fundamental distinction between transactional and transformational leadership.

Transactional leadership is defined as trading one thing for another, whereas transformational leadership is more focused on change. As described by Bass and Riggio (2006: 3), there are three forms of transactional leadership: contingent rewards, management by exception and laissez-faire leadership. The modes are labeled Contingent Reward, Management by Exception-Active, and Management by Exception-Passive. The Contingent Reward mode of transactional leadership is seen as fairly effective by Bass and Riggio in motivating constituents to achieve higher levels of performance. The Management by Exception-Active and the Management by Exception-Passive modes of transactional leadership are not seen as being as effective and may actually be counterproductive (Bass & Riggio, 2006: 8).

Transformational leadership is a form of leadership in which leaders set a common goal and shared vision of the future, inspire followers mentally and show individual consideration to followers (Chi & Huang, 2014: 302). Charbonnier, Akremi, and Vandenberghe (2010: 700-702)

also argue that transformational leadership promotes followers' adaptive performance, and its practice has a built-in linkage with the emergence of adaptive behaviour which involves the capacity to work imaginatively and gain knowledge of new skills, the ability to deal with demanding circumstances, as well as the competence to contain varied social environments. These capacities should be particularly well addressed by transformational leaders.

Transformational leadership focuses on stimulating and inspiring followers to achieve both extraordinary outcomes and develop their own leadership capacity (Bass & Riggio, 2006: 3). Bass (2002) stated that transformational leadership emphasizes the growth and development of an organization's followers and its goals.

In addition, Hargis (2011: 11); Bass and Riggio (2006: 5-8) classified the dimensions of transformational leadership into the following four categories:

1. *Idealized Influence*: The transformational leader becomes a role model for the followers, facilitates the acceptance of group goals, and encourages them to upgrade their organizational goals. Idealized Influence is the degree to which leaders behave in charismatic ways, causing followers to identify with them. The followers transcend their self-interest for the sake of the organization and develop a collective sense of mission and purpose.
2. *Intellectual Stimulation*: The leader's behavior helps the followers to identify new approaches when faced with difficult challenges. Intellectual stimulation is the degree to which leaders challenge assumptions, take risks, and solicit followers' ideas. Here the transformational leaders question the status quo, appeal to followers' intellect, stimulate them to question their assumption, and invite innovative and creative solutions to problems.
3. *Individualized Consideration*: Transformational leader provides the followers with helpful advice relevant to each individual. It is the degree to which leaders attend to followers' needs, act as mentors or coaches, enabling them to develop and self-actualize, and listen to follower' concerns.
4. *Inspirational Motivation* refers to the way in which transformational leaders energize their followers by articulating a compelling vision of the future. The leader

communicates high expectations to followers, inspiring them through motivation to become committed and a part of the organization's shared vision.

Thus, transformational leadership gives more attention to the charismatic and emotional basics of leadership. Northouse (2010: 187-191) also explains transformational leadership as a process where an individual engages with another person and creates a correlation that raises the level of inspiration and goodness in both the leader and the follower. Such leaders also set demanding goals of the future that inculcate dedication, favour the materialization of empowerment in work groups, and enhance results closely related to adaptive performance such as ingenuity and organizational modernization. Transformational leadership also encourages independence and demanding work, became increasingly important to followers' job satisfaction (Bass, 2010: 10; Bass & Riggio, 2006: 4; Charbonnier, et al., 2010: 700-702; Chi & Huang, 2014: 302; Goodnow & Wayman, 2009: 4-5; Munoz, 2003:37; Tekleab, Sims, Yun, Tesluk, & Cox, 2008: 187).

The fundamental job of transformational leaders is to increase the responsiveness and consciousness of their subordinates to higher levels of behaviour and goodness. The final measurement for actual transformational leaders is their role in promoting employees higher ethical maturity and they move followers to go beyond their self-interests for the benefit of their team, organization, or society (Mulla & Krishnan, 2012: 86).

Tekleab et al. (2008: 186-187) maintain that transformational leadership focuses on educating followers' loyalty to governmental goals and shaping the culture in ways consistent with the organizational plan. According to these authors, transformational leadership helps to focus followers' efforts on lasting targets. To achieve these objectives, they concentrate on setting goals and stimulating followers' desire for success. Bass (2010:10) also emphasizes that transformational leadership goes beyond one's self interest for the wellbeing of the society and that personal interests and values of employees are also aligned with that of the organization. Furthermore, transformational leadership inspire alterations or alignment of structures in the service of a new vision rather than functioning within existing systems to maintain the status quo.

Zagoršek, Dimovski, and Skerlavaj (2009: 145) also portray the potential role of the transformational leadership as one of the essential ways of creating learning institutions.

According to these authors, some behaviours of leadership such as helping and empowering of employees that are the features of transformational leadership positively affect organizational learning. Transformational leadership also influences employees and practices by encouraging flexibility and exchange of views and creating an environment for learning. This also creates a condition for improvement and employees develop the culture of taking initiatives, exploring and developing new ideas, actions, and products out of which organizations can benefit.

As the main action of transformational leadership involves stimulating followers to widen their horizon and see challenges from various perspectives, it also assists subordinates to grow and get to higher performance, and inspires them through a demanding goal. Such actions should be facilitated when the work group has created cultures and values that stimulate individual initiatives, new views, and innovative ideas (Charbonnier et al., 2010: 700).

Transformational leaders constantly examine and review their environment to satisfy the changing needs of organizations. Transformational leaders also integrate the resources of the organizations and direct all efforts towards the common goal and make the organization open to change. In transformational leadership, accountability and responsibility are increased and transformational leaders constantly share the vision of the organization to all the members of the organizations. If organizations want to plan and implement change, they need to have transformational leadership practitioners. Transformational leadership also focuses more on the charismatic and emotional elements of leadership (Munoz, 2003: 37). Therefore, prioritising the organisations interest in the place of individual interest is sine-qua-non. Transformational leadership goes well with the needs of today's team-based organizations which can be effective when they are motivated and empowered to succeed in times of uncertainty.

Charbonnier et al. (2010: 700) also state that transformational leadership behaviour helps to set a common objective and vision of the future, encourage subordinates emotionally and show personal selflessness to employees. Transformational leadership is also certainly related to work group performance outputs. Chi and Huang (2014: 302-303) assert that transformational leadership influences performance of team in organizations by determining shared targets within work groups.

Moreover, Bass and Riggio (2006:7) posit that transformational leaders ensure productivity by enabling the employees translate vision into action by inculcating inspirational culture across the institution that can create congenial working environment and to promote intellectual stimulation among the school community. Thus, the role of transformational leadership is reflected in the attributes of a principal who transforms the values and needs of teachers, motivates them to achieve goals beyond their expectation, and provides leadership and support through carefully conceived change stages, acting as a role model (Kim, 2012: 876).

Today, there is widely accepted conceptualization that leadership in a school setting is a shared process, rather than a one-way process in which only leaders influence others. The introduction of mutual influence process in leadership study has brought a paradigm shift in educational leadership understandings. Principals now need active involvement from their staff members to achieve their schools' goals. Leadership theories that closely link with this concept are known as transformational leadership. Transformational leadership is a type of shared or distributed leadership. Principals who exercise transformational leadership models focus on bottom-up approaches to incite change in schools (Hallinger, 2003:338).

The present study, based on the Transformational School Leadership model (TSL) (Leithwood, Steinbach & Jantzi, 1999; 2001; 2006), adopts the three categories (setting directions, developing people, and redesigning the organization) and six dimensions (sharing school vision and building consensus, high performance expectation, individualized support, intellectual stimulation and modelling behaviour, building collaborative structure and strengthening school culture) of transformational school leadership.

Leithwood et al. (1999; 2001; 2006) model incorporates the Bass and Avolio dimensions of transformational leadership that are idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, inspirational motivation and contingent reward. They have done more than 34 large studies using transformational school leadership model. Among these 22 of the studies focused on principals. After such extensive research Leithwood et al. determined that Transformational School Leadership is the best starting point to develop a model for making schools effective (Gulbin, 2008: 31).

Leithwood et al. aligned the behaviours with the concepts of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and organized them into three categories. According to Gulbin (2008: 265-271) and Leithwood & Jantiz (2006: 212-216), the three categories and specific dimensions of transformational school leadership model are discussed as follows:

1. Setting Direction. This category has three dimensions, namely: Building school vision, Establishing school goals and Demonstrating high performance expectations. While *building school vision* focuses on providing staff with an overall sense of purpose, sharing and exciting staff with visions, helping clarify the meaning of the school's vision in terms of its practical implications for programs and instruction, assisting staff in understanding the relationship between external initiatives for change and the school's vision and the larger social mission of the school, and using all available opportunities to communicate the school's vision to all the school community; *establishing school goals* concentrates on providing staff with a process through which to establish school goals and to regularly review those goals, expecting teams of teachers and individuals to regularly engage in goal setting and reviewing progress towards those goals, assisting staff in developing consistency between school visions and both group and individual goals, encouraging teachers to establish and review individual professional growth goals.

*Demonstrating high performance expectations* gives attention on expecting staff to be innovative, hard working and professional, commitment to the welfare of students, not accepting second-rate performance from anyone, permitting freedom of judgment and action within the context of overall school goals and plans. Examining the proximity of constructs between building school vision and establishing school goals, the researcher merged them in to one dimension- sharing school vision and building consensus. Thus, in this study setting direction have two dimensions (sharing school vision and building consensus, and demonstrating high performance expectations).

2. Developing People. This category has three dimensions, namely: providing Individualized support, providing Intellectual stimulation and Modelling. Offering *individualized support* includes treating everyone equally, having an 'open-door' policy, being approachable, giving personal attention and being thoughtful about the personal needs of staff. Moreover, encouraging individual staff members to try new practices consistent with their interests, providing coaching



for those staff members who need it, following through on decisions made jointly with teachers and assuring staff members that they can get what they want personally in exchange for their efforts are behaviours included in this dimension.

Providing *intellectual stimulation* focuses on the practice of removing penalties for making mistakes as part of efforts toward professional and school improvement, directly challenging the basic assumptions of staff about their work as well as unsubstantiated or questionable beliefs and practices, encouraging new initiatives, stimulating the search for and discussion of new ideas and information relevant to school directions.

Modeling behaviours gives attention to best practices and important organizational values, general commitment to the school organization, working alongside teachers to plan special events, displaying energy and enthusiasm for own work, commitment to professional growth, demonstrating the value of examining problems from multiple perspectives, modeling problem-solving techniques that others can adapt for their own work. Furthermore, this dimension promotes reinforcing key values such as respect for others, trust in the judgment of one's colleagues, integrity and the instrumental value of punctuality.

3. Redesigning the Organization. There are two dimensions under this category, creating a productive school culture and developing structures. Creating a *productive school culture* dimension dedicated on clarifying the school's vision in relation to collaborative work and the care and respect with which students were to be treated, reinforcing with staff norms of excellence for their own work and the work of students, using symbols and rituals to express cultural values in the context of social occasions in which most staff participate, confronting conflict openly and acting to resolve it through the use of shared values, using slogans and motivational phrases repeatedly, acting in a manner consistent with those beliefs and values shared within the school. Furthermore, this dimension includes sharing power and responsibility with others, working to eliminate 'boundaries' between administrators and teachers, and providing opportunities and resources for collaborative staff work.

*Developing school structures* focuses on distributing the responsibility and power for leadership widely throughout the school; Sharing decision-making power with staff, Taking staff opinion into account when making decisions; Providing autonomy for teachers (groups, individuals) in

their decisions, altering working conditions that helps staff have collaborative planning time and creating opportunities for staff development. Though this category (redesigning the organization) has two dimensions, the researcher merged them to one dimension-building collaborative structure and strengthening school culture.

Thus, in this study the transformational school leadership model is constructed by three categories and six dimensions. It is widely believed that the more the transformational leader employs these dimensions, the more likely the school becomes efficient and effective (Gulbin, 2008: 34). Leithwood and Jantzi (2007:190) in their review of transformational leadership research found that this type of leadership had positive relationship with the concept of school effectiveness.

### **2.3 TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION**

Policy designers who have objectives of improving schools by introducing large scale changes believe that the achievement of the implementation of those designed policies is highly related to the character and value of the leadership at the local level, particularly at the school level (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006: 201). It is also believed that such local leadership has the considerable impacts on school situations and learners' education. This also calls for searching the best way of developing successful leaders at school levels.

In the context of education, the two leading approaches to study leadership are instructional leadership and transformational leadership (Hallinger, 2003: 329). Sun and Leithwood (2012: 420) further discuss that different aspects of transformational leadership in education setting include instructional leadership and managerial leadership. As opposed to numerous previous leadership theories such as trait, situational and contingency theories that were implemented in the school context, the instructional and transformational theories centre clearly on the way in which the educational leadership exercised by leaders and educators at school level brings about enhanced educational results. Including instructional leadership aspects into the transformational leadership approach makes a complete and more appropriate model for schools.

Schools must change themselves into learning institutions to get better, to continue to meet the expected objective, that is, student achievement. So, the task is to develop practice around the

notion of school effectiveness that demands “personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, team learning and systems thinking” must be there (Hargis, 2011: 12).

Instructional leadership approaches developed at the beginning of 1980s from early studies on effective schools which identified “strong, directive leadership focused on curriculum and instruction from the principal as a characteristic of elementary schools that were effective at teaching children in poor urban communities” (Hallinger, 2003: 330). Assumptions disseminated in the 1980s and at the beginning of 1990s globally about successful principal leadership were also shaped by this instructional leadership model, and this model is chosen by many principals.

Beginning early 1990s, the scholars in the field of educational leadership see birth of new terminology such as “shared leadership, teacher leadership, distributed leadership, and transformational leadership” (Hallinger, 2003: 330). This also indicated a broader discontent with the instructional leadership model, because its main focus was excessively on the director as the core source of capability, influence and authority.

Leadership models in education are subject to the same fashion that is evident in other areas of the study. Over the years, researchers have subjected both instructional leadership and transformational leadership approaches to expand practical research. Even though substantial development has been made over the years, the environment of successful leadership at the school level still requires more investigation to properly understand the substance and form of leadership appropriate for it.

Transformational models to leadership have long been explained as best in situations essentially in schools targeted for reform. As has been pointed out by Leithwood and Jantzi (2010: 452), this approach to leadership basically aspires to promote capacity expansion and higher levels of individual dedication to organizational objectives. Improved approaches and loyalty are believed to create additional attempt and better output.

Oterkiil and Ertesvag (2014:6) contend that a school leadership whose ability to enhance shared decision making and collaborative efforts at highest level is required for school-based interventions. This type of leadership is indispensable. However, it is challenging because it demands a principal who can establish good culture and structure in the school system. The authors also say that combining both transformational and transactional leadership approaches

may offer the needed leadership practices to apply multifaceted interventions effectively. Transactional leadership will give the predictable, logical and constructive school situation that is important for staff to discharge responsibility in the decision-making process. Hence, a principal's capability to balance competently both approaches of leadership (transformational and transactional) will make the school system capacitated and successful.

As depicted by Leithwood and Jantzi (2010: 206), transformational school leaders set directions of schools by designing school visions of the school, setting detailed and achievable objectives and priorities, and creating soaring performance outlooks. In addition, such leaders also engage in building the capacity of human resource of the schools by arranging scholarly inspiration, giving personal assistance, and modelling attractive specialized activities and standards. Furthermore, transformational leaders redesign the processes of the school. This results in building a school culture where collaboration prevails, designing organizational structures that promote involvement of members in decisions related to educational issues, and establishing creative society relations.

This shows that school principals have a responsibility in establishing a suitable work environment in which instructors perform together being united and identify strongly with the purpose of the schools. The means for achieving such an environment include the allocation of tasks, development of instructors' educational levels ('empowerment') and the development of a shared vision for the track in which the educational institution must develop (Scheerens, 2012:23).

To transform a school system, the leader needs to set out a vision, properly plan and put activities in a sequential order, and clearly spell out how the restructured process can shape the employees. In most cases, transformational leaders start the activities of changing the institutions by focusing on the structures of the organization before planning for change in the organization. The practice of reforming the organization may include shaping and properly matching the organization and the vision (Kiper, 2007: 19).

Bonaros (2006: 22) also argues that the school principal should provide services to the community by modelling the art of teaching and supporting the school community so that they become better followers. This will lead to a leadership style driven by service and stewardship. A

study conducted in Tanzania by Nguni et al. (2006:161) shows that teachers' value dedication was more influenced by transformational leadership factors whereas loyalty to continue was more influenced by transactional leadership factors.

School leadership should connect people to each other and their work following the rules of morality. Nguni et al. (2006:162) also found that the more the level of the experienced transformational and transactional leadership aspects, the more the level of satisfaction of the employees on their work. As identified by Leithwood and Jantzi (2010:204), practices of transformational leadership in school settings have both direct and indirect effects on teaching staff performance. The leaders in education also indirectly influence the teachers' inspiration, competence, and work conditions.

Research scholars Bass & Riggio, identified the elements of transformational leadership as found in a study that the followers of such leadership experience dedication to schools and associated organizational citizenship deeds and professional pleasure (Bass & Riggio, 2006: 34). The commitment of an employee can be perceived as his/her attachment to his superior or it can be to the work group or it may be. The transformational leader guides the attitudes of teachers by designing a vision for the future, by stimulating, encouraging, providing personal assistance through coaching and by establishing scholarly challenges.

In addition, the importance of building an educational school institution by ensuring organizational transformation of teachers into learners shall be the main focus (Scheerens, 2012:23-24). There is need for distinguishing the leadership styles especially transformational leadership from transactional leadership. These two aim to utilise two different means to fulfil intended objectives. The transformational leadership strive to enhance intrinsic motivation of the teachers, whereas the later one, teachers are inspired mainly to change based on the external rewards.

All transformational theories to leadership focus on feelings and ideals and share the basic objective of promoting capacity building and advanced levels of individual dedication to institutional objectives on the part of leaders' social groups. Improved competences and loyalties are believed to bring about additional endeavour and better output. Power and pressure associated with this kind of leadership are not essentially owed to those who occupy official

managerial positions. Rather, authority is indeed ascribed by members of the organizations. Practices associated with transformational leadership may be extensively disseminated all the way through the business.

The study of Bonaros (2006: 6) also indicates that strong positive relationship between transformational leadership and work performance exists be it military or non-military organizations, business or school. In educational context, scholars also identified a strong positive relationship between transformational leadership and learners' achievement. Effective schools are those that show clear organizational purpose, successful leadership and activities, higher expectations, a secure, logical, and helpful situation, greatest utilization of instructional time and regular follow-up of learners' improvement and encouraging relationships between students' home and the school. Hence, majority of the studies show positive relationship between principal leadership and student achievement.

Marks and Printy (2003:128-130) also suggest a reasonably well-built, constructive association between transformational and dependable and superior pedagogy. Examination of different school cases revealed the significance of the school leader's role in establishing convincing academic challenges, enhancing academic staff's leadership abilities, and creating numerous and regular links to teachers job in their classrooms.

Lazzaro (2009: 21) suggests that school principals need to adopt transformational leadership approach. He also found out that teachers' satisfaction improved with the awareness of their leaders' leadership methods applied as more transformational and less transactional. Furthermore, Lucas and Lazzaro (2002: 21) found a strong relationship between transformational leadership and school culture. They also reported that the sharing of power between leader and their leadership work teams increases the success of modelling school culture. In such kind of leadership, mutual support systems prevail.

In general, the capacity of a principal to implement the conducts of a transformational leaders such as setting clear vision, modelling behaviours, promoting dedication, offering personal assistance, giving scholarly inspiration and holding better performance outlooks can change the school culture. This will also help to improve the retention of school staff. So, it can be said that the job of school effectiveness begins with the school leader because the principal is powerful in

optimistically planning and implementing the needed change. Transformational school leaders emphasize transforming and positively changing the school environments. “In a healthy and positive school climate, change can be successfully implemented to facilitate school improvement” (McCarley, 2012: 7). Schools with good climate are critical to student achievement.

Leadership is considered as one of the most prominent organizational factors that can influence the ability of school to change because it has the capability to positively influence the other things and to bring about possible capacities that are found in school settings. Transformational leadership is well thought-out to play an essential role in sustaining or restraining changes in school environments (Oterkiil & Ertesvag, 2014:6). By transforming and making the change sustainable in the school environment through transformational leadership, it could be possible to determine what practices and characteristics can be associated with positive student achievement. According to Hargis (2011: 12), the school principal’s leadership has a clear impact on learners’ attainment.

In sum, transformational leaders are those who can lead change in schools. They are the reformers of school environment. To change the whole system, they can influence the attitude of the followers towards the shared vision of the future. By implementing and leading successful change in school environment, transformational leaders can enhance students’ achievement.

## **2.4 THE CONCEPT OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS**

Studies published in the 1970s (Coleman et al., 1966; Jencks et al., 1972) showed that teachers, schools, and even education in general did not at all make much difference on student outcome.

These studies concluded that it is the students’ background characteristics (student ability and family background) that contribute to students learning outcomes, not the education factors. It was the studies in the 1980s (see Edmonds, 1979; Rutter et al., 1979) that brought out strong arguments and findings against the early (1970s) studies that schooling makes a difference in students’ success (Creemers & Kyriakides, 2008:12).

Following these, several studies in different countries conducted research on school effectiveness and identified factors that make schools effective or ineffective (Teddlie & Reynolds, 2000: 71). School effectiveness refers to the impact that school-wide factors, such as school policy for

teaching, school climate, and the school's perceived mission, have on students' cognitive and affective performance (Creemers & Kyriakides, 2008:3).

School effectiveness is one of the concepts that are hard to explain and even more tough to quantify. Many scholars in the arena of educational planning see "effectiveness as a measure of factors that seeks to improve a child's ability to learn irrespective of his/her background. Among different models of school effectiveness the Five-Factor model put forward the five factors i.e. leadership, high student expectations, a secure environment, acquisition of basic skills, and frequent performance assessment as very important that help attain school effectiveness (Scheerens, 2000:23).

School effectiveness depends on several factors, particularly under the current climate where global reforms in education and innovation have been the order of the day. Researchers, educational planners and policy makers have been much occupied with what constitutes school effectiveness. They are also concerned with how to make their schools more effective and raise quality and standards of achievement.

However, the concept of school effectiveness evolved into the current definition gradually following certain agreements on measurements. Two widely known elements of measuring school effectiveness are *economic and sociological*. To economists, effectiveness is related to the production process of an organization, that is, transformation of inputs to outputs. The assumption of this perspective is that the increased inputs will lead to increments in outcomes. While they consider finance, educational materials and students as input; instructional methods, curriculum, and organizational conditions are considered the process that produce the output. Students' successful graduation or their grades at the end of school are considered output. However, input-output model is criticized for not giving clear answers to how the desired outputs can be defined and how the production process operates (Creemers & Kyriakides, 2008: 15-16).

According to sociological perspectives, Socio Economic Status (SES), gender, social and cultural factors have effects on student achievement. The effectiveness of education is measured by its ability to provide schooling to the needs of different groups of students. They take school climate, culture, and structure as main factors for effectiveness. Moreover, as organizational theorists they take pluralistic stance and thus measure organizational effectiveness criteria such



as productivity, adaptability, involvement, continuity, and responsiveness to external stakeholders (Creemers & Kyriakides, 2008:16).

In 1970s and 1980s, researchers used school results such as the number of transfer for special education, transitions from one levels of education to the other and repetition ratio as criteria for school effectiveness, current studies mostly use data from national tests (Creemers & Kyriakides, 2008: 20). Horng, Klasik, and Loeb (2009: 18), in their study, principal time-use and school effectiveness, also use four types of school effectiveness measures: student achievement on state standardized tests, teachers' assessments of the school, teacher satisfaction, and parents' assessments of the school.

Moreover, quality and equity are used as measurement of effectiveness. The criteria for effectiveness will be measured at the level of individual students, classes, and schools (Creemers & Kyriakides, 2008: 23), as well as how far each school manages to reduce the variance between students (equity). Quality is measuring outcomes of schooling by investigating whether what is achieved exceeded the expectations, the expected is achieved, or less than expected is achieved. Equity is measuring outcomes of schooling by investigating whether the gap is reduced, remains the same, or is increased (ibid).

Effective schools give more emphasis to the formative purposes of assessment than for the summative purposes (Kyriakides, 2005a in Creemers & Kyriakides, 2008:40). In less effective schools, more scheduled time is wasted because there is no system to encourage, or compel schools to use time effectively. Achieving or excelling goals that are set by a school is generally deemed as school effectiveness.

Several studies (Sun & Leithwood, 2012; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom, 2004; Robinson, 2003; Horng, Klasik, & Loeb, 2009; Witziers, Bosker, & Kruger, 2003; Scheerens, 2001; Creemers & Kyriakides, 2008; Gulbin, 2008; Nguni et al., 2006; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2007; Catano & Stronge, 2007; Browning, 2014; Greb, 2011) have been conducted to establish possible correlation between school leadership and student achievement. Of these studies, some focused on transformational leadership. The meta-analysis of Chin (2007) showed that transformational school leadership had positive and very large effect on student achievement. Bush also argues that the quality of leadership makes a significant difference to school and

student outcomes. This requires trained and committed teachers but they need the leadership of highly effective principals (Bush, 2009: 375).

Sun and Leithwood (2012) analysed the nature of transformational school principalship and its effects on student achievement. They found that transformational school leadership has small but significant effects on student achievement (Sun & Leithwood, 2012: 418). Similarly, Leithwood and Sun (2012) examined unpublished studies to see the effects of transformational school leadership on student achievement. Though, Sun and Leithwood (2012) in their review found that the effect of transformational school leadership on student achievement is low, they argue that the result adds value to the understanding on how transformational school leadership affects student achievement (Sun & Leithwood, 2012:422).

Researchers most frequently use student achievement or student learning outcome to measure the impact of transformational leadership on school effectiveness (Ross, 2004; Leithwood et al., 2003; Leithwood et al., 2004; Griffith, 2004; Silins & Mulford, 2002). While Day et al., (2001a; 2001b) and Griffith (2004) used local and national test scores, Ross (2004), Silins and Mulford, (2002) and Leithwood et al. (2003; 2004) used state and national test results in math and language skills to measure student achievement. All the above studies reported significant and positive correlation between transformational leadership and student achievement, except the study by Leithwood et al. (2004) that reported insignificant effect (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2007: 190).

This study uses Ethiopian National School Leaving Certificate Examination's aggregated results to measure the relationship between transformational school leadership with student achievement at secondary school of SNNPR, Ethiopia.

## **2.5 THE ROLE OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS**

The six dimensions (building collaborative structure and strengthening school culture, sharing school vision and building consensus, high performance expectation, intellectual stimulation, modelling behaviour and individualized support) of transformational school leadership will collectively or individually enhance schools' effectiveness. The role of transformational school leaders in excelling schools is immense. The leader gives challenging tasks to enhance teachers'

skills, serves as role model, clearly articulates and shares his/her vision, and inspires teachers to be committed to achieve higher outcomes (Sun & Leithwood, 2009: 407).

The role of transformational leadership is transforming followers into good leaders by “motivating them to do more than they originally intended and some times more than they thought possible” (Bass & Riggio, 2006: 4). Developing leadership skills in their subordinates or followers are what make transformational leadership special. Bass and Riggio (2006: 2) believe that transformational leadership is fundamental for effective performance of schools. Rose and Gray (2006: 800) postulate that principals who practice transformational leadership can raise teachers’ willingness to go beyond the usual requirements of teaching. Nguni et al. (2006: 161) found that principals’ transformational leadership contributes between 17 and 18% of the variance in organizational commitment. Today, principals are expected to exhibit this leadership quality to improve teaching and learning in schools.

Bass and Riggio (2006) argue that transformational principals motivate teachers to strive for their school’s effectiveness by setting more challenges. Transformational leaders succeed by committing themselves to satisfying and empowering their followers and by giving more attention to individual needs and personal development. By allowing teachers to exert their leadership potential, transformational principal raise teachers’ leadership abilities to higher levels. Transformational principals inspire their followers to commit to shared vision and goals (Bass & Riggio, 2006: 4) and continually highlight the mission of the school to staff, parents, and students (Kirk & Terry, 2004:3). Thus, the role of the transformational principal, as the articulator of the mission of the school, is crucial to the overall effectiveness of the school (Lezotte, 2001: 3).

For the principal to have an effective school with motivated teachers, he/she should not only seek to motivate teachers directly on the quality of curriculum and instruction, but also directly influence their behaviour by using a facilitative and distributive approach to leadership. Hallinger (2003:339) stated that transformational leadership effects are far reaching. It will not only enable teachers to be vision oriented but also turn themselves into leaders of the future when they are under transformational leadership. Ultimately the teachers under such leadership ascribe to same vision as with that of their leaders that paves way to the present as well as future of the school leadership (Barth, 2002:6).

Devos and Bouckennooge (2009: 191) conducted research on principals' conceptions about their leadership role using Quinn's model. They divided educational leaders' role into three, namely: people-minded school leader, administrative-minded and moderate. The study realised that strong leaders motivate professional learning and be able to work so even in dynamic environments and generally emphasize on mentoring role. The administrative-minded principals, who consider administration, organization, and the implementation of rules and regulations as more important than their educational leadership role and or who consider the mentor role not as their most important leadership role. They lack the skills to support their staff effectively and more likely will have a negative impact on school climate.

Transformational leadership model has been advocated for effective management of schools. For some time now, it has attracted researchers and educational policy makers. Rose and Gray (2006: 798), in their search to identify the impact of the role of transformational leadership, found that schools with higher level of transformational leaders produced teachers with higher self-esteem resulting in higher student achievement. Researchers (Rose & Gray, 2006: 799; Nguni et al., 2006: 168) argue that teachers' commitment and sense of self-efficacy are attributes principals can use to influence student achievement.

A transformational school leader is one who inspires teachers and the school community to excel and articulate a meaningful vision for the organization. By involving teachers in decision-making, creating opportunities for them to learn from each other, and reducing their stress level, principals can move teachers to go beyond their own interest for the good of their school.

Leithwood and Jantzi (2005:192) conducted a meta-analysis of studies published between 1996 and 2005, and found that transformational leadership has effects on academic achievement and students' engagement. While the transformational leadership effects on academic achievement were mixed but tending toward positive, transformational leadership effects on student's engagement in school was uniformly positive.

Sun and Leithwood (2009: 407) also conducted a meta-analysis of studies done between 1996 and 2004, and found that transformational leadership has effects on teachers' emotions and beliefs, teachers' practices, school conditions, and student achievement. Among 24 studies, 19 indicate that transformational school leadership has effects on five different types of student

outcomes (achievement, attendance, college-going rates, dropout rates, and graduation rates). However, transformational school leadership had small but significant positive effects on student achievement as typically measured by State wide achievement tests. Similarly, Chin (2007) analysed 28 unpublished studies and found that transformational school leadership had positive and very large effects on student achievement (mean effect size =.49).

Research confirms that transformational leadership style is best suited to achieving school reform aspiring to improve student learning outcomes (Day et al., 2001; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2007; Eyal & Kark, 2004). Leithwood and Jantzi (2007: 186) found that transformational leadership model is the favoured model in school systems devising school reform initiatives. Transformational leadership also emerges as the style of choice in times of crises or confusion in schools. Under such conditions, principals are duty bound to take risks and serve as role models (Bass & Riggio, 2006: 8). Transformational leaders take advantage of such situations by creating a shared sense of vision and inspiring teachers to be committed to organizational goals (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2007:186).

Beach and Reinhartz (2000: 87) assert that transformational leadership is important in meeting the challenges facing schools today. In transformational leadership, the leader gives personal attention to the individual and provides opportunities for them to achieve and grow in a supportive environment.

The principal mobilizes the resources and allows teachers to exploit them to achieve schools' goals (McLean, 2004:116). It indicates that the principle enables teachers to consume resources in the interest of the school and also ensures their commitment to the school by creating a sense of ownership (Sahin, 2004:388). In addition, a transformational school leader plays a key role in promoting the teachers interest in an ethical way (Gupton, 2003:3). It can be realised that the school affairs revolve around the principle. Instead of being head of the line authority the principle shall of professional expertise for him to be a transformational leader in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The principal shall mentor his teachers as he would monitor. Gupton (2003:106) shares similar view and states that the principal as manager should create such system to promote mutual interest.

However, transformed principals do not concentrate only on management skills. They also engage teachers, parents and other stakeholders in planning as well as in evaluating so as to advance the school and improve student achievement. Investigations studying the importance of a sense of community within a school test the relationship between the principal's role in managing interpersonal relationships and enhanced student learning. Transformed principals work hard to promote community involvement in almost every aspect of school leadership. The literature is replete with studies that show effective community participation as valuable to school effectiveness. For example, Cheng (2005:387) argues that family-school collaboration is a cooperative process of planning that brings together staff, parents, children, and community members to maximize resources or school achievement and development. Sharing the school vision with community, which enhances the organizational commitment and social cohesion, is one of the roles of transformational leaders (Kark& Shamir, 2002 in Castro et al., 2008: 1843).

The Ethiopian Ministry of Education states that school principals are given power and responsibility, among other things, to appropriately manage the overall educational activities in schools, and seek and maintain the active cooperation of the community. Despite being of paramount importance, the effort of promoting active community participation has been hindered by different factors. These are associated with school principals' lack of competence and commitment, refusal to encourage the school board and association to participate, degrading the decision making capacity of community representatives, lack of clearly defined roles and responsibilities of school committees, and distance of school community residence from the school preventing active participation in school matters (MoE, 1994: 32). Principals who possess transformational leadership skills typically overcome shortcomings by involving community members. Gaps between leaders and the community are typically recognized and filled by transformational principal. Hallinger (2003: 338) conceptualizes transformational leadership as shared leadership style between the principal and the school staff and community rather than as one person's show.

Another essential role of transformational school leader is the ability to create and communicate the school vision. Significance of vision was a recurring message in educational research literature. Vision is a statement of what the organization aspires to be and it expresses what is desirable. What is desired must be achieved in ways that inspire and motivate. As a starting

point, principals must envision better schools, articulate the vision to others and orchestrate consensus on the vision. Cheng (2005:342) defines vision as an image of a future that school members want to achieve. According Bush (2008: 3), vision is increasingly regarded as an essential component of effective leadership. Transformational principals have a vision or a picture of what they want their schools to be and their students to achieve. They have the ability to persuade their followers to join their vision and share their ideals. The actions of transformational leaders convey the beliefs and commitments that they speak about (Kim, 2012: 870).

Harris (2005: 53) adds empowering the teaching staff as another role of transformational principals. Empowering teachers by giving space on organizational decisions, giving them opportunities to shape organizational goals, purposely providing forums for staff input, acting on staff input and giving real leadership opportunities are situations that really matter and should be among the roles of transformational principals (Harris, 2005: 53). Many scholars view empowerment as an act by transformed school principals to delegate authority and responsibility to teachers on matters related to classroom instruction.

Transformational leaders act through empowerment in influencing work outcomes. Empowerment plays crucial role in positively influencing teachers' behaviour. Transformational leaders can use empowerment to create perceptions among followers that they are being accepted and recognized as important part of an organization (Epitropaki & Martin, 2005 cited in Castro et al., 2008:1843). In addition, transformational leaders empower their followers by encouraging them to see higher purpose in their jobs and this enhances satisfaction, effort and cohesion among followers (Castro et al. 2008:1846). Transformational leaders provide teachers with opportunities for professional growth and development through feedback, reward, recognition, training, seminars, conferences, and workshops to help increase participant skills and organizational standards.

Using review methods, including standard meta-analysis and vote-counting techniques, Sun and Leithwood (2012: 419) identified a wider range of TSL practices than typically has been measured in previous TSL research. They found that most leaders engage in practices at both ends but evidence has suggested that transformational practices augment effects above transactional leadership alone. TSL (subsumes instructional leadership and managerial

leadership) ground its roots in moral foundations and can be participative. The development of TSL has aimed to absorb and integrate many other leadership models. The inclusion of these newer dimensions into transformational leadership model makes it a more comprehensive leadership model in different settings (Sun & Leithwood, 2012: 420).

Transformational school leaders formulate and articulate idealized future goals that serve to energize and create a sense of empowerment to followers who internalize these goals. Sergovanni (2001) points out that most of the time the best principal is engaged in transformational leadership behaviours. They do this by generating enthusiasm for achieving goals and by providing meaning and challenge in the followers' work. Inspirational motivation generally increases the follower's self-identity. Moreover, transformational school leaders use intellectual stimulation to challenge their followers' thoughts, imagination and creativity. They also use individualized considerations to help bolster teachers' achievements and growth by encouraging them to take on increasingly bigger responsibilities to reach their full potential (Castro et al. 2008: 1847).

Researchers apply different mediators or intervening variables to examine how transformational leadership roles of principals impact student outcomes. For example, the study of Barnett and McCormack (2001) and Silins, Mulford, Zarins and Bishop (2000) used *learning climate*, while Leithwood and Jantzi (1999a) used *professional collaboration*; Leithwood and Jantzi (2002) used *organizational commitment* and Bogler (2001) used *job satisfaction* as mediators. In extensive review of the above mediators, Leithwood and Jantzi (2007: 187) concluded that transformational school leadership had uniformly positive effects on all mediators. Moreover, Geijsel, Slegers, Leithwood and Jantiz (2003), Ross (2004) and Leithwood et al. (2004) in their study used *changed teacher practices*, and the Leithwood, Aitken and Jantzi's (2001) study used *planning and strategies for change, school's information collection and decision making process, decision making structures and school policies and procedures*. Ross (2004) and Ross and Gray (2006) used *collective teacher efficacy* as mediator and found they have the mediating effects of transformational leadership on student learning outcome (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2007: 187). Principals might affect the student achievement by influencing teaching learning environment particularly teachers, since the conduciveness of the school environment can be measured through teachers' perceptions (Horng, Klasik, & Loeb, 2009: 21). If teachers do not



identify and articulate their experience about their principals' leadership, educational leadership could be a futile exercise. Leithwood and Jantzi (2005: 192) found that student characteristics (a prior achievement) and teacher perceptions do act as mediating variables to measure transformational leadership.

Using Quinn's model, Devos and Bouckenooghe (2009: 191) did a research on principals' conceptions about their leadership role. They categorized the role of school leaders in to three areas: 'people-minded, administrative-minded and moderate'. While they found that the people-minded leaders are supportive, stimulate professional learning environment and believe mentoring as their invaluable role, administrative-minded leaders mainly consider the organization, rules and regulation as more important than educational leadership roles.

## **2.6 THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS' TOWARDS THEIR LEADER**

This section of the literature review is especially concerned with the principals' transformational leadership role and the perceptions of teachers towards their principals. Since transformational leadership creates emotional attachment between principals who exercise this style and teachers, the style helps build beliefs, values and commitments in followers since teachers are considered the best in evaluating principals' leadership roles. According to Castro et al. (2008: 1842), teachers' consent is an important variable in measuring the success of principal leadership styles and its results in schools.

Employees may like their organization for many reasons. They may like the type of work they do, payment and benefits they receive, people they work with, and the existence of a recognition system or career advancement opportunities. The most important indicator of commitment, according to Bass and Riggio (2006: 32), is leadership that is inspirational, stimulating, and considerate of followers' needs. The strongest effects of transformational leadership seem to be on followers' attitudes and their commitment to the leader and the organization. Teachers who feel inspired by school objectives are more likely to have an affective link to their school (Ozaralli, 2003 in Castro et al., 2008:1846).

In transformational leadership, followers develop strong affinity with the leader positively influencing their commitment and behaviour (Castro et al., 2008: 1842). This leadership style

encourages teachers to be involved in continuous learning and work with the staff to identify individual goals (Hallinger, 2010: 338).

Analysis done by Bass and Riggio (2006:36-38) revealed that each component of transformational leadership does help build followers' commitment in different ways. When the leaders' exercises idealized influence, teachers want to imitate the leader or identify with the leader emotionally identifies with the goals, interests, and values of the leader. When leaders use inspirational motivation, teachers perceive that principals are trying to build emotional commitment to the mission or goals, values, beliefs, and responsibilities. By employing leadership, particularly by creating opportunity to deal with problems in a creative way, transformational leaders increase followers' commitment. Since followers feel their personal career needs are being met and the coaching and support provided by their leader enhances their competency to carry out assignments, their commitment towards the leader, the task and the larger organization will escalate.

Leadership is a significant issue for employees' happiness since leaders have considerable power on work strains and work resources both of which can affect followers' emotional wellbeing (Holstad, Korek, Thomas & Mohr, 2014: 271). As clearly depicted by these authors, transformational leadership style clearly contains the supply of necessary resources. Teachers positively perceive if leaders pay attention to the problems of the followers and if principals show that they are concerned for every one of the employees (individual consideration).

Transformational leadership is also related to different job satisfactions that all over again associate to minimize tension levels of employees. Social support, empowerment, meaningful tasks, high level of task behaviours, clarity of responsibility, and opportunity for growth are positively related to transformational leadership (ibid). Since transformational leadership creates good working conditions and fulfil the necessary resources to a higher level, it is associated with enhanced comfort of employees.

To followers, transformational leaders are those who motivate and encourage employees to attain beyond expected results, and one who also broaden their own leadership ability. Such leaders assist organizational members develop into leaders by reacting to their individual interests. Teachers perceive that transformational leaders undertake these activities by empowering and

aligning the goals of the follower and team members with organization's objectives (Bass & Riggio, 2006: 3). Besides motivating and inciting followers to work beyond expectations, transformational leaders also align team goals with individual goals (Chi & Huang, 2014: 302).

Teachers perceive that transformational leadership can move employees to go beyond the predictable result and direct to elevated levels of pleasure and loyalty if they do provide individualized support to teachers and involve teachers in school decisions. Teachers believe that such practice could establish trust between staff and brings organizational unity. Trust is an important an important glue between teachers and their principal. The higher trust there is in a school, the less people keep things to themselves. The less people keep to themselves, the more trust there is (Segovanni, 2007: 117). Teachers perceive that creating opportunities to be active part of school goals and giving support for their professional development are important roles of transformational leaders. Hence, we can say that principals highly influence employees' work and contextual performance, team and organizational citizenship behaviour if they implement transformational leadership styles.

Finally, the positive impact of transformational leadership on school outcomes such as teachers' satisfaction, student achievement and other performance indicators is well established (Bass et al., 2003; Castro et al, 2008; Ross & Gray (2006); Leithwood & Jantzi, 2007; Sun & Leithwood 2019; 2012). Besides these impacts, it would be not free from possible negative costs and challenges. Being a transformational school principal is not an easy task. Such leaders face several challenges. One of the challenges experienced by transformational school principal is low student achievement. They are always expected to register high student achievement in their school, which is the highest priority by the government and parents. According to Bass and Riggio (2006: 225), matching their philosophy with those of the staff, school and community is one of the challenges that confront a transformational school principal.

Similarly, Bass et al. (2003) state that transformational school principal face a number of challenges, the most important of which is to communicate the vision effectively to followers. Moreover, until they gain the staff's heart, they face strong resistance and suffer misunderstandings. Transformational leadership though touted as the most successful method of leading, is also replete with challenging circumstances (Bass & Riggio, 2006: 226).

Transformational leadership constructs such as individualized consideration and intellectual motivation demand more energy and time, which may cause family conflict or leader burnout. Since this leader does not practice contingent leadership, producing dedicated teachers in the school needs more work than transactional leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006: 236). Complications with community relations add their own time consuming challenges to the best of transformational leaders as well.

## **2.7 SUMMARY**

In this chapter, a review of literature relevant to general leadership theories, particularly the concept of transformational leadership and its role in education in general and in school effectiveness in particular, the concept of school effectiveness and the perceptions of teachers' towards their leaders has been assessed. Transformational school leadership dimensions that focus on the school context, the practice of transformational leadership by school principals and its relation with student achievement has also been reviewed.

The next chapter deals with research methodology that addresses the research approach, design and the instruments the researcher used to carry out this study.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The theoretical and empirical review that was done in Chapter Two addressed the objectives of the present study. The objectives mentioned in the chapter are (1.4.1):

1. To determine what constitutes the transformational leadership role of school principals;
2. To explore how principals in SNNPRS of Ethiopian secondary schools implement transformational leadership;
3. To assess how principals perceive their transformational leadership roles in SNNPRS of Ethiopian secondary schools;
4. To examine teachers' perceptions of their principals' transformational leadership in selected SNNPRS secondary schools;
5. To explore the nature of the relationship between the transformational leadership role of school principals and student achievement; and
6. To make recommendations that may serve as strategy for secondary schools leadership based on the findings of the study.

This chapter describes the research methodology of the study. According to Kothari (2004:8), research methodology may be defined as a technique that indicates how a research is done systematically; and it is the general principle that guides ones research practice (Dawson, 2002:14). It includes research processes, tools and procedures or steps to be taken in accomplishing the research. Thus, this chapter presents the research methodology that comprises, based on the above conceptualization, the research approach and design, the research instruments and type of data collection techniques which the researcher has used. The chapter also describes how the data have been organized, summarized, analysed and interpreted by using appropriate statistical methods based on the type of data. This chapter also comes out with the discussion on the validity and reliability of the research and the ethical considerations involved in pursuing the same.

### **3.1 RESEARCH APPROACH**

The research approach employed for this study is mixed methodology. The mixed methods research dates as far back as the 1950s (Creswell, 2005:14). During the latter half of the 20th century, researchers began employing the mixed methods research design as it was proved to produce more complex and supportive results. Mixed method was recognized as a third method during 1980s (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003: 697; Bryman, 2008:605).

Mixed methods research is identified as the combination of both qualitative and quantitative questions, methods, concepts and techniques in a single study (Johnson & Onwuegbuzle, 2004:113). They further stated that such mixed methods interpret numerical data by way of narratives to numbers which help to arrive at a conclusion and definitive findings. While utilising such methods the data can be mixed at any stage of the research process one or multiple times. This model also allows for two types of data to be gathered simultaneously or sequentially during the data collection (Creswell, 2009: 203).

Though mixed methods research has several advantages over mono methods, it has limitations too. According to Creswell (2009: 205) and Bryman (2008:624), the challenges that researchers face while employing mixed approach include enormous data collection, consumes much time for analyzing text and numeric data are some of its limitations.

The purpose of employing a mixed method approach is to create opportunities for wider and fuller perspective (Creswell, 2006:204; Frankel & Wallen, 2006:443) and to exploit the advantages that both methods have (quantitative and qualitative) by filling the gap that comes from their demerits (Trochim, 2005:120). Furthermore, the mixed method approach is superior to a single method approach because it gives strong deduction, widens opportunities to collect and integrate different data, and enables the researcher to answer research questions that other approaches cannot (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003a:15). In addition, the mixed method approach provides an opportunity to understand the problem deeply (Creswell, 2006: 5).

Bryman (2008:624) debates the advantage of employing mixed methods research as it is one such method that offers absolute realisation of a research problem which is not the case if a researcher applies any of either approach individually. To accrue this advantage it involves

collection of both quantitative and qualitative data, integration of these two forms of data, and using distinct designs that may involve theoretical frameworks and philosophical assumptions.

When research is based on quantitative data alone, it provides the researcher with knowledge gathered through an instrument, say, questionnaire, often in the form of a numeric account of styles, attitudes, or views of a sample population (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2005: 190). With a survey, study group participants are expected to independently respond to the questions regarding their individual leadership behaviours. However, quantitative data alone would not be sufficient to provide answers to the research questions formulated in this study. Conversely, the use of qualitative data provides the researcher with narrative data based on the participants' points of view would not be adequate to enquire in the said research objectives. Thus, a combination of both methods has been attempted in this study.

The main goal of this research is to draw from the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative approaches in answering the research questions and combining the data using mixed methods approach, to verify whether there is any convergence in the findings. Quantitative data were collected using the questionnaire, while the sources of qualitative data were open-ended questions in interviews and focus group discussion with the study participants.

Quantitative results gathered from the self-designed questionnaires rooted in Transformational School Leadership (TSL) model, developed by Leithwood et al. (1996; 2001; 2006) were then compared with the qualitative data that collected from the interviews and focus group discussions. Quantitative results from the questionnaire, along with the qualitative data from the interviews and focus group discussion had been analyzed after transcribing the field notes, finding patterns and identifying common themes. The self-reported measures (questionnaires) were developed to tap on the features of transformational style of school leadership. Data from the questionnaire were examined to determine the manifestation of TSL role based on six dimensions of TSL (Sharing school vision and building consensus, Building high performance expectation, Modelling Behaviour, Providing Individualized Support, Providing Intellectual Stimulation, Building collaborative structure and culture) goals. Information garnered from the interview and focus group discussions transcripts were also analyzed for common themes of actions, behaviours, and practices relevant to transformational leadership. The present study used

the concurrent triangulation mixed research design. The rationale for using the concurrent triangulation design is presented in next section.

### **3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN**

A research design refers to the plan or proposal to conduct research (Creswell, 2009:5); a plan for collecting research data in order to answer the research questions (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2005:599) and it is a framework for the collection and analysis of data (Bryman, 2008:31). A research design used to structure research setting, sample, data collection strategy, measures and methods of assignment in order to answer the research questions (Trochim, 2005:135).

In this research, a concurrent triangulation mixed research design was used to examine the transformational leadership role of principals in secondary schools within SNNPRS. For a research to be identified as concurrent triangulation design to determine if there is convergence, differences, or some combination the researchers has to gather both qualitative and quantitative data concurrently and then compares and integrates the two databases (Creswell, 2009:213).

Fraenkel and Wallen (2005: 443) state that concurrent triangulation design allows the researcher to collect both quantitative and qualitative data simultaneously, compares the results and then uses findings to see whether they validate each other. The two databases are compared to determine the possible convergence. Moreover, besides shorter data collection period, it has the advantage of enabling well-validated and substantiated findings (Creswell, 2011:213).

The concurrent triangulation design will allow the researcher to gain extensive perceptions by combining the results of both sets of data, and it may enhance our confidence in our research findings (Bryman, 2008: 624). The information was derived from individual responses on the questionnaire and through face-to-face interviews and focus group discussions with participants, while the secondary sources of data are gathered from Regional Education Bureau and NEFE.

According to Creswell (2009:213), using the mixed research design creates a wider perspective of knowledge and information through the use of different methods of data collection. The mixed method model of concurrent nested strategy has numerous strengths and weaknesses. Some of its strengths are: both qualitative and quantitative data can be collected simultaneously; it enables information to be gained from the different types of data or from the varying levels within the study; allows a shorter data collection time and helps to balance the weakness or strength of two



methods. On the other hand, some of its limitations are: the data must be interpreted in a manner which can be integrated at the analysis phase, requires great effort and expertise for adequate enquiry, difficult to compare the results obtained by different methods, and would result in refuting evidence and can be detrimental to the research interest (Creswell, 2009:214).

The present study uses the combination of questionnaire, interview and focus group discussion in order to verify the research objectives. The questionnaire helps in assessing several transformational school leadership characteristics and the interviews and focus group discussions provide the participants an opportunity to express their experience, values and beliefs easily (Fink, 2006:1) concerning the subject under investigation. Open-ended questions also allow the respondents to provide details from their own point of view.

Thus, in this research an equal emphasis is laid on both quantitative and qualitative data and their integration has been given importance. The quantitative data was utilized to measure leadership behaviours as they related to TSL characteristics. At the same time, how teachers and supervisors working with the principals perceive the principals' leadership style was explored through focus group discussion and face-to-face interviews with each of the participant. In this study, data were mixed in an interpretation and discussion section.

The mixed method design used in this study pertains to concurrent triangulation design and has been done at the stage of interpreting and corroborating the findings. More specifically, the study attempted to employ the concurrent triangulation design of mixed methods to examine the transformational leadership role of the principal in secondary schools of SNNPRS in Ethiopia and to explore its relationship with student achievement.

### **3.3 STUDY POPULATION AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE**

The school districts involved in this study are located in the Southern Nations, Nationalities, and Peoples' Region of Ethiopia. The region is a multinational and multicultural entity consisting of about 56 ethnic groups with their own distinct geographical location, language, cultures, and social identities. Based on ethnic and linguistic identities, the region is at present divided into 14 Zones (and sub-divided into 126 Woredas), one City Administration and 4 Special Woredas along with about 321 public secondary schools spread all over the fourteen Zones, four Special Woredas and the City Administration.

The target/study population for this study are school principals, teachers and supervisors working in SNNPR. According to the Education Bureau of the region, there are about 321 public secondary schools, consisting of 321 principals (main) along with 8324 teachers in the region (REB, 2013:32).

Eighty schools from 10 Zones, two Special Woredas and one City Administration, namely; Hawassa were selected by using purposive sampling method. The sampling method of this study was based on a specific participant criterion, which includes three or more years of leadership experience as a principal. The three-year minimum threshold of experience as a principal in studied school has been used as a criterion to select the participant principal (Mills, 2008: 59) and to check the relationship between transformational leadership role and student achievement

The principal's role has been assessed through collecting and analyzing quantitative data using a questionnaire, and qualitative data that have been collected through open-ended interviews and focus group discussions. The student achievement, secondary data, has been assessed based on the pass percentage in standardized assessments for the school year (2012/2005-2015/2007) of record. These assessments were based on the Ethiopian General School Leaving Certificate Examination (EGSLCE) results.

### **3.4 SAMPLING TECHNIQUES AND SAMPLE SIZE DETERMINATION**

An attempt is made to make the selection representative in terms of location, total number of secondary schools, accessibility and presence of principals meeting the experience requirement. From the selected Zones and City Administration, 48 Woredas and four Sub-cities have been chosen on the basis of the selection criteria established. Some Woredas have more than one school while others have only one. About 80 schools met the minimum selection criteria. Thus, 80 principals in total are included in the study.

Proportional and simple random sampling techniques have been used to select teachers from the Zones, Woredas and Schools. Proportional sampling technique was used to determine total sample size to be taken from each Zone, Woreda and school. Once the sample size is determined, an attempt was made to select the teachers who worked with the current principal at least two or more years using simple random sampling techniques.

The sample size required for the study was determined using the formula developed by Cochran (1977) as follows:

$$n = \frac{N Z^2 \frac{\alpha}{2} S^2}{N d^2 + Z^2 \frac{\alpha}{2} S^2}$$

Where,

N= 8324 is total number of the population under study,

$d = \epsilon \bar{y} = 0.014 * 58.48 = 0.82$ : Absolute (marginal) error of school effectiveness from small preliminary sample/pilot survey.

$S^2 = 129.11$ : Variance of school effectiveness requirements from small preliminary sample.

$Z_{\alpha/2} = 1.96$  is the critical value for a 95 % confidence interval in a normal probability table value of standard normal deviation with level of significance of  $\alpha = 0.05$ . The larger the sample the more precise the estimates will be, however, cost, time and operational constraints limited the ability to do so. Thus, considering these constraints and the desired levels of the precision, relative error has been decided as 0.014.

In deciding the size of the sample using the above formula, the unknown population parameters must be estimated. There are four commonly used methods of estimating these parameters. They are as follows: taking a simple random sample of size n (preliminary survey), using the pilot survey, using previous survey results and the educated guesses of investigator. The present study used preliminary surveys to estimate the unknown parameters. Therefore, the researcher selected a preliminary survey for each dependent variable and computed the respective estimated variances. Based on the largest variance and combined mean, the sample size has been determined. Consequently, the required sample size for the two strata is obtained as follows:

$$n = \frac{8324 \times (1.96)^2 \times 129.11}{8324 \times (0.014 \times 58.48)^2 + (1.96)^2 \times 129.11} = 679.56. \text{ This can be approximated as } 680.$$

It is expected that all the public secondary schools are led by principals and hence the total number of principals in the region is considered as 321 and a 25% (80) of them are included in this research.

### **3.5 INSTRUMENTATION AND DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES**

In this study, both quantitative and qualitative (mixed) data collection tools and techniques are employed to study the transformational leadership roles of secondary school principals and the relationship between transformational leadership roles of principals and student achievement. Questionnaire, interview, and focus group discussion were used as data collection tools. Students' achievement data were gathered from the Regional Education Bureau (SNNPREB) and General Education Quality Assurance and Examination Agency (GEQAEA). The aggregate results of General Education School Leaving Certificate Examination (GESLCE) data of sample secondary schools (2005/2013-2007/2015) were used as student achievement data (see Appendix H for percentage pass in GESLCE).

#### **3.5.1 Questionnaire**

The surveys consisted of two sets of questionnaire that were administered separately for the principals and teachers. The preferred styles of leadership practices of the principal and how their leadership practices are perceived by teachers measured by using these survey questionnaires. While the self-rating questionnaire was used to assess how an individual principal believed he/she is engaged in particular leadership behaviours, the second (rater) was used to assess how teachers working with them perceive their principals' leadership style.

Eighty (80) and 680 survey questionnaires were distributed to school principals and teachers, respectively. Among these, 76 principals (95 % return rate) and 642 teachers returned (94.4%) usable questionnaires. Both survey questionnaires have enclosed all standard information (see Appendix F and G).

Pilot testing was conducted prior to the actual administration of the tools to the study participants. A pilot test [n=60, principals (10) and 50 teachers] was conducted at the end of July, 2015, with encouraging results. This sample represented individuals much like those in any school community in the region, and the results indicated that the instrument can be applied to a spectrum of people who have varying experiences and involvement in a school community. Individuals and groups were approached for collecting both verbal and written feedback regarding the questions relating to wording, clarity, and relationship to study. A few practicing

interviews were completed with two of these individuals in an effort to calculate the time required, along with practice using the recording device.

Reliability and validity of the instrument were assessed. The first test was reliability of an instrument. To measure the internal consistency the researcher used Cronbach's Alpha. Thus, for the pilot test, constitutes of transformational leadership-principal for the total of the 28 items was +.93; transformational leadership implementation-principal for the total of the 42 items was +.91; principals' perception/effectiveness in their transformational leadership for the total of the 49 items was +.95 and perception of teachers on effectiveness of their principal's transformational leadership for the total of the 49 items was +.96. There is general agreement that +.75 or above indicates appropriate instrument internal consistency (Creswell, 2009; Bryman, 2008). Content validity was also done based on the comments obtained from education professionals and principals.

### **3.5.2 Interview and focus group discussion (FGD)**

The second form of data collection has been through individual semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions. Semi-structured interviews and focus group discussion created dialogue that used open-ended questions that specifically targeted the research questions (Creswell, 2009: 181). In addition, individual interviews allowed participants to share information and ideas through questions and responses, resulting in communication with meaning and purpose. A semi-structured interview allowed respondents to express themselves at length, but also offered a framework to prevent unnecessary rambling (Creswell, 2009: 183).

In this study, among 48 secondary school supervisors existing in study area, 22 school supervisors were involved in the interview. They were selected randomly. The supervisors were mainly selected to assess the activities of the principals and performance of the schools located in their respective Woredas. The interview took approximately 45 minutes each. Questions were open-ended and focused on principal transformational leadership practices. The data collected from interview coded based on the six dimensions of transformational school leadership. See Appendix D (for interview protocols and guide).

In addition to interviews, focus group discussions (FGD) were conducted. This type of primary data collection tool has an advantage of recording individual thoughts and experiences freely. This tool let the researcher document particular experiences and views of the participants.

In this study, for the purpose of triangulating the data obtained from the teachers, about 8 to 12 teachers were randomly selected from each zone for focus group discussion. The focus group discussion ( 10 in number) took approximately one and half hour and the participants were placed in groups and allowed to discuss on issues related to principals' transformational leadership, their roles and manifestation, relation between leadership and student achievement and challenges that principals face, etc. The data collected from interview coded based on the six dimensions of transformational school leadership. See Appendix E (for FGD protocols and guide).

### **3.6 METHODS OF DATA ANALYSIS AND VALIDATION**

This study employs mixed methods data analysis techniques. The paragraphs below provide the detailed procedures involved. Prior to analysis of the quantitative data, the collected data were classified and tabulated to enter it into SPSS software. Data classification and tabulation were done based on the main research question as well as demographic data. Quantitative data were analyzed using the factor analysis, descriptive statistics, Pearson and Spearman' rho correlations and multiple regressions. The quantitative analysis of data presented the mean and/or standard deviations, along with the range of scores. Results showed the array of scores congregated from respondents' response out of questionnaire. The questionnaire captured the characteristics of a transformational leader and helps individuals to discover how they measure up in their own eyes and in the eyes of those with whom they work (Bass & Avolio, 2004b: 1).

The questionnaire was framed to identify leadership style which is based on Transformational School Leadership Model (TSL) developed by Leithwood et al. (1999; 2001; 2006). The responses from participants were utilized to fulfil research questions. The quantitative data from these respondents joined with results from the interviews and FGD, provided the results for research questions.

In this study, except student achievement data (which was based on national school leaving certificate examination result of grade 10), all items were measured on a Likert Scale using a range of 1 to 5 differentiating options. While items related to the first two research questions were measured on a Likert Scale ranging from 1 (never, or negative) to 5 (almost always, or positive), items that evaluated perceptions were measured using Likert Scale that ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Research questions one and two were addressed by administering factor analysis while research questions three and four were addressed by computing the mean and standard deviation at school level. To know the mean difference between the ratings for teachers and principals, regarding the existence of transformational leadership, an independent samples t-test was used since the samples are independent.

To address research question five, correlation coefficients were conducted on the relationship between the combined mean of principal transformational leadership measured by raters and students' score percentage (school average) at the school level. The overall transformational school leadership (TSL) scores were regressed on student achievement to determine whether or not the principals' overall transformational leadership style (score of the raters) was a significant predictor of school effectiveness. Furthermore, the six dimensions of transformational school leadership were also regressed one-by-one in order to determine which of them had the most predictive relationship with student achievement-General Education School Leaving Certificate Examination (GESLCE).

Teachers' and principals' ratings of their transformational leadership behaviours were combined to generate the six dimensions scores for transformational school leadership style/behavior (Leithwood, et al, 1999; 2006) to measure the practices of TSL. By averaging the principal and/or teacher responses, it was possible to create the dimensional scores for all items. These six dimensions of TSL style/behavior were combined with the aggregate result of student achievement collected from 2013-2015 in order to measure the relationship of TSL with student achievement. To make the scaling uniform and consistent, the negatively phrased items were reverse coded.

Qualitative information was obtained from meetings with supervisors and teachers who agreed to participate in the interviews and in the focus group discussions (FGD) based on open-ended questions that were related to the survey items. The qualitative data analysis had begun with recording the audio-taped interviews and focus group discussions. This had consumed a lot of researcher's time and felt to be very tedious. The qualitative data were then transcribed, coded, grounded and analyzed by comparing responses relative to the research questions.

A code matrix was developed based on the responses from the interviews and focus group discussion. An open coding process was used. Coding comprised areas of patterns, education, experiences, leadership styles and characteristics of leadership. Creswell (2009: 227) defines coding as "the process of organizing the material into chunks before bringing meaning to those chunks or segments of text in order to develop a general meaning of each segment". Creswell (2009) further recommends carefully reading each interview transcript, while jotting down ideas as they emerge. Following these recommendations assisted with keeping the data organized and uniform, providing for a smoother understanding regarding data interpretation. Utilizing abbreviations and descriptive wording has assisted the grouping of information. Analysis included categorizing the data and labelling each category, which allowed themes to merge. The coding process enabled the data to be interpreted to provide meaning.

To complement findings from the questionnaire, qualitative methods of data generating were used. This enabled the researcher to compare results of the quantitative data from the principal's assessed leadership styles to the outcomes of the qualitative data responses. The interviews with school supervisors were meant to gain insights on, among other issues, the competence and capacity of principals, the relationships of principals with teachers and overall school community, the leadership style, and motivational approaches of principals. Interviews were also used to obtain data on the views of supervisors regarding the ways of principals engage teachers in order to increase effectiveness in their schools, the challenges principals face and how they overcome them as well as opinions regarding the importance of leadership to student achievement.

Moreover, FGDs were conducted with teachers. The main themes that were discussed include teachers opinions about transformational leaderships, the role that principals have in this, what kind of leaderships style that their principals practice in schools, the relationships between



principals leadership and vision of school, the ways in which principals communicate with teachers and school community, and how teachers view the ways the school is administered and its implication to the overall student achievement. Conclusions were specified strengths or weaknesses of leadership practices as they related to transformational styles of leadership which provided the answer to research questions. The research questions were answered using the data from the interviews and FGD, combined with data collected from the questionnaire. It was in an interpretation and discussion sections that both data were mixed.

Checking for the internal and external validity of the tools completed with the assistance of pilot test. Comments and remarks suggested from pilot participants are important to this study as they assist with determining the accuracy and relevance of the interview questions. Input from the pilot participants helped to ensure the data gathered from the interview protocol would provide accurate, concise information to answer the research questions. Utilizing evidence from differing data sources strengthened the evidence which supported the resulting emerging themes (Creswell, 2009:213).

Transcripts from the interviews contained both positive and negative statements which offered varying perspectives to add to the credibility of the study. Detailed comments from the participants contributed to the richness of the data. Common themes were noted and compared with the quantitative results from the questionnaire. This was a further confirmation of the honesty and integrity of the data gathered. Precise reporting of the data collected enables a reader to conclude the accuracy of the researcher's findings.

### **3.7 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

Ethical considerations in conducting research are very important. While collecting data, rules of the schools were respected by the researcher. The research plan was showed and participants' permission was sought before participants are included in the study by having them read and sign the 'informed consent form'. Permission was sought to get access to schools and participants, by writing letter to South Regional State Education Bureau that has authority to approve and inform concerned offices. Necessary precautions have been taken not to disturb the participants' daily flow of activities as much as possible.

For the analysis and interpretation parts of the study, the researcher maintains the identity of participants' anonymity. Names were disassociated from responses in the process of coding and recoding survey data and numbers were used to ensure anonymity (Creswell, 2009:91). Only a summary the responses will be public. After analysing the data, the researcher securely archived the data for a long time (5-10 years) as recommended by Sieber (1998 as cited in Creswell, 2009:91). In interpreting the data, "member checking, in-depth description, bias clarification, and peer-debriefing" are used to make the information more accurate (Creswell, 2009:91; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005:100; Bryman, 2008: 118).

In the study write-up and final dissemination, only unbiased, respectful and sensitive languages are used. To be consistent, the word 'participants' is consistently used in reference to respondents of the study (Creswell, 2009:92). The researcher has not falsified the research findings to fulfil the researcher's own purposes (Bryman, 2008: 124; Neumann, 2000 as cited in Creswell, 2009:92). Finally, a copy of the dissertation will be provided to all the schools in appreciation for their participation in this study. Moreover, UNISA has a rigorous way of evaluation to protect potential human participants, and to contribute to the highest attainable quality of scientific and ethical research. Hence, the researcher obtained certificate of Ethical Clearance from the College of Education (CEDU) at UNISA.

### **3.8 SUMMARY**

The research methodology for this mixed methods study was presented in this section. The reasons for the choosing mixed method approach and concurrent triangulation design were presented. An explanation of the research approach and design, along with the setting and sample population, was provided. Detail explanation about population and sampling techniques, instruments that were employed in this study and data collection strategies were given. It also presented that quantitative and qualitative data were considered as the main data collection strategy and both had equal weight in this study. The last part of the chapter briefly discusses about the ethical considerations employed to protect participants' privacy.

The presentation and analysis of data, along with the results of the questionnaire, semi-structured interviews and focus group discussion are provided in Chapter Four.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS**

This chapter presents the results derived from both quantitative and qualitative data. The data are presented in prose, numerical figures and in table formats. The chapter starts with the presentation of the demographic and other characteristics of respondents-principals and the teachers in selected SNNPRS secondary schools. The chapter also presents reliability and validity of the data collected and analysed.

#### **4.1 DEMOGRAPHIC DATA OF RESPONDENTS**

As noted above, empirical data from individual schools were collated for the study. The target teachers and principals personally completed the surveys, with vice principals representing principals in rare occasions. The sample size involved 80 school principals with three or more years of experience and 680 teachers from the same schools. Among these, 76 principals (95 % return rate) and 642 teachers returned (94.4%) usable questionnaires.

The surveys consisted of two sets of questionnaire that were administered separately for the principals and teachers. The demographic characteristics contained eight items for the school principals and seven items for teachers. The items covered by the survey to obtain demographic characteristics from principals include their gender, age, education level, and total number of service years as principal, total number of years at the current school, number of students in their school and level of grades in their school (whether or not they administer secondary first cycle: 9/10, secondary second cycle: 11/12, or comprehensive: 9-12). Similarly, teachers' demographic data included their gender, age, educational level, total years of teaching experience, the number of principals they worked under, their present position, and years of service with current principal. Tables 4.1 and 4.2 show the principals' and teachers' demographic data.

##### **4.1.1. Demographic data of principals**

Analysis of demographic data showed that 91% of the respondents were principals with only 9% being vice principals.

**Table 4.1. Socio-demographic Characteristics of School Principals**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Positions held	Principal	69	90.8
	Vice principal	7	9.2
Gender*	Male	76	100*
Age	25-35	46	60.5
	36-55	30	39.5
Qualification	Diploma	1	1.3
	Bachelor degree	44	57.9
	Master's degree	31	40.8
Service Years as principal	3-6 years	13	17.1
	7-10years	33	43.4
	10+ years	30	39.5
Service (in current school)	3-6 years	59	77.6
	7-10years	17	22.4
Number of students in the school	<500	7	9.2
	501-800	12	15.8
	801-1000	13	17.1
	1001-1500	11	14.5
	>1500	33	43.4
Grade	9 <sup>th</sup> -10th	32	42.1
	9 <sup>th</sup> up to 12th	44	57.9

*Source: Field Survey: 2015*

All the principals were males, where the majority (60.5%) fall between the age brackets of 25-35 years while the remaining (39.5%) were between the age intervals of 36-55 years. The complete absence of female leaders in the sampled schools is in sharp contrast to the national education policy of Ethiopia which seeks to achieve gender equity and parity in school leadership. The Fifth Education Sector development Program (ESDP V) clearly states that gender imbalance in education is of national concern. Currently, women account for only 8% of school leadership roles (ESDP V, 2014/15), requiring a nationwide strategy for improved female participation in school leadership. Regarding their educational background, 58% of principals have their first degrees, 41% have master's degree. A great majority (80%) of them have more than seven years' service as school principals. Table 4.1 shows that 77.6% of surveyed principals hold the current position in the schools with three to six years of service, and 22.4% of them have served the same school for more than six years. While few schools (9.2%) have less than 500 students in their schools, 32.9% of schools have between 501-1000 students in their schools, while 57.9% of them have an enrolment of more than 1000 students.

Table 4.1 shows the level of grade range from the first cycle secondary (9-10 grades) to second cycle secondary (11-12 grades). While 42% of the schools enrol only 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grade students, 58% of the schools are comprehensive, offering 9<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> grades.

#### **4.1.2 Teachers' Demographic Characteristics**

The demographic data from teacher participants including age, gender, educational level, years of service and their current position, number of principals worked under, and years of service with current school.

#### 4.2 Socio-demographic Characteristics of Teachers

Variables	Categories	N	%
Age	25-35	452	70.4
	36-55	176	27.4
	56-65	12	1.9
	66+	2	0.3
Gender	male	524	81.6
	female	116	18.1
Qualification	Bachelor's degree	603	93.9
	Master's degree	36	5.6
	others	3	0.5
Total years of service	0-2 years	67	10.4
	3-6 years	188	29.3
	7-10 years	183	28.5
	10+ years	204	31.8
Number of principals worked with	1	55	8.6
	2	166	25.9
	3	210	32.7
	4+	210	32.7
Current position	Teacher	251	39.1
	High teacher	176	27.4
	High Leading teacher	95	14.8
	Leading teacher	100	15.6
	Others	20	3.1
Years of service with current principal	1-2 years	207	32.2
	2-3years	258	40.2
	3+years	174	27.1

*Source: Field Survey: 2015*

Table 4.2 portrays that majority of teacher respondents (70.4%) were 25-35 years of age, while (27.4%) of them are between the ages of 36-55. Table 4.2 indicates that 82% of the teachers were male with the ratio of female teachers at 18%. Comparatively, the national average of qualified female teachers is 16%. The gender imbalance is unacceptably wide among staff as well. In educational profile, the data show that 94% of teachers held bachelor's degrees. This is slightly higher than the national average of (93%) for appropriately qualified teachers. While 89.6% of teachers have served three or more years', the remaining 10.4% served up to two years. Ninety one (91%) of the teachers have worked with more than two principals.

Table 4.2 reveals that 39% of the teachers hold "Teacher" position, while 27.4% hold "Higher Teacher" and 14.8% hold "Leading Teacher" positions. Table 4.2 also shows that 32% of teachers have up to two years' work experience with current principal, while 67.3% of them have more than three years work experience with current principal. It is believed that longer experience with incumbent principal makes the rating of principals more reliable and critical.

#### **4.2 RELIABILITY OF DATA**

To test the reliability, Cronbach's alpha was used to analyze the internal consistency of the items. The reliability of the transformational leadership role, implementation strategies and perceptions of principals and teachers (six TSL dimensions, namely; sharing vision and consensus building, holding high performance expectation, model behaviour, providing individualized support, providing intellectual stimulation, building collaborative structure and strengthening a school culture) were measured. The results show (Table 4.3) very high reliability rate, ranging from ( $\alpha=.880$ ) to ( $\alpha=.958$ ).

**Table 4.3 Transformational Leadership Survey Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Result**

Source	No. of respondents	No. of items	Cronbach's Alpha*
Overall Survey (P)	76	117	.958
TL role (P)	76	28	.939
Implementation (P)	76	42	.880
Perceptions (P)	76	47	.893
Perceptions (T)	642	47	.951

\*Note that alpha coefficient are larger than .60 are acceptable; and those above .80 are high (see in Pallant, 2010). Source: Computed from Survey Data, 2015

### **4.3 DISCUSSION OF SURVEY, INTERVIEW AND FGD RESULTS**

This section presents the results from quantitative and qualitative analyses done by way of answering the research questions stated above. Accordingly, data presentation and interpretations follow the order of the questions. As noted above, the findings from the quantitative data analysis and the findings from the qualitative data analysis do complement each other. It was using a mixed approach that reinforced the commonality of ultimate findings.

#### **4.3.1 What Constitutes the Transformational Leadership Role of School Principal?**

To determine what constitutes transformational leadership roles of the principal in secondary schools of SNNPR, factor analysis, mean, standard deviation correlations and then qualitative analysis were conducted. For the items to be included in the factor analysis, items needed to have high correlation coefficients with at least one other item in the matrix. It was also necessary that for the item to total correlations also exceed .3 for items to be included in the factor analysis (Pallant, 2010: 187). And the KMO value needed to be .6 or .7, and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity value should be significant, that is, it should be 0.05 or smaller (Pallant, 2010: 187). Table 4.4 shows that KMO values are above .8, and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity had sig.value of .05.



**Table 4.4 KMO and Bartlett's Test 24 items 6-factor Solution (N=76)**

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		.843
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	902.894
	Df	276
	Sig.	.000

Source: Computed from Survey Data, 2015

The 28 items of the transformational leadership role scale were subjected to principal components analysis (PCA) using SPSS version 21. Prior to performing PCA, the suitability of the data for factor analysis was assessed. According to Pallant (2010: 187), the KMO = .843 and Bartlett's Test (Chi-square = 902.894,  $p = .000$ ) suggest that the application of factor analysis to the data set (of the 28-item transformational leadership measure) is appropriate. Table 4.5 indicates the results of PCA.

**Table 4.5 Total Variance Explained (Varimax Rotation) 24 items 6-factor Solution (N=76)**

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total
1	9.067	37.781	37.781	9.067	37.781	37.781	3.546
2	1.609	6.705	44.486	1.609	6.705	44.486	3.185
3	1.564	6.518	51.004	1.564	6.518	51.004	3.015
4	1.415	5.896	56.901	1.415	5.896	56.901	2.310
5	1.141	4.755	61.655	1.141	4.755	61.655	2.089
6	1.064	4.432	66.087	1.064	4.432	66.087	1.715
24	.110	.456	100.000				

Source: Computed from Survey Data, 2015

The KMO value was .84, exceeding the recommended value of .6 and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity reached statistical significance, supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix. Principal components analysis, Table 4.5, revealed the presence of six components with

eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining 37.8%, 6.7 %, 6.5%, 5.9%, 4.7%, 4.4% of the variance, respectively. These six components explain a total of 66.08% of the variance.

**Table 4.6 Varimax Rotated Component Matrix for 24 item 6-factor Solution (n=76)**

<i>Items</i>	<i>Components</i>					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Q19	.688					
Q15	.678					
Q6	.627					
Q13	.627					
Q16	.604					
Q17	.599					
Q1		.753				
Q2		.670				
Q26		.603				
Q25		.601				
Q5		.495				
Q27			.753			
Q28			.726			
Q18			.720			
Q11			.589			
Q3			.536			
Q8				.636		
Q4				.630		
Q10				.605		
Q9				.570		
Q22					.743	
Q14					.727	
Q24						.712
Q23						.652

\*Note Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. Source:

Computed from Survey Data, 2015

Inspection of the correlation matrix in Table 4.6 revealed the presence of many coefficients at .4 and above. The six component solution explained a total of 66.087 % of the variance, with component 1 contributing 37.8%, component 2 contributing 6.7%, component 3 contributing 6.5%, component 4 contributing 5.9%, component 5 contributing 4.7%, and component 6 contributing 4.4%. Thus, to principals in secondary schools of SNNPRS, transformational leadership roles are made up of six factors. These are sharing the school vision and building consensus, building high performance expectation, modelling behaviour, providing individualized support, providing intellectual stimulation, and building collaborative structure and culture. This result provided support for the claim that transformational leadership in school context function in six categories of behaviours (Leithwood et al. 1999; 2001; 2006), by showing that the instrument was consistently measuring one factor (TSL).

**Table 4.7 Descriptive Statistics of the TLR 6-factor Solution (n=76)**

Categories	M	SD	Rank (Roles mostly used )
SVBCr	4.25	.54	2
PEXr	3.92	.75	6
MBr	4.13	.60	3
ISr	3.95	.81	5
INSr	4.06	.66	4
SCUr	4.26	.51	1
OASr	4.09	.49	

Notes: OASr (Overall Survey Principals' Role), SVBCr (Sharing school vision and building consensus), PEXr (Building high performance expectation), MBr (Modelling Behaviour), ISr (Providing Individualized Support), INSr (Providing Intellectual Stimulation), SCUr (Building collaborative structure and culture). Source: Computed from Survey Data, 2015.

To establish the extent to which principals in secondary schools of SNNPRS, Ethiopia, are engaged in the six transformational leadership practices, descriptive statistics, means and standard deviations were conducted. Table 4.7 suggests that principals in secondary schools of SNNPRS, Ethiopia mostly practiced six roles, Category 6 (Building Collaborative Structure and Strengthening School Culture), Category 1 (Sharing Vision and Consensus Building), Category 3

(Modelling Behaviour), Category 5 (providing Intellectual Stimulation), Category 4 (providing Individualized Support), and Category 2 (holding High Performance Expectation) respectively.

**Table 4.8 Transformational Leadership Roles Dimension Correlation**

Dimensions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. SVBCr	1	.47**	.60**	.42**	.58**	.68**	.78**
2. PEXr		1	.47**	.41**	.44**	.49**	.73**
3. MBr			1	.43**	.63**	.62**	.80**
4. ISr				1	.42**	.45**	.72**
5. INSr					1	.56**	.78**
6. SCUr						1	.79**
7. OASr							1

\*p < .05; \*\* p < .01; \*\*\*p < .001

OASr (Overall Survey Principals' Role), SVBCr (Sharing school vision and building consensus), PEXr (Building high performance expectation), MBr (Modelling Behaviour), ISr (Providing Individualized Support), INSr (Providing Intellectual Stimulation), SCUr (Building collaborative structure and culture). Source: Computed from Survey Data, 2015

The Person correlation coefficients for the transformational leadership role factors were calculated and presented in Table 4.8. From medium to strong and positive correlation were found between the factors of transformational leadership roles. The values ranged from  $r = .41$  to  $r = .80$  with an average of  $r = .61$ . Sharing School Vision and Building Consensus were positively correlated with all transformational leadership roles ranging from  $r = .42$  to  $r = .68$ . However, it had a lower correlation with individualized support scales with a value of  $r = .42$ . Building Collaborative Structure and Strengthening School Culture was also positively correlated with the remaining dimensions of transformational leadership roles with the range of  $r = .45$  to  $r = .68$ . All correlations between transformational leadership roles were significant ( $p < .05$ ).

The above data analysis confirms in important ways the six dimensions of transformational leadership. On the other hand, analysis of the data from interview and FGD with supervisors and teachers have generated insight on what they see is key in transformational school leadership in

secondary schools in SNNPRS. The following section presents important perspectives on several aspects of transformational leaderships that are one or other way captured by quantitative data. .

### **Sharing school vision and building consensus**

The majority of the supervisors agreed that school vision and building consensus determined the direction of schools that they supervise. One of the supervisors said that “I know that principals were doing their best to inscribe their schools’ vision in the heart of their staff.” Another supervisor added “principal works towards creating a sense of ownership of the school by sharing not only the school vision, but also the goals of the school with all concerned in a transparent manner.” One supervisor explained his experiences from visiting a school and attending staff meetings:

“Talking about vision statement and its meaning in terms of its practical implication for teaching-learning process was what I was hearing whenever the principal conducts staff meetings. He [the Principal] was also keen in sharing the vision of a school and objectives with his colleagues.”

Similarly, another supervisor explained how principals undertake their jobs in the following way:

“Principals in my supervisory constituency have developed a strategic plan that makes the school vision, mission and values well understood by all the stakeholders”.

However, a number of supervisors underscored the fact that although most schools had vision, creating a sense of ownership of the school vision among the stakeholders is an aspect that still lags behind.

This issue was also emphasised by several teachers who participated in FGD. Teachers believe that their schools have a good vision. However, it was also noted that some teachers did not clearly describe or articulate their schools’ vision. One of the teachers had to say the following:

“I saw vision and mission statements near at the main gate and in staff lounges, the principal was assisting us to understand and engage in collective development of the vision statement.”

The other teacher view point here indicates how some teachers may lack full engagement with school vision:.

“I know my school has a vision statement, but I do not remember the contents. Even, I do not think most of the staff would be able to recite it.”

Interestingly, three teachers who participated in the discussion admitted that they thought the “vision” posted on their school gate “was not for them”. According to the two respondent teachers, anything associated school vision is largely “the duty of the principal”.

The following quotations taken from one teacher reveals about how visions need to presented in concrete and short manner

“I do not understand why they wrote such long sentences. I start reading it, but do not finish because it is so long.”

In addition to giving less attention to the importance of having vision, some teachers even perceive it as a symbolic practice. The following extracts from FGD testify to this fact:

“They put it there because it was the fashion of the day.”

“Nothing is there that relates to me. It was more about the students’ achievement and not about teachers.”

Regarding the content of the vision, although some participants had difficulty in recalling the vision word by word, the majority of the teachers emphasized that high academic excellence and learning outcome/student achievement as key elements of the vision.

Teachers said that excelling in academic standards was a pride to them. The extracts below show how they seriously value achieving high academic standards as a source of pride for them:

“As a teacher, I would like to be part of an excellent school. To be a member in an excellent school is highly desirable.”

The opinion of another teacher also confirms the above comment:

“Yes, since our effort is measured by our students’ success, producing students who score top marks could be part of the vision.”

Analyses of the above situations demonstrate that school vision statement and building consensus exist in sampled schools. However, even though teachers knew about the vision, some of the informants viewed their school’s vision as the concern of the principal alone. Clearly, principals need to demystify the misunderstanding by visibly defining and explaining the vision

of their school using all available communication opportunities. This includes ensuring that school effectiveness and achieving the vision of the school is not only the job of principals but instead of all the teachers as well. Although the majority of teachers believe on the significance of school vision, the differentiated perspectives and unequal degree of involvement by some teachers indicates that this is an area that school principals need to pay attention to.

### **Building high performance expectation**

The second concept that was identified from interviews and the FGDs is “high performance expectation”. A supervisor said,

“Principals in my district were committed to maintaining academic excellence and quality of service. They try to bring these through preparing school-based citizens-charter and performance agreement with teachers and students.”

Another supervisor added that, “the principal is serious about improving students’ academic performance. He makes no compromise over this matter.” A large number of supervisors stated that placing an enhanced performance by teachers as well as increased students’ achievement is an important expectation that is emphasised particularly at the beginning of every academic year. Principals were encouraging everyone to come to embrace a higher standard by promoting a culture of excellence. However, this is not as easy as it appears on the paper. The following extracts taken from respondent supervisors reveals this gap between how principals set a high expectation that may not always be achieved in reality:

“Principals make bi-annual analysis of students’ results and carry out a regular follow-up to gain further improvement. Principals try to meet school goals in order to uplift students’ academic performance, as measured by the promotion rate of general secondary school leaving certificate examination. However, principals run into serious challenges as they attempt to implement their plans.”

Another supervisor similarly testify that,

“Efforts are underway to improve students’ performance, though teacher attitude and educational inputs were less than desirable. Leaders of the two schools in my constituency have set their goals of achieving 100% pass rate in national examinations. They were encouraging both teachers and students to work harder.”

The above quotation of supervisors is also supported by most teachers who explained that principals in their schools were good at putting high goals and expectations for teachers and students. However, these goals were not easily achievable. Several teachers from the FGD raised the issue of the student's entry behaviour (that is, capacity to perform in preceding grades), educational inputs (i.e. books, highly qualified teachers, laboratory, school budget etc.) and continuous professional development activities as some constraining factors for achieving what the school set out their goal. The extract taken from a FGD confirms the above point:

“Of course we sign a performance agreement to promote over 95% of students from grade X to grade Y, or to enhance a student's score in each subject to above 70. However, these indicators were not achieved as planned. You know why? Students entering high school were very weak in Natural Sciences, Maths and English.”

Another FGD participant said: “It would be wonderful if we can meet the expectations. For one thing, we do not have sufficient laboratory and library; secondly, we cannot coach every student in the class since teacher/student ratio is exceedingly high.”

Yet another teacher added: “To achieve such lofty goals we need to have continuous professional training and strong support from the school and community.”

The above quotations collectively reveal that in studied schools, the construct or the idea of expecting staff and students to be hard working and professional is a good thing. Teachers think that such expectations should exist and be part of the school plan. However, it should not be unrealistic but rather it framed in achievable ways and need to consider existing contexts and inputs.



## **Modelling Behaviour**

The third construct was modelling best practices and important organizational values of principals. The existence of the principal and his/her modelled behaviour was recognized both by supervisors and teachers. Some supervisors commented that although principals were implementing their goals through demonstrating timeliness and regularity practices such as arriving at meeting hall before everyone, coming to school before the staff and going home late, and keeping promises, they also indicated that such behaviours may not always exist in all schools. One supervisor stated: “Principals in my district demonstrate their leadership through their consistency in judgement, disclosure of information to all concerned staff members and by giving fair solutions to conflicts.” Some supervisors explained that principals lead their schools through showing commitment to their school and their staff. For example, one of the supervisors said:

“The principal in my district usually takes personal risks and actions to achieve his school’s goals. He visited individual parents’ house to talk about girls who are frequently absent from their school. He was successful and most teachers followed his model in returning dropouts.”

Another supervisor explained a similar case: “I also noted that the principal in my district felt cheery for being able to tackle the high rate of school dropping out through working with the community groups who were appointed as village level education ambassadors.”

Yet another supervisor stated how the principal was positively valued by teachers for his ‘showing by doing’ behaviour where such demonstration is sought for. The supervisor thinks that the principal’s responsiveness to the legitimate requests made by teachers is also another quality: “He adheres to the principle of transparency both in financial utilization and performance tracking.”

Several teachers in FGD stated the importance of the modelling behaviours of the principal in implementing school leadership effectiveness. Teachers reported that the vision of schools could be implemented through principal’s exemplary activities, as the following examples from three teachers demonstrate:

Teacher 1: “the principal was caring for staff; he is a first person to arrive when you are in problem.”

Teacher 2: “he is always involved in all aspects of school activity. His office is always open to staff. This encourages the staff to be his followers.”

Teacher 3: “He demonstrates care and respect for the school community. I feel he was showing real respect to teachers, students and parents.”

Teachers believe that the TSL’s commitment would create conditions to move the schools forward to the desired effects. One of a teacher said that “I believe that the exemplary behaviours and deeds of a principal were essential for the transformation of schools.” The other teacher said: “A principal’s personal integrity, punctuality and readiness to get feedback from his staff would be values that we were expecting from transformational leaders.”

The result revealed that principals were leading their schools through punctuality and timeliness, consistency in their decisions and risk taking, and through showing care and involvement in school activities which were the indicators of the existence of the construct modelling behaviour of leadership. However, as it will be shown in the latter section of data analysis an important dimension of the model behaviour is linked to what teacher and supervisor mentioned is “principals’ vulnerability”. This is a new aspect that is not covered by Leithwood and Jantiz’s (1999; 2000) model on TSL but have emerged from interviews and FGD and, as such, will be discussed in detail later.

### **Providing Individualized Support**

The fourth construct that was discussed by two of the groups (teachers and principals) focused on offering individual support. The majority of the supervisors said that, except few exceptional principals, most principals lack the attribute of giving personal attention to teachers; taking individual teacher’s opinion into consideration; and supporting personal and professional development of staff. However, the limitations were not intentional, but instead were attributed to lack of skill and resources. The following responses that were taken from supervisors show the perceptions of supervisors towards the principals in their districts on the issue of teacher-principal relationships and support.

“Though principals in my district were trying to treating everyone equally, dislike favouritism, and were approachable, they are weak in identifying individual needs of their staff and giving

support. I believe the source of this weakness is some lack the skills and others not do it because of insufficient resources.”

In some cases the principal-teacher ratio is high, making it difficult to give individual attention, support and follow-up of teachers. From the perspective of teachers, the schools’ leaders were providing relatively little individualized support. The teachers stated:

“The principal is not accessible or welcoming. Moreover, he does not encourage thinking out of the box or trying new practices. Some of us submitted a student-related project to him once, but it took him three months to finally say’ No’.”

Supporting the idea above, some teachers said that their principals do not even like to listen to their concerns. Instead of finding solutions together, the principal blames the Woreda/district education office.

Analysis of the FGD with teachers suggests that they are concerned that principals are always busy with urgent activities that may consume most of the time. They explained that principals are not free to coach teachers as needed. Administrative routines seem to overshadow provision of professional support to classroom instructional activities.

On the other hand, few teachers said that the principal was trying to provide encouragement and support that is tailored to meet the individual needs of teachers. They believed that since the principal focuses on raising scores and promoting collaboration, empowering and supporting teachers was seen as pivotal for this. These teachers further confirmed that their principals demonstrated transformational leadership by citing their accessibility and positive relationship with staff. The following excerpt from three teachers confirms this assertion:

Teacher 1: “He is very approachable and has developed a strong relationship with the school community.”

Teacher 2: “He practices an open door policy. His office is always open to all of us.”

Teacher3: “He recognizes us individually and relates to us all by name, giving greetings by calling names. He listens patiently and tries to give solutions as much as possible.”

Despite the above, the finding of this study shows that principals seem to offer limited individualized support to their staff. Teachers seriously criticized principals for not giving serious attention to teachers’ personal and professional development needs. Since principals are

key in motivating staff and developing a collective environment to achieve goals, they should provide continuous support, recognize their staff contributions and coach those who have a need.

### **Providing Intellectual Stimulation**

The fifth concept was providing intellectual stimulation that was related to challenging the status quo and effort in changing school norms that addresses the bottleneck thinking of staff. The majority of supervisors said that principals were toiling to break old thinking and trying to bring their staff to accept new ideas. However, principals were not seriously challenging the basic assumptions of staff regarding work ethic. Principals were neither strongly encouraging staff to take student learning outcomes and achievements too seriously. Supervisors said that principals in their constituencies were trying to challenge teachers to focus on student-centred teaching methods. Though some principals pushed teachers to try new approaches, they did not follow-through with teachers to ensure implementation.

“I guess,” said one supervisor, “principals at times lack the resolve and/or the capacity to convince or inspire teachers to higher level of professionalism or motivate them to self-growth. Another supervisor complemented: “instead of motivating their staff, principals tend to penalize for making mistakes, reprimands and salary deductions which discourage teachers and staff.”

Few supervisors mentioned that principals in their district were good in sharing new ideas and experiences with their staff. The following extracts taken the supervisor attests to this:

“I had two or three reports that he [the Principal] shared new ideas that he obtained from workshops and trainings. He called me to attend the session that he was presenting new experiences and ideas he attained from visiting other schools and from workshop.”

Teachers said that as teaching staff, they appreciate the practice of challenging the basic assumptions that hinder their effectiveness. However, as one of the teachers said, “for one thing we are not ready to do a strong discussion when a serious issue comes up. The second thing even if we have a discussion, we may not come up with an agreement. So we go home with our own old assumptions.”

One teacher commented on the ability of his principal regarding his way of presenting new ideas: “I do not like the way the principal tries to challenge us. He was not smart. He managed it not in encouraging way rather he was dictating to do this and that way.” Another teacher supported this

sentiment arguing that his principal “lacks how to stimulate discussion of new ideas and information relevant to school future direction. Yet, some of us are becoming part of the change”.

Conversely, some teachers are positive about the ways principals engage them in the activities and initiatives of the school: “I am happy if the principal encourages us to participate in change initiatives and provides the necessary resources.”

To summarise, although both teachers and supervisors mentioned the importance of the provision of intellectual stimulation as well as how the principals were trying to practice it in one or another, the existence of this construct (i.e. intellectual stimulation) was not to the level that is expected from TSL.

### **Building collaborative structure and culture**

The sixth construct that transcribed from the discussion was building collaborative structure and strengthening the school culture. The majority of supervisors disclosed that principals are aware of the importance of building collaborative structure and strengthening the school culture to facilitate the success of the school’s mission. One of the supervisors said,

“Principals in my district were good in providing opportunities for participative decision making. They have strong relationships with parents and surrounding community. They positively influenced the culture of the current school through emphasizing norms of excellence for his work first then the work of teachers and students. For example, principals disclose conflicts that rise to staff immediately and find solutions together and give decisions.”

Several supervisors underscored how principals were trying to build new school culture through the practice of sharing leadership down to the student level. They explained the practice of organising small study teams consisting of five to six students that have their own team leaders. In this practice, the issues each team raised and decisions they made would be part of the school decision. They also explained how teachers have the same structure. Through these structures, the principal established a firm culture of the school.

While a minority of teachers recognize the practices of building collaborative structure and strengthening the school culture in their schools, several teachers revealed that principals were weak in sharing power and responsibility with staff and providing autonomy for teachers. A

teacher said: “While some principals share responsibility and important information to all staff members in their school, others do these only to people very close to them.” Another teacher added that “we have a very fragmented and individual based culture. The principal did not bring the staff to shared beliefs.” Most teachers think that principals do not give them autonomy to decide on matters related to their own professional growth. For example, the teacher talked about how principals usually disapproved teachers’ decisions to further their education and short-term professional development programmes. Moreover, principals did not involve teachers in new initiatives from the onset but rather post their decision on the notice board.

On the contrary, a number of teachers reported the existence of the practice of positive school culture and distribution of power and responsibility. A teacher stated that

“In my school the principal inculcated the culture of working together, identifying and solving problems together, and he established the custom of valuing to one’s achievement.”

Similarly another teacher reported:

“The principal considers our opinions when taking decisions and encourages that most issues should be decided at lower levels such as in our team of five members. Sometimes he sends letters to departments which says ‘let me know your decision’; to me this gives autonomy for us.”

The result showed that principals in studied schools were practicing building collaborative structure and strengthening the school culture. However, regarding the implementation of sharing responsibility and involving teachers in decision making, the result showed that the practice was low. This has important implications how, through strengthening the school culture and developing structures, principals could encourage participation in school decisions as well as build shared values and beliefs among their staff.

### **Vulnerability**

An important aspect of the construct that emerged from the interview as well as FGD was the issue of vulnerability. Both supervisors and teachers spoke at length that principals should acknowledge weakness and that they are vulnerable.

Supervisors repeatedly mentioned that principals were not too keen to accept feedbacks from their staff. They said that principals wish everything that they were introducing should be accepted without questions. Some supervisors mentioned how principals do not give due time to

their staff. One supervisor stated that “principals tend to be defensive. Usually, they lack the gut to say ‘it is my mistake’ rather they try to justify or protect themselves. They do not show readiness to accept weakness and risk vulnerability.” The issue of lack of vulnerability is something that was emphasized both by teachers and supervisors. One of the supervisors claimed how “to some principals it is not easy to change their old practices. Some of them are secretive and rigid. They are not ready to accept weaknesses and be vulnerable.”

Similarly, teachers said that most principals were persistent, highly formal and think they know everything which is not a behaviour that appreciated by the school community. Teachers stated that some principals were not ready to share their personal weaknesses with their staff because they see it as a sign of failure. A teacher said, “I think it would be healthier if principals would be ready to be emotionally challenged”, and further explained the advantages of demonstrating “their real life to their staff rather than pretention, because they were living with us.”

The teacher said that “to me besides the other dimensions that we discussed about transformational school leadership, principals’ vulnerability is the foundation for his leadership success.” He further stated that “to me leader is one who is not wasting time in protecting himself from the observation of others and rather ready to contain the views and ideas of his/her staff.”

To conclude, both groups (supervisors and teachers) revealed that vulnerability, accepting weakness and self-criticism (reflection) is an important construct of transformational leadership roles. Thus, principals should show their vulnerability to their staff in order to increase the number of followers that share their schools’ vision.

The above discussion also indicates that principals’ self-evaluation and showing vulnerability that were highlighted by teachers and supervisors are useful aspects that would help us rethink Leithwood and Jantiz’s model of TSL.

**Table 4.9 Dimensions of TSL Role of Principals (interview and FGD)**

<b>Dimensions</b>	<b>n (S 17)</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N (T 42)</b>	<b>%</b>
SVBC	17	100	40	95
PEX	14	82	39	93
MB	16	94	41	98
IS	14	82	42	100
INS	14	82	42	100
SCU	17	100	40	95
VUL.	12	70.6	37	86

Source: Computed from interviews and FGD Data, 2015

Table 4.9 summarizes supervisors' and teachers' responses categorized in seven dimensions. Whereas supervisors gave high rank (100%) to sharing vision and building consensus, building collaborative structures and strengthening school culture, teachers, on the other hand, gave high rank (100%) to intellectual stimulation and individual support.

Thus, regarding the constructs of TSL, the interview results of supervisors largely coincide with what principals said in the quantitative survey. Similar to principals, supervisors ranked building collaborative structures and strengthening school culture, sharing vision and building consensus, modelling behaviour, intellectual stimulation, performance expectation and individualized support, respectively. A possible reason for this similarity between principals and supervisors could be their familiarity with activities of school management.

However, in the FGDs, teachers' priorities were slightly different from those of principals and supervisors. The teachers gave high value to offering individualized support and providing intellectual stimulation, then Modelling Behaviour of the principal, Building Collaborative Structures and Strengthening the School Culture, Building School Vision and Establishing the School Goals, respectively. Teachers argued that an organization is defined by its staff. To be effective, its staff should be well treated and managed. Thus, to teachers a transformational leader was more of someone who works with his/her staff and supports them to deliver their best (Leithwood & Jantiz, 2006; Bass & Avolio, 2004; Northouse, 2010).



### 4.3.2 How do Principals in SNNPRS Secondary Schools Implement Transformational Leadership?

In this sub-section, the study examines how secondary school principals in SNNPRS implement their transformational leadership roles. The principals were asked to rate the ways they use to implement transformational leadership roles. Based on their responses, factor analysis was run to identify the factors that represent different ways of implementing transformational leadership roles in schools. The study shows that secondary school principals in studied schools employed eight ways to implement transformational leadership in their schools. Table 4.10 depicts 26 items that assess how principals implement transformational leadership roles. It was subjected to principal components analysis (PCA) using SPSS, version 21. Before commencing PCA, the suitability of data for factor analysis was assessed. Hence, the result showed that the KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure) = .754 and Bartlett's Test (Chi-square = 913.046, p = .000) suggest that the application of factor analysis to the data set (of the 42-item transformational leadership measure) was appropriate.

**Table 4.10 KMO and Bartlett's Test 26 items 8-factor Solution (N=76)**

<b>KMO and Bartlett's Test</b>		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.754
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	913.046
	df	325
	Sig.	.000

Source: Based on Survey Data, 2015

In the same analysis, the dimensions of principal transformational leadership roles were extracted using the Varimax option to identify independent factors. The results are presented in Table 4.11

**Table 4.11 Total Variance Explained (Varimax Rotation) 26 items 8-factor Solution (N=76)**

<i>Component</i>	<i>Initial Eigenvalues</i>			<i>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</i>			<i>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>% of Variance</i>	<i>Cumulative %</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>% of Variance</i>	<i>Cumulative %</i>	<i>Total</i>
1	7.343	28.241	28.241	7.343	28.241	28.241	3.544
2	2.426	9.330	37.572	2.426	9.330	37.572	3.544
3	2.101	8.082	45.654	2.101	8.082	45.654	2.796
4	1.690	6.500	52.154	1.690	6.500	52.154	1.868
5	1.421	5.466	57.620	1.421	5.466	57.620	1.763
6	1.299	4.998	62.618	1.299	4.998	62.618	1.679
7	1.079	4.148	66.766	1.079	4.148	66.766	1.633
8	1.029	3.958	70.724	1.029	3.958	70.724	1.561
26	.116	.446	100.000				

Source: Computed from Survey Data, 2015

Table 4.11 presents total variance of the 26 items with eight factor solutions. The principal components analysis (PCA) shows the presence of eight components with eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining (28.2%) to component one,(9.3 %) to component two, (8.1%) to component three, (6.5%) to component four, (5.5%) to component five, (5.0%)to component six, (4.1%) to component seven and (4.0%) of the variance to component eight. These eight components explain a total of 70.72% of the variance.

**Table 4.12 Varimax Rotated Component Matrix for 26 item 8-factor Solution (n=76)**

<i>Items</i>	<i>Components/Factor Loadings</i>							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Q10	.791							
Q7	.768							
Q33	.640							
Q15	.638							
Q13	.564							
Q32		.738						
Q6		.668						
Q35		.663						
Q11		.662						
Q24		-.636						
Q36		.538						
Q16			.818					
Q20			.751					
Q18			.731					
Q22			.584					
Q28				.818				
Q8				.531				
Q25					.738			
Q1					.582			
Q3					.508			
Q21						.774		
Q23						-.763		
Q37							.740	
Q42							.565	
Q28								.763
Q38								.598

*Source: Computed from Survey Data, 2015*

An examination of the correlation matrix in Table 4.12 shows the presence of many coefficients of .5 and above. The eight component solution explained a total of 70.72 %, the variance, with component 1(engaging people) contributing 28.2%, component 2 (encouraging new initiatives) contributing 9.3 %, component 3 (maintaining standards) contributing 8.1 %, component 4

(communicating) contributing 6.5%, component 5 (coaching) contributing 5.5%, and component 6 (task apportioning) contributing 5.0 %, component 7 (goal setting) contributing 4.1%, and component 8 (motivating) contributing 4.0%. Thus, principals in secondary schools of SNNPRS implemented transformational leadership through engaging people with mission, encouraging staff to come-up with new initiatives and maintaining standards. They also exercised leadership by continuously communicating the vision of the school, coaching at individual and group levels, sharing tasks as well as power, setting goals that should be achieved and motivating people, and instilling deserved pride in all.

Besides rating, principals were asked open-ended questions on the questionnaire to describe transformational leadership roles of principals. As a sample, transformational leadership traits projecting similar ideas were described. The following lists were found to be among the top reported additional factors of transformational leadership by principals (Source: Survey Data, 2015):

1. Creating conducive school climate;
2. Working in collaboration with teachers and stakeholders;
3. Involving teachers in decision making;
4. Playing exemplary role in every aspect;
5. Acting as a coach or mentor to develop her/his followers' potential;
6. Design rewarding mechanism for best performing teachers;
7. Inspire followers to be innovative and creative;
8. Providing CPD to teachers on continuous bases; and
9. Sharing school vision.

In addition to the survey, interviews and focus group discussions with supervisors and teachers showed that principals were using several strategies to achieve schools goals. Eight broad themes emerged describing how principals implemented TSL roles in the schools studied.

### **Engaging School Community**

The majority of supervisors and teachers agreed that TSL was implemented through *engaging school community* in the collective development of a shared vision, through encouraging new initiatives and through maintaining standards. One supervisor said that “transformational school

leadership is implemented by regularly communicating to engage the school community around the vision of the school. Principals were using all opportunities to talk about school vision and mission particularly in staff meetings, in PTA meetings, in student council meetings etc.” Similarly, another supervisor said: “Transformational principals engage their staff through sharing the objectives of the school. It is through involving stakeholders in school matters and by including staff as part of the decision making process that the principal exercises his leadership.”

Organizing discussion forums with parents and students and calling monthly meetings with teachers are additional ways that principals engage their stakeholders as a strategy. However, the majority of the teachers said the practice of engaging staff in basic issues such as decision making on staff development was very minimal. However, teachers agree that principals try to create opportunities for teachers to be part of different events. One of the teachers said: “Meetings the school convenes were taking more than half of our time, including weekends, thus, I did not participate in these meetings and missed out on important decisions.” Another teacher added: “We might be involved in discussions and some school-based activities, but principals do not implement what was agreed to.”

Yet, some teachers also experienced transformational leadership efforts of their principal very positively, as the following quotation demonstrates:

“Our principal, when he joined the school five years earlier, he tried to understand the environment and the situation in the school. He improved student performance key indicator for success. Then, he engaged the whole school community including parents and students in meaningful and problem solving ways. Today, our school is among the leading schools.” Yet another teacher added, “Yes, our principal also succeeded in moving the school forward. This happened because he involved all of us in areas of our expertise. I believe I am part of this success.”

The result was that principals were implementing TSL through engaging the school community. Nevertheless, the disappointment of teachers who are not engaged in school issues in a meaningful ways should be addressed.

## **Encouraging New Initiatives**

Several principals and teachers agreed that transformational leadership was implemented through *encouraging new initiatives*, although the magnitude of the practice may vary considerably. This is seen in the opinions of participating supervisors: “Principals in our district encourage their staff to come up with new initiatives. We know that new initiatives and innovations were part of their annual plan. For example, one principal funded group of teachers who come up with the laboratory simulation project that filled the scarcity of models in physics laboratory. It was recorded as best practice and was shared with other schools.” Another supervisor agreed, “Yes, teachers with the help of their principals established mentoring and tutoring programme that senior students (grades 11/12) mentor lower grade students on their free time. The principal arranged classrooms and necessary resources and encouraged them by getting involved in what they were doing. This practice added value by increasing student achievement.”

The majority of the supervisors said that though few principals encourage their staff to be innovative and bring new initiatives, many others contribute to their schools by stimulating, challenging and inspiring their staff. One outstanding problem is the attitude of both principals and teachers, followed by limited financial resources.

Except for few teachers, most FGDs participants said that the success rate of stimulating teachers to bring new ideas and initiatives was extremely low.

The result indicated that encouraging teachers and other staff members to try new practices and pursue their own goals for professional growth as one of the leadership strategy was not seriously practiced by principals in studied schools.

## **Maintaining Standards**

The majority of principals and teachers agreed that transformational leadership was implemented through *maintaining standards*. Both supervisors and teachers appreciated the role of principals’ and efforts in trying to keep the academic standards of the schools.

Several supervisors spoke about the advantages regarding the school community having monthly meetings in order to discuss the achievements and underachievement of goals during a particular month. Principals were using this as a platform to maintain standards of key indicators. Student-input ratio (books, laboratory, classroom, etc.), dropout, and students’ performance were topics

that were evaluated. The following extract shows the supervisor's perceptions regarding principals' practices.

“Principals in their districts consult even with mothers, in a separate session, to deal with the household workload of female students which is known to hinder girls' academic performance. Principals develop a stretched plan in order to attain the goal of promoting students' academic performance as measured by the promotion rate of general secondary school leaving certificate examination.”

Several teachers suggested that principals always set standards, particularly regarding student outcome, to maximize promotion rate and minimize repetition and dropout rates. Principals include these goals in teachers' performance agreement and each teacher signs to meet these objectives. To meet the standards, goals were categorized under topics divided by subject matters, grade level, and individual student competency level.

To summarise, principals in studied schools were working hard to maintain standards and professionalism. Moreover, the discussion revealed that principals include outcomes they expect from their staff in the performance agreement in order to meet the goals of academic standard.

### **Communication**

The fourth strategy that transpired from discussion with supervisors and teachers was *communication*. Both groups affirmed communication as the most important component of the principals' leadership role in a school. However, the ways in which principals succeed in creating and sustaining the atmosphere of effective communication was mixed. Supervisors and teachers stated that while some of the principals communicate to share vision and mission of the school and to exchange needs and feelings of individuals, others were weak in using it as a change tool. Most supervisors described the fact that principals understand the importance of continuous interaction with their staff and community and that it will create more understanding to practice school mission. Some active principals send and receive information very quickly and smoothly. Since all teachers and students are organized in small teams, they use these teams to transmit information and get feedback. Yet, some supervisors explained how principals make decisions on the basis of information that come out of these teams. Using this communication channel, principals exercise leadership throughout the school. It was also found out that principals use different mechanisms to communicate the school's vision and mission. For

example, some principals conduct continuous meetings(daily, weekly, biweekly, monthly, quarterly and yearly) with different groups of the school community including parents, others use short discussions with few selected individuals, post every events on staff notice board, and send letters and memos to concerned bodies. On the other hand, others use scheduled presentations and reports, while still others observe and walk the school to visit with staff addressing the communication needs. From interviews with supervisors it was revealed that most principals prefer oral communication as opposed to the written one.

In addition, principals strengthen their relationship with their school community by responding to the needs of their staff. The data were obtained from classroom visits, school level or small group discussions, and from informal meetings. Allowing loans, permitting leave in case of emergency and providing necessary teaching materials as quickly as requested, were among the responses that help to establish positive relationships. It was further found out that by calling parents and community leaders for meetings and inviting them to be part of school committees, principals connect their school with stakeholders.

Responses that teachers gave were also similar to those provided by supervisors. However, few teachers mentioned the possibility of principals communicating to manipulate information for their own end. They stated that principals make decisions without exhaustive discussion, and manipulate information to benefit the preferred few.

The result from the discussions showed that most principals use communication as one strategy to practice school leadership. However, some of them lack skills in communicating and using every opportunity to transfer school vision and goals.

### **Coaching and Mentoring**

The fifth concept that was drawn out of FGD and interviews posits that TSL was implemented through *coaching and mentoring*. Supervisors and teachers believe that coaching has positive impact on teachers' performance, particularly when teachers are coached with feedback from principals. This boosts their moral and commitment to take responsibility for their professional development. Teachers said that the coaching and mentoring role of principals increases their confidence, and they believe it has a positive contribution for the teaching-learning process.



In a FGD a teacher said: “The good side of their principal’s practice was his coaching based on data that he collected from classroom visits, minutes of meetings, and from self-assessment tool.” Another teacher added: “In addition to what my friends said, my principal provides coaching based on student marks by subject, class attendance of teachers and materials covered in class. Whenever he gives feedback based on data, we are pleased and ready to improve our practices as well as our student achievement.” However, another teacher said: “Principals were not skilful in communicating weaknesses and strengths.” Though many teachers said that principals were exercising coaching as a leadership tool and they were positively influenced by them, the majority of the teachers said the practice was infrequent and used to find fault and weaknesses in teachers.

According to supervisors, most principals were good in setting aside enough time to coach and provide feedback to teachers. Supervisors believed that principals can and do inspire and mobilize teachers, students, and community groups for the purpose of assisting students achieve high success. They do scheduled and unscheduled coaching and frequently give feedback to teachers in reference to their level of performance. The coaching was aimed at building the capacity of the teaching staff at all costs. They plan feedback sessions with teachers to discuss about what works and what does not.

To summarise, both supervisors and teachers agreed that principals in studied schools were providing coaching support to their staff, but most teachers complained that principals were not fully committed to providing coaching and support for those teachers/staff who need it.

### **Apportioning Tasks**

The sixth concept extracted from both supervisors and teachers was the issue of apportioning of tasks by principals to teachers and other school staff members. One supervisor stated: “Principals in our district usually divide tasks and distribute them to each level. For example, principals set performance goals they expect at the end of the year, and then indicate roles of individuals as well as groups (teachers, administration staff, and students).” Another supervisor said: “Principals plan and schedule work using reasonable timeline as a leadership strategy. Though some principals involve their staff and school community in planning, others simply forward the plan for execution.”

Yet another supervisor explained the methods that principals use to divide roles and responsibilities for teachers as follows: “while some of the principals’ plan together with their teachers/staff and notify them of their tasks and roles at each level in writing, other skilled principals not only notify, but also coordinate activities and provide needed support.”

Similarly, teachers responded that principals in their schools lead by giving defined tasks to each teacher. One teacher said: “We have a clear job description. Regarding activities, it depends on the school annual plan. Either the principals send general annual objectives of the school to teachers and then we operationalized it at department level, or they send us finalized performance agreement with our signature.” Another teacher said: “Principals establish different committees at the beginning of the year and involve teachers as committee members.” Such principals believe in allocating tasks to responsible bodies and expect a corresponding performance. “Yes”, said the another teacher, “our principal also apportion tasks among the staff and provides rewards based on the level of accomplishments.”

Another teacher added: “The principal in my school dispatches tasks to each of the staff and follows-up on progress made. Where there is deviation, he posts a notice to individual staff for dialogue and consultation with the aim to improving performance. He strives for better performance using such strategies.”

The result of discussion with both groups showed principals were leading their schools using task apportioning as a strategy. However, most respondents were unhappy about principals’ focus on tasks only. The expectation was that principals should not only focus on tasks, but also on leadership styles that broadly embraces all staff.

### **Goal Setting**

The other implementation strategy that came out from the interview and FGDs was *goal setting*. Both teachers and supervisors responded that principals were using goal setting as a leadership strategy. Principals set goals to keep the schools headed in the right direction. While some give opportunity for individuals and groups to make their interests known, others use it to share their vision. The supervisors discussed how set goals that are consistent with the needs of the school. They appreciate the fact that vision can be achieved by establishing school goals. Principals also

try to share their goals and reach consensus on how to make progress on the teaching and learning process, and how to cascade components of goals to individual level.

On the other hand, most teachers believe that principals have no problem with setting goals. But they do it either themselves or with few individuals or groups who are unable to provide inputs or advice on how to accomplish the goals. One of the teachers added: “For one thing, the goals set by the principals were very ambitious and highly stretched. Secondly, the level of student competence, availability of the educational materials and other inputs and teachers’ capacity hamper the ability to achieve these goals.”

Similarly, another teacher argued: “Most of the goals were challenging, but they created an opportunity to cooperate with each other in order to accomplish the goals. We gained clarity on the school vision through discussion about the goals. I understood now that as we successfully accomplish the goals, we are closer to fulfilling our vision.”

To summarise, principals in studied schools practice goal setting as one of their transformational leadership practices, according to supervisors and teachers who participated in interviews and FGDs. They also articulated that, principals should motivate teachers to understand the school vision and goals. This should be done not only by challenging them, but rather by providing the means and support so they can achieve them.

### **Motivation**

The eight strategies that come out of the discussion with supervisors and teachers was motivation. Supervisors and teachers responded that principals were using motivation as one important approach to exercise their school leadership. Supervisors explained that many principals motivate their staff through giving extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. They motivate their teacher through acknowledgement of best performance, giving material and financial rewards and showing respect to their staff. It was found out that principals also motivate their staff through facilitating to participate in training, involving in school based committee delegating responsibility. They provide moral support by making teachers feel appreciated for their contribution to the school. However, majority of teachers pointed out that principals in their schools were very weak in motivating and supporting their staff.

The overall theme that emerged from interviews and FGD is that principals try to exercise leadership roles through engaging school community (teachers, students and parents) on school goals by involving them in school planning and by taking their opinion on important issues. They mobilize school community by introducing and encouraging new initiatives; maintaining standards by setting goals on student achievement for each grade level; and then signing performance agreement with teachers. Principals also exercise leadership roles establishing relationship with school community and parents using different communication mechanisms; building capacity by allocating time for teaching and learning, by classroom observation and coaching and regularly following-up and giving timely feedback; through apportioning tasks and responsibilities to unit leaders, department heads and teachers using score cards; taking measures such as reprimands and salary deduction when not meeting expectations; through setting goals and celebrating performance through rewards and get-together sessions to keep staff cohesiveness and socialization, and creating a sense of ownership by presenting physical and financial performance reports to all stakeholders in monthly and/or quarterly meetings, to name a few.

Although principals exercise their leadership role using eight strategies that were mentioned above, they were criticized not considering what the staff say, not distributing leadership, not setting goals that are realistic, sharing responsibility and information only with people very close to them and busy on routine matters rather than focusing on strategic issues that would transform their schools. The eight strategies identified through qualitative data match the quantitative data rated by principals.

#### **4.3.3 How do Principals in SNNPRS Secondary Schools perceive their Transformational Leadership?**

Principals' ratings on their transformational leadership styles were aggregated to make the six dimension scores for transformational school leadership styles. While the dimensions were presented by averaging responses for all items in the dimensions, the negatively stated items were reverse-coded.

**Table 4. 13 Principals Ratings of their Transformational School Leadership Descriptive Survey****(N=76)**

Dimensions	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
SVBCp	76	2	3	5	4.09	.380
PEXp	76	2	3	5	4.34	.501
MBp	76	2	3	5	4.27	.431
ISp	76	2	3	5	3.56	.412
INSp	76	2	3	5	4.02	.321
SCUp	76	2	3	5	4.09	.387
OASp	76	2	3	5	4.06	.313

OASp (Overall Survey Principals' Perceptions), SVBCp (Sharing school vision and building consensus), PEXp (Building high performance expectation), MBp (Modelling Behaviour), ISp (Providing Individualized Support), INSp (Providing Intellectual Stimulation), SCUp (Building collaborative structure and culture). Source: Computed from Survey Data, 2015

In Table 4.13, the leadership survey descriptive results of school principals are revealed where the mean score ranges from 3.56 to 4.34, reflecting positive perceptions of their leadership style. The standard deviations show that principals uniformly rated themselves, except for the digression regarding the provision of individualized support. The dimension that scored most agreeable mean score was building high performance expectation (4.34), modelling behaviour (4.27), sharing school vision and building consensus (4.09) and establishing collaborative structure and school culture had (4.09), while individualized consideration had the lowest mean score (3.56). Though Individualized Consideration dimension mean score was low, the overall survey mean score showed that principals in SNNPRS secondary schools perceived they are transformational leaders (4.06). The possible explanation for an exceptionally low rating of principals regarding the provision of Individualized Support could be lack of sufficient resources in the school, low motivation, culture and knowledge on the importance of human consideration, or it emanated from their transactional leadership behaviour. Bass and Riggio (2006: 5-7) pointed out that transformational leadership behaviours such as individualized support augment followers' motivation to transcend their own self-interest for the good of the group or organization.

**Table 4.14 Pearson Correlation Results of Principals' Self-ratings**

Dimensions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 SVBCp	-	.64**	.65**	0.22	.63**	.73**	.83**
2 PEXp		-	.73**	.26*	.65**	.66**	.87**
3 MBp			-	0.14	.65**	.71**	.84**
4 ISp				-	0.11	0.18	.42**
5 INSp					-	.72**	.80**
6 SCUp						-	.86**
7 OASp							-

\*p < .05; \*\* p < .01; \*\*\*p < .001

*Notes:* SVBCp (Sharing school vision and building consensus), PEXp (Building high performance expectation), MBp (Modelling Behaviour), ISp (Providing Individualized Support), INSp (Providing Intellectual Stimulation), SCUp (Building collaborative structure and culture), OASp(Overall Survey Principals' Perceptions). Source: Computed from Survey Data, 2015

The Pearson correlation coefficients for the principals' perceptions dimensions were calculated and presented in Table 4.14. The results showed that it ranged from weak positive relation to strong and positive correlation. The values ranged from  $r = .11$  to  $r = .87$  with an average of  $r = .50$ . Sharing of school vision and thereby building consensus was positively correlated with all dimensions with the range of  $r = .64$  to  $r = .73$ . However, weak correlation was noted with individualized support. Performance expectation of the principal was positively strongly correlated with modelling behaviour ( $r = .73$ ) while individualized support had weak relation with other dimensions, except with high performance expectations ( $r = .26$ ). The overall dimension of principals' perceptions registered strong and positive correlation with each dimension ranging from  $r = .42$  to  $r = .87$  except with individualized support value of  $r = .42$ . All of the principals who returned the survey reported that they possessed transformational leadership behaviour and worked toward securing high student achievement. This result is similar to Munoz's (2013:90) statement that principals in secondary schools of SNNPRS tend to rate themselves as TSL to a somewhat greater extent than their followers rated them.

In addition to the quantitative analysis presented above, the qualitative result showed that the leadership styles used in secondary schools of SNNPRS were blended. Some were completely

autocratic while others swing from autocratic to laissez-faire and still others were transformational.

Most of supervisors and teachers involved in FGDs described the leadership style of principals in studied schools to be *autocratic*. One of the supervisors said that “principals in my district exercise autocratic leadership style. He said: “Principals are harsh in their approach and tone. Staff members of schools that I supervise indicated that usually principals use ‘do it because I say so’ rather than convincing and involving their staff in school issues.” Another supervisor supports the above view:

“Most principals are weak in creating a friendly climate in the school. They let teachers know what they are expected to do but not show much interest in taking teachers’ opinions into account.”

Supervisors think that some of the principals rush to administer warnings and reprimands. They [principals] usually use punishment as a resort.

Similarly, teachers said that principals in their school mainly practice *autocratic* leadership style. They explained how principals assign responsibility to teachers with a warning about failure to comply with their instructions. They commented how principals rush into taking measures than counselling and support in the case of delay or failure to deliver up to their expectations. One teacher articulated this issue as follows:

“To him [the principal] implementation of rules and regulations are more important than responding to teachers’ requests. He does not understand that supporting his staff effectively and efficiently were among a principal’s role.”

On the other hand, some of the supervisors and teachers involved in the interview and FGD indicated that principals in studied schools were using different leadership styles as the situation required. Principals use more of directive way of leadership when there is a crisis. One teacher explained his experience whereby a principal ordered all teachers to give supplementary class by coming to school in every weekend for two months after evaluating students’ result was very low on model test. According to one supervisor, some principals may provide “continuous coaching only to less experienced teachers.” However, according to one supervisor, “some principals

consult more with teachers or parents who have relevant knowledge or influence depending on the nature of the issue.”

Teachers further commented on how principals swing from one style of leadership to another depending on the circumstances and prevailing conditions. Some of the teachers said that it is difficult to say the exact leadership style exercised by their principals.

They argued that sometimes their principal may call a joint meeting to solve the problem or just call few of the teachers to have input to make decisions. Teachers elaborated on how sometimes principals could be fast in making their decisions and when they may take decisions when things went wrong. In some instances, it was noted that, principals may avoid teachers or sometimes give them emotional support. Sometimes they do not like to be involved on serious issues that are important for teachers but the other time they may take risks.

Several supervisors and teachers agreed that principals in the studied schools were exercising TSL. One of the supervisors said that principals in my district possessed a good deal of coordination skills, arguing that his leadership orientation is of a transformational style:

“He [the principal] is a likeable school leader by teachers. He works in close consultation with teachers. Usually, he allocates tasks to teachers and makes follow-up in due course of time. This principal is thoughtful of teacher’s needs. He designed the mechanism through which better performing teachers are being acknowledged. His timely responses to requests made by teachers make him an acceptable academic leader among teachers.”

The above supervisor explained that principals in his district were up-to-date in sharing new developments with teachers. They do not only share information, but also share objectives with their colleagues. He explained that the school has over 250 staff and about 5600 students. Despite this large population school community, the principal knows each teacher by name, visit classes, do monthly meetings with teachers and students. He ranked him as “a good communicator” because he “disseminates information on time using the available channels without any delay.”

Another supervisor added that “some principals showed in words and deeds that teachers are an important part of a school. Some of them were successful in producing best teacher leaders.”



Teachers indicated that principals in their schools usually challenge the status quo and empower them by sharing important information, as the following quotation demonstrates:

“He is a person who challenges you to solve problems in creative ways. He helped me to use my potential. For example, I am one of the teachers who is insisting that laboratories can function only when all the inputs are made available. He [the Principal] convinced me to consider the possibility of finding other options. Then, afterwards, I produced several testing inputs and models by using local materials. As a result, I became the model teacher of the year.”

Similarly, another teacher argues that the principal in his school is the source of their unity and recognition of the purpose of the school:

“He [the Principal] won our commitment through his fair and honest ways of information sharing, the value he gives for our opinions, and though his professional expertise.” “I am devoted to work with him because of his commitment to serve us and the whole school community said one of the teachers.”

The other teacher added

“My principal tries to implement what we asked him as much as possible. He cares about our relationship. Moreover, in every meeting he brings new ideas that incite our spirit positively and initiatives that bolster us more engaged with school missions.”

The summary of interviews and FGDs show that the leadership styles that principals used in secondary schools of SNNPRS are not uniform. Some were completely autocratic while others found to swing from autocratic to laissez-faire and still others were transformational. Even though the qualitative analysis showed there was a grey of transformational leadership practices in studied schools, majority of the principals were exercising non-transformational leadership. Thus, the qualitative analysis does not support the quantitative result.

#### **4.3.4 What are Teachers’ Perceptions regarding their Principals’ Transformational Leadership in Selected SNNPRS Secondary Schools?**

In this sub-section, the study examines teachers’ perceptions towards their principals’ TSL. Teachers were requested to rate their principals’ leadership behaviour. Table 4.15 presents the descriptive statistics regarding teachers’ ratings of their principal’s TSL behaviour. The results indicate that except for the individualized support of 3.30 the mean ratings were above 3.79 that

showed positive perceptions of teachers' towards their leaders. For each subscales the standard deviation ranged from .47 to .71. The mean scores ranged from 3.30 to 4.1 for each subscale. The mean score for TSL was 3.8. This constituted the sum score of sharing school vision and building consensus, building high performance expectation, modelling behaviour, providing individualized support, providing intellectual stimulation, building collaborative structure and culture ranging from 1 to 5. The standard deviations indicate that teachers' perceptions regarding their principal were not uniform particularly in holding high performance expectation (.69) and in modelling behaviour (.71).

**Table 4.15 Teachers Ratings of their Principals' Transformational School Leadership Styles Descriptive Survey (N=642)**

<b>Dimensions</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
SVBCt	3.99	0.50
PEXt	4.10	0.69
MBt	3.97	0.71
ISt	3.30	0.47
INSt	3.72	0.61
SCUt	3.65	0.51
OASt	3.79	0.51

SVBCt (Sharing school vision and building consensus), PEXt (Building high performance expectation), MBt (Modelling Behaviour), ISt (Providing Individualized Support), INSt (Providing Intellectual Stimulation), SCUt (Building collaborative structure and culture, OASt (Overall Survey teacher's Perceptions). Source: Computed from Survey Data, 2015.

However, the overall survey (.51) result showed that strong perceptions similarities existed among teachers. While sharing school vision and building consensus (3.99), holding high performance expectation (4.10) and modelling behaviour (3.97) were the most agreeable behaviours that were practiced by principals, while providing individualized support (3.30), building collaborative structure and culture (3.65) and providing intellectual stimulation (3.72) had the lowest ratings. The overall survey mean ratings of (3.8) revealed that some teachers were inclined to agree that their principals were on their way to becoming TSL. Though there were many ratings below the acceptable range (disagree and strongly disagree), some of the secondary

school teachers in SNNPRS also had positive perceptions on their principals' transformational leadership behaviours.

**Table 4.16 Person Correlation Results of Teachers' Perceptions Ratings of their Principals' Transformational Leadership**

Dimensions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 SVBCt	-	.78**	.80**	.50**	.82**	.81**	.90**
2 PEXt	-	-	.80**	.44**	.82**	.79**	.90**
3 MBt	-	-	-	.48**	.88**	.84**	.93**
4 ISt	-	-	-	-	.48**	.51**	.63**
5 INSt	-	-	-	-	-	.85**	.94**
6 SCUt	-	-	-	-	-	-	.92**
7 OASt	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

\*p < .05; \*\* p < .01; \*\*\*p < .001

*Notes:* SVBCt (Sharing school vision and building consensus), PEXt (Building high performance expectation), MBt (Modelling Behaviour), ISt (Providing Individualized Support), INSt (Providing Intellectual Stimulation), SCUt (Building collaborative structure and culture, OASt (Overall Survey teacher's Perceptions). Source: Computed from Survey Data, 2015.

Table 4.16 shows that the transformational school leadership dimensions of teachers' perceptions correlated with each other positively and strongly. Sharing school vision and building consensus was strongly correlated with all TSL behaviours ranging from  $r = .50$  to  $r = .82$  while Individual Support that the principals provided to their teachers had medium and positive correlation with all other dimensions ranging from  $r = .44$  to  $r = .51$ . Intellectual Stimulation had positive and strong correlation with all other dimensions ranging from  $r = .48$  to  $r = .88$ . Similarly, Building Collaborative Structure and Culture in the school was strongly and positively correlated with all other dimensions ranging from  $r = .51$  to  $r = .85$ , while it had medium and positive correlation with individualized support. The overall ratings of teachers' perceptions had strong and positive correlation with each dimension of TSL ranging from  $r = .63$  to  $r = .94$ .

Prior to examining the effect of principal leadership on students' achievement, the researcher attempted to find out the difference between principals and teachers' perceptions mean scores. Since there were differences between mean scores on principal and teacher perceptions, a t-test was used to identify the magnitude of the difference. If the variance between groups were similar

( $p > 0.05$ ) then equal variances were assumed. On the other hand, if they were significantly different ( $p < 0.05$ ) then equal variances were not assumed.

**Table 4.17 T-values, Standard Deviations (SDs) and Means Scores of Teachers and Principals in Transformational Leadership Dimensions**

TL dimensions	Respondents	N	Mean	SD	Df	t-test	p
SVBC	Teacher	642	3.9671	.32306	150	-2.092	.038
	Principal	76	4.0868	.38030			
PEX	Teacher	642	4.0888	.49109	150	-3.146	.002
	Principal	76	4.3421	.50140			
MB	Teacher	642	3.9655	.44796	150	-4.336	.000
	Principal	76	4.2747	.43109			
IS	Teacher	642	3.3526	.24845	150	-3.768	.000
	Principal	76	3.5605	.41185			
IST	Teacher	642	3.7447	.37785	150	-4.787	.000
	Principal	76	4.0171	.32141			
SCU	Teacher	642	3.8987	.45269	150	-2.794	.006
	Principal	76	4.0895	.38664			
OASTP	Teacher	642	3.8362	.35764	150	-4.140	.000
	Principal	76	4.0618	.31259			

Notes: SVBCt (Sharing school vision and building consensus), PEXt (Building high performance expectation), MBt (Modelling Behaviour), Ist (Providing Individualized Support), INSt (Providing Intellectual Stimulation), SCUt (Building collaborative structure and culture, OASt (Overall Survey teacher's Perceptions).

Source: Computed from Survey Data, 2015

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the perceptions' scores for teachers and principals. There were significant differences in scores for teachers ( $M= 3.83$ ,  $SD= .357$ ) and principals ( $M=4.06$ ,  $SD= .313$ ;  $t(150) = 4.14$ ,  $p=.000$ , two-tailed). The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference =  $-.225$ , 95% CI:  $-.333$  to  $-.117$ ) was moderate ( $\eta^2=0.97$ ).

In addition to computing composite scores (six dimensions), item-by-item examinations also revealed that teachers and principals showed significant difference in some items and no significant difference in fewer items. While they scored no significant difference in few items,

they scored significantly different ratings in many items. In examining dimensions on which these items belonged regarding items that scored no significant differences, it was concluded they belonged to all dimensions, but in different frequencies. Sharing school vision and building consensus, collaborative structure and strengthening school culture, modelling behaviour and individualized support obtained high similarities in ratings. Regarding significant differences, items under intellectual stimulation had high significant differences, though the other dimensions also had differences ranging from three to seven items.

The qualitative analysis that was obtained from interviews and FGDs correlated with the finding from quantitative data. Though principals claim that they are manifesting TSL behaviour (cf. 4.3.3), data from quantitative (teachers rating) as well as qualitative data (interview and FGD) did not support the principals assert. The summary of qualitative response drawn from interviews and FGDs in Table 4.18 describes the leadership style of principals as “autocratic”, “situational” and “transformational”. This implies that the leadership styles of principals in SNNPRS were diverse. Thus, according to Table 4.18, while majority of supervisors described principals’ leadership style as autocratic, a number of them rated principals as using different styles as the situation required. Moreover, minority of supervisors agreed that their principals were transformational.

**Table 4.18 Leadership Styles of Principals (Interview and FGD)**

Category	n (S)	%	n (T)	%
Autocratic	7	41	19	45
Situational	4	23.5	10	24
Transformational	6	35.5	13	31
Total	17	100	42	100

Source: Computed from interview and FGD Data, 2015

Similarly, majority of teachers believe their principals' leadership style was autocratic. While quite a few teachers said that their principals swinging from one leadership style to another depending on the circumstances and prevailing conditions, several teachers stated that their principals in one way or another employed transformational leadership style. It is possible to conclude that transformational leadership style was exercised by few number of secondary school principals. Therefore, the number of teachers adopting TSL needs to increase significantly. Generally, the qualitative data suggest that both supervisors and teachers perceived the principals' leadership styles almost in similar way and thus the qualitative analysis strengthens the quantitative result-principals in secondary schools of SNNPRS were less transformational leaders.

**4.3.5 What is the Nature of the Relationship between the Transformational Leadership Role of School Principals and Student Achievement?**

A major point of this study is to determine if the TSL role has relationship with student achievement. To examine this, three years' (2005/13-2007/15) worth aggregate data results of 10<sup>th</sup> grade (GESLE) students were gathered from National Educational Assessment and Examinations Agency (NEAEA). To find the extent of the relationship between principals' leadership and school effectiveness correlation coefficient analysis was conducted between the combined mean of teachers' ratings of their principal's transformational leadership and students score percentage (school average) at the school level. Moreover, the overall TSL scores were regressed on student achievement to determine whether or not the principal's overall transformational leadership style was a significant predictor of school effectiveness.

**Table 19 Rank Correlation between Transformational Leadership and Student Achievement**

Dimensions	1	2
1. OASt		.065
2. ACHI	.065	

Notes: OASt (Overall Survey Teacher's Perceptions).ACHI (aggregate result of student achievement)

Source: Computed from Survey Data, 2015

The relation was examined by means of Spearman rho correlational analysis (see Table 19). Table 19 indicates that there is relationship between transformational school leadership role of secondary school principals in SNNPRS and student achievement. Though the total transformational school leadership role measured based on teachers' perceptions rating has a positive and strong relationship (.065) with student achievement, its relation is not significant.

**Table 20 Rank Correlation between Transformational Leadership Dimensions and Student Achievement**

Dimensions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. ACHI	1.000	.053	.067	.013	-.008	.153	.032
2. SVBC		1.000	.701**	.699**	.482**	.739**	.725**
3. PEX			1.000	.775**	.529**	.842**	.856**
4. MB				1.000	.561**	.805**	.878**
5. IS					1.000	.523**	.532**
6. IST						1.000	.840**
7. SCU							1.000

\*p < .05; \*\* p < .01; \*\*\*p < .001, Notes: OASt (Overall Survey Teacher's Perceptions) ACHI (aggregate result of student achievement) Source: Computed from Survey Data, 2015

As indicated in Table 20, the results of the correlation analysis between the six transformational leadership dimensions scores and student achievement revealed there is relationship between these six dimensions and student achievement.

Sharing school vision and building consensus had a positive relationship (.053) with student achievement, but their relationship is not significant. Similarly, performance expectation of principals (.067) and modelling behaviour had (.013) weak positive relationship with student achievement. However, both dimensions had no significant relationship with student achievement. Providing individualized support is negatively (-.008) correlated with student achievement. Even though individualized consideration is a core dimension of TSL, its relation to student achievement is negative and not significant. Intellectual Stimulation (.153) and collaborative structure and building culture (.032) also had positive but not significant relationship with student achievement. Thus, Spearman correlation test result did not provide statistically significant supportive evidence to suggest that principals in secondary schools of

SNNPR show effective transformational leadership in terms of student achievement. This result is consistent with the findings of Leithwood, et al. (2004).

**Table 4.21 Multiple Regression Results: Transformational Leadership and Student Achievement**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	SE	P
1	.183 <sup>a</sup>	.033	-.051	13.88375	.878

Source: Computed from Survey Data, 2015

Multiple regression analysis was done to confirm the extent of relationship between transformational leadership and student achievement of secondary schools in SNNPRS. As presented in Table 4.21, the components of total TSL was statistically not significant and explained only 5 % of the variance in student achievement. All components (six dimensions) were also statistically not significant and did not show their contribution to the improvement of student achievement. Therefore, the descriptive results indicate that the teachers' composite ratings of their principal's leadership behaviours and the teachers' individual leadership dimensions ratings did not significantly predict student achievement.

**Table 4.22 Standardized Beta Weighting Coefficients for the Components of Transformational Leadership**

Model	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Correlations		
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Zero-order	Partial	Part
1 (Constant)		2.116	.038	3.236	109.893			
SVBC	.148	.350	.727	-29.202	41.642	.050	.042	.041
PEX	.034	.061	.952	-29.747	31.619	.041	.007	.007
MB	-.088	-.161	.872	-35.557	30.239	.024	-.019	-.019
IS	.015	.058	.954	-27.374	29.021	-.008	.007	.007
IST	.519	1.019	.312	-17.807	54.992	.101	.122	.121
OASt	-.536	-.306	.761	-152.598	112.033	.048	-.037	-.036

Source: Computed from Survey Data, 2015

Moreover, according to Table 22, a standard multiple regression analysis result showed that standardized beta weightings were also not significant for all six dimensions. The possible



explanation for this result could be that though there is the practice of transformational leadership and students' performance improvement in some schools, the principles of transformational leadership are not practiced to the level of getting teachers' willingness to provide extra effort.

However, although the correlation showed that the relationship between principals' transformational leadership and student achievement was not statistically significant, discussion with supervisors and teachers revealed that the more the principal leadership style is transformational, the better the student achievement results would be.

One of the supervisors used the metaphor of mirror arguing that "a school looks like its principal". He said that "I do not mean that the school's physical outlook, though that is also important, I mean to what extent the principal motivated school community and made them committed to achieve common goals of the school. I mean the level of progress in percentage of successful students per year and low wastage in that school. I mean to what extent the principal engaged his school community, including parents, with school vision. If he did these, he would improve his school's performance and consequently get respect and recognition from the school community as well as government."

Supervisors believe that the principals' leadership behaviour has a strong relationship with student achievement. They consider principal's efficiency determines his/her schools' effectiveness in general and student achievement in particular.

Teachers who participated in FGDs said that the name of a school goes with the principal's popularity or reputation. One of the teachers said,

"To me the principals' role is important to student achievement. Without his coordination, support and facilitation things will not go smoothly. The way he led his school determines the success of his school. He is a driving force."

Similarly another teacher stated:

"Yes, at the back of all his success or failure, there is the issue of how well he governed his school community. Though the principals' leadership and the climate he is creating important, teachers' commitment has also significant contribution to student achievement."

Participants mentioned the way that the principal creates willingness in his staff determines the student achievement, and stressing those principals should understand and find out what motivates their staff to work towards their schools' vision. This is evidenced in the excerpt from one teacher:

“Principal, who understands individual needs, provides coaching and gives support for professional development could positively affect school goals.” The other teacher added “it is only principals who were not favouring (not being partisan on religious or ethnic grounds) individuals or groups would convince his staff to stand with him and move them to exert their effort to enhance student learning outcome.”

Another teacher complemented the above as follows:

“Principals, who involve teachers in major decisions, protect teachers from outside attack and principals who try to build staff consensus, respect staff, and above all principals who accept their shortcomings could mobilize teachers and school community would take up their schools to the level of effective school.”

In general, both supervisors and teachers agreed on the importance of principal leadership to the overall transformation of a school. The school level data analysis supports the importance of principals' leadership role in student performance. Both groups of participants emphasized that principals' leadership behaviours such as individualized support, intellectual stimulation, high expectations, sharing vision and modelling were very important to improve the performance of students. However, the quantitative data did not show significant relation.

To probe the result further, the researcher extracted principals that were rated transformational by their teachers (rated 4.0 and above mean score) only and then examined the trend of the average percentage of students passed each year in these schools.

**Figure 4.1 Schools, Principals rated TSL by Teachers and Average Percentage of Students Passed per Year**

School Name	Overall Survey	2005 Passed %	2006 Passed %	2007 Passed %
4	4.1	89	96	99
6	4.4	49	55	74
9	4.3	95	91	96
10	3.9	89	90	92
19	4.0	63	69	73
24	4.3	65	66	86
28	4.3	58	77	89
40	4.2	86	91	92
41	4.3	39	46	63
47	4.6	99	93	100
49	4.5	37	45	53
54	4.0	57	73	81
60	4.0	60	62	86
61	4.2	49	50	62
64	4.3	81	71	91
66	4.2	64	80	100
67	4.0	69	41	86
68	4.0	60	80	92
70	4.0	84	44	93
71	4.2	98	68	76

Source: Computed from Survey Data, 2015

Figure 4.1 portrays that from 76 secondary school principals that were included in this study, 20(26%) of them obtained their teachers' full confirmation that they were transformational leaders (4.0 and above mean score). Teachers' ratings of their principals broadly related to the aggregate result of students in GESLCE. In Figure 4.1, it appears that TSL has relation to student achievement and if principals employ transformational leadership behaviours sufficiently, students' achievement could improve. Thus, it is possible to conclude that the lower the extent of the existence of transformational leadership style in the school, the lower its relationship with student achievement and the lower its effect on school effectiveness.

Finally, even though the demographic data was not included in the basic questions of this study, the researcher looked at this data and obtained interesting results.

**Table 4.23 Person Correlation Results of Principals’ Demographic Data and Student Achievement**

Dimensions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Age	1	.404**	.311**	-.110	.094	.034	.085	.015
2. Education Level		1	.141	-.089	.168	.155	.015	-.005
3. Total service as a principal			1	.272*	.113	.117	.034	.019
4. Service in current school				1	-.167	.010	-.093	.133
5. Number of students					1	.371**	.061	-.240*
6. Grade level						1	-.093	-.013
7. OASp							1	.286*
8.ACHIEVEMENT								1

\*p < .05; \*\* p < .01; \*\*\*p < .001, Source: Computed from Survey Data, 2015

According to Table 4.23, in the correlation analysis between principals’ demographic data and student achievement, some of the dimensions were correlated with student achievement. Among the principals’ demographic data, it was only the number of students in the schools (r=-.240) that had statistically significant negative relationship with student achievement. While principals’ age has significant positive correlation with education level (r=.404) and with total service as a principal (r=.311), the total mean of principals self-rating (r=.286) had positive and moderately significant correlation with student achievement.

**Table 4.24 Multiple Regression Results: Principals’ Demographic Data and Student Achievement**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	SE	P
1	.385 <sup>a</sup>	.148	.125	12.66885	.003

Source: Computed from Survey Data, 2015

A standard multiple regression analysis was used to conclude the extent of relation between principals’ demographic data and student achievement of secondary schools in SNNPRS, Ethiopia. Table 4.24 showed that from seven demographic data about the principal and his/her schools, the number of students in the school was statistically significant and explained 15% of

the variance in student achievement. The component of TSL were not (sharing vision and consensus building, holding high performance expectation, model behaviour, providing individualized support, providing intellectual stimulation, building collaborative structure and strengthening the school culture) statistically significant and explained only 5% of the variance in students achievement. Therefore, all components (six dimensions) were statistically not significant and did not show their contribution in student achievement.

**Table 4.25 Standardized Beta Weighting Coefficients for the Components of Principals’ Demographic Data and Perceptions**

Model	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Correlations		
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Zero-order	Partial	Part
1 (Constant)		1.305	.196	-13.253	63.475			
Number of students	-.259	-2.390	.019	-4.561	-.413	-.240	-.269	-.258
OASp	.302	2.789	.007	3.734	22.422	.286	.310	.301

Source: Computed from Survey Data, 2015

In Table 25, a standard multiple regression analysis result showed that standardized beta weightings of number of students is -.259 and OASp is .302 which indicate that both values were making a significant and unique contribution to student achievement. Moreover, the number of students in a school uniquely explained 7% of the variance in student achievement while the overall survey of principals’ perceptions uniquely explained 9% of the variance in student achievement. The negative correlation between student achievement and the number of students in the school tells us that the larger the size of students in a school, the less the student performance. Similarly, Howely’s (2000) research on school size points out that smaller school size has been associated with higher achievement.

Both supervisors interviewed and teachers involved in FGD listed several challenges that principals as well as schools faced. Supervisors and teachers feel that though principals and their community are trying to achieve goals set by the school, principals have some challenges. The major challenges are shortage of educational inputs (skill and attitude of teachers, laboratory, reference books, and insufficient budget), lack of parental support in their children’s education

and number of students in the classroom as well as in the school. One of the supervisors said, “There are three schools under my supervision. They do not have sufficient laboratory equipment, chemicals or trained laboratory attendant. Books in the library are also not adequate and most of them are very old editions.” The other supervisor added that “although principals expect strong support and involvement from parents, the level of the parents’ engagement is very low.”

Similarly, teachers that involved in FGD added more challenges on what supervisors said. They said that student’s competency or readiness; number students in the class and principals’ inclination to administrative work are serious challenges. The majority of teachers stated that besides material and financial challenges, student capability to the level is a basic challenge. Students lack knowledge and interest in science subjects and their language proficiency is weak. This is a basic challenge both for us and for the principal. In many cases, the number of students in the class was another challenge. Most teachers cannot gain access to each student in order to coach and support them. However, teachers are expected to meet the standard. According to one teacher, “this is one of the basic challenges in our effort to improve student performance.” This teacher further explained: “I am a mathematics teacher. I do give homework and class work to my students. However, I cannot expose students to new content; it impedes me to use a variety of ways to enhance their skills. I cannot be a resource person for the needy students easily. This affects student capability and hampers my effort.” Similarly, biology and chemistry teachers argued that instead of finishing one lesson in one laboratory session, because the number of students in the class the number of the session doubled or tripled. This also led to push the content or not to cover the lesson designed for that grade. The teachers argued that most principals spend more time on administrative and out of school work which is a challenge to teachers who need the principals’ leadership support.

The empirical evidence obtained from both quantitative and qualitative analysis, besides the other challenges mentioned, indicated that school size was found to having a negative effect on student achievement. Thus, the number of students in the class should be minimized in order to mentor students on an individual basis and to improve student achievement.

#### **4.4 SUMMARY**

The present study used the mixed methods approach to study the transformational leadership role of principals in the secondary schools of Ethiopia. The main question of the study centred on the manifestation of TSL and the relation between the roles of secondary school principal leadership with the student achievement. The main focus of this study was to explore the relationship between transformational leadership and student achievement. It commenced with checking whether TSL exists in secondary schools of SNNPR, and then how principals implement leadership in studied schools, principals self-rating and teachers rating of principals were examined and ranges of the differences between the self-rating (cf.4.3.3) and raters (cf. 4.3.4) were evaluated. The relationship of transformational leadership with student achievement (General Education School Leaving Certificate Examination results from the past three year period was used as the dependent variable) was analyzed based on teachers' ratings of their principals. While the quantitative analysis showed that the relationship between TSL role and student achievement was not statistically significant, empirical analysis of interviews and FGD revealed that principals' leadership role has strong relationship with student achievement and principals' roles determine the performance of student achievement.

The last chapter of this study will present a summary of findings and conclusions drawn from the study. Implications and recommendations for future study and organizational performance improvement will be discussed.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

This study focused on the principal's role in providing transformational leadership as defined by Leithwood and Jantiz (2006; 1999). The study was conducted in the Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Regional State (SNNPRS) of Ethiopia measuring the relationship between principal transformational leadership role and student achievement in studied secondary schools. This study used mixed research approach to examine the relationships between transformational school leadership as defined by Burn and Bass (2006) and operationalized by Leithwood and Jantiz (2006; 1999) in relation to student achievement measured by General Education School Leaving Certificate Examination (GESLCE).

The study was designed to establish the extent to which the principal's transformational school leadership role has relationship with secondary school students' achievement. The study used 10<sup>th</sup> grade General Education School Leaving Certificate Examination (GESLCE) as proxy for student achievement. The Nature of School Leadership (NSL) (Leithwood & Jantiz, 2006) scores were used to measure transformational school leadership (TSL). Secondary schools in SNNPRS whose principals had been the incumbent for three or more years in studied schools were selected purposively. A total of 80 survey instruments were distributed to as many school principals and 680 survey questionnaires to teachers in identified schools. Seventy-six school principals and 642 teachers returned the surveys representing 95% and 94.4% return rate for principals and teachers, respectively. Interviews and focus group discussions (FGD) were conducted with supervisors and teachers who worked with the principals. Participants were informed of the objectives of the study and assured of confidentiality in formal letters and clarified issues in person. In examining the relationship between TSL roles of principals and student achievement in selected secondary schools in the SNNPRS, this study sets out to address the following objectives (cf. 1.4.1).

1. To determine what constitutes the transformational leadership role of school principals;
2. To explore how principals in SNNPRS of Ethiopian secondary schools implement transformational leadership;



3. To assess how principals perceive their transformational leadership roles in SNNPRS of Ethiopian secondary schools;
4. To examine teachers' perceptions of their principals' transformational leadership in selected SNNPRS secondary schools;
5. To explore the nature of the relationship between the transformational leadership role of school principals and student achievement; and
6. To make recommendations that may serve as strategy for secondary schools leadership based on the findings of the study.

Thus, to this end, this chapter presents summary of the research findings of the study following the conclusions, implications for general practice and recommendations for further research.

## **5.2 SUMMARY OF IMPORTANT FINDINGS**

A summary of the main findings is presented in accordance with this study's objectives as follows:

### **5.3.1 Objective one: To determine what constitutes the transformational leadership role of school Principals (cf. 1.4.1).**

Leithwood, et al. (1999) and Leithwood and Jantiz (1999; 2006) constructed TSL styles based on Bass (1985) and Burns' (1978) study and prepared a measurement tool called "The Nature of School Leadership" that helps to identify the existence of various aspects of leadership within schools. In that model, transformational leadership characteristics and behaviours were grouped into three categories (Setting Direction, Developing People, and Redesigning the Organization) and six dimensions (*Sharing Vision and building Consensus, High Performance Expectation, Modelling Behaviour, Providing Individualized Support, Providing Intellectual Stimulation, and Building Collaborative Structure and Culture*).

In this study, the quantitative (factor analysis and correlation) and qualitative (interviews and FGD) investigations revealed that the six dimensions (Sharing Vision and building Consensus, High Performance Expectation, Modelling Behaviour, Providing Individualized Support, Providing Intellectual Stimulation, and Building Collaborative Structure and Culture), developed by Leithwood and his colleagues constitute TSL roles in secondary schools of SNNPRS,

Ethiopia. All correlations between transformational leadership roles were significant ( $p < .05$ ). Three dimensions, namely: Sharing School Vision and Building Consensus, Building Collaborative Structure and Strengthening the School Culture had high ranking compared with the six roles of the principals in secondary schools of SNNPRS, while lower ratings were given to the degree to which the principal provided Individualized Support. Supervisors and teachers who were involved in interviews and FGDs also largely listed several constructs associated with TSL in their school context.

While supervisors ranked *building collaborative structures and strengthening school culture, sharing vision and building consensus, modelling behaviour, intellectual stimulation, performance expectation and individualized support*, respectively, the teachers gave high value to *offering individualized support and providing intellectual stimulation*. Providing Intellectual Stimulation and Individualized Support were ranked the lowest leadership dimensions by both principals and supervisors.

One of the findings obtained from interviews and FGD with supervisors and teachers was vulnerability, which could be the extension of modelling behaviour in the constructs of TSL. Vulnerability, raised by supervisors and teachers were, in one way or another, presented in categories constructed by Leithwood and Jantiz (1999, 2006), but were not as exhaustive or fully explained by the context of secondary school principals in SNNPRS of Ethiopia.

Various studies (Leithwood & Jantiz, 2005; Leithwood & Jantiz, 2006; Waters & Grubb, 2004) show that TSL roles can be constituted in six dimensions. In this respect, this study joins the previous research (Estapa, 2009; Gulbin, 2008 and Mills, 2008) in confirming that TSL roles of principals were found in six dimensions and the result showed that the instrument was consistently measuring one factor (TSL).

### **5.3.2 Objective two: To explore how principals in SNNPRS of Ethiopian secondary schools implement transformational leadership (cf. 1.4.1).**

The researcher attempted to understand how secondary school principals in SNNPRS practiced transformational leadership roles. The statistical analysis and qualitative analyses revealed that principals in secondary schools of SNNPRS practiced transformational leadership in eight ways. These eight components explain a total of 70.72% of the variance.

Engaging people with a mission, encouraging staff to come up with new initiatives and maintaining standards, sharing vision through communicating, coach at the individual level, sharing tasks as well as power, setting goals and motivating through celebrating achievements. These were the strategies principals used to improve the performance of student achievements. Both qualitative and quantitative data revealed that principals in this study exercised leadership through maintaining standards by setting goals for student achievement at each grade level, and then by signing performance agreements with teachers. Engaging the school community was another strategy principals used to obtain consensus on school vision and goals by involving teachers, students and parents in school planning by taking their opinion on important issues.

Principals focused on capacity building of the school community by allocating time for teaching and learning, classroom observations and coaching, regular follow-up and giving timely feedback. Sharing information using several communication ways; apportioning tasks and responsibilities to unit leaders, department heads and teachers; using scorecards and taking measures, such as reprimands and salary deductions, from those not meeting expectations, were additional strategies used by principals.

Presenting physical and financial performance reports to stakeholders, calling monthly and quarterly meetings were additional strategies used by principals to create a sense of commitment and ownership. Though such exercises were not broadly practiced, principals celebrated good performance through rewards and social events to keep staff cohesive and socialized. Research conducted by Munoz (2013:85-87) revealed that effective leaders use similar exercises to make their schools effective.

Although principals exercise their leadership role using eight strategies that were mentioned above, they were criticized for not considering what the staff say, not distributing leadership, not setting goals that are realistic, sharing responsibility and information only with people very close to them and busy on routine matters rather than focusing on strategic issues that would transform their schools.

### **5.3.3 Objective three: To assess how do principals perceive their transformational leadership roles in SNNPRS of Ethiopian secondary schools (cf. 1.4.1).**

The third issue that was examined was the perceptions of principals on the effectiveness of their transformational leadership. Principals in secondary schools of SNNPRS rated themselves as successful transformational leaders. Principals rated themselves high in their practice of all TSL dimensions (constructed by Leithwood & Jantiz, 1996; 2006), except providing Individualized Support, which is a key indicator of TSL. The overall dimension of principal's perceptions had strong and positive correlation with each dimension (from  $r = .42$  to  $r = .87$ ) except in Individualized Support ( $r = .42$ ). The quantitative data showed that principals in SNNPRS secondary schools perceived that they were transformational leaders and worked to secure high student achievement results.

Even though principals rated themselves high with strong transformational behaviours, including in Sharing School Vision and Building Consensus, Building High Performance Expectation, Modelling Positive Behaviour, Providing Intellectual Stimulation, and Building Collaborative Structure and School Culture; the evidence collected in the interviews and FGD did not fully support the principals' claims. The qualitative data analysis revealed that principals in secondary schools of SNNPRS (Ethiopia) practiced a blend of leadership styles. While most principals practiced autocratic styles, others swung from autocratic to laissez-faire and some were of course transformational.

Research studies (Munoz, 2013; Bass & Avolio, 2004; Bolton, 2010) support these findings. While Munoz's (2013:90) study reported that principals rate themselves high with strong transformational leadership characteristics, Bass and Avolio (2004) stated that leaders tend to rate themselves higher on transformational leadership than their followers rated them. Bolton (2010:51) revealed that principals look at their transformational leadership styles in an exaggerated way.

### **5.3.4 Objective four: To examine Teacher's Perceptions regarding their Principals' Transformational School Leadership in selected secondary schools (cf. 1.4.1).**

Since the leadership styles of principals are based on the perceptions of the followers, Raters-Form of NSL was used to measure the perceptions of teachers towards their principals. The

overall survey mean ratings (M=3.8) of teachers' perceptions revealed that teachers were inclined to agree that some of their principals were on their way to becoming transformational school leaders. Though there were ratings below the acceptable range (disagree and strongly disagree), some of the secondary school teachers in SNNPRS also had positive perceptions regarding their principals' transformational leadership behaviours. When Holding High Performance Expectation (M=4.10), Sharing School Vision and Building Consensus (M=3.99) and Modelling Behaviour (M=3.97) were the most agreeable behaviours that were practiced by principals, providing Intellectual Stimulation (3.65) and Individualized Support (M=3.30) had the lowest ratings. In other words, teachers rated their principals higher on demonstrating high performance expectations behaviour, and low in providing individual consideration.

Moreover, all six TSL dimensions of teachers' perceptions correlated with each other positively and strongly. An independent-sample test was conducted to compare the perceptions scores for teachers and principals and the result revealed that there was significant difference in scores for teachers (M= 3.83, SD= .357) and principals (M=4.06, SD= .313;  $t(150) = 4.14$ ,  $p=.000$ , two-tailed). The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = -.225, 95% CI: -.333 to -.117) was moderate (eta squared=0.97).

Findings from interviews and FGD were consistent with survey data. According to supervisors and teachers, principals under their domain practiced a blend of leadership styles. While majority of principals practiced autocratic styles, others swung from autocratic to laissez-faire and some were practiced transformational leadership styles.

### **5.3.5 Objective five: To explore the nature of the relationship between the transformational leadership role of school principals and student achievement (cf. 1.4.1).**

The fifth objective that this study examined was the relationship between principal's transformational leadership with student achievement. This study found that TSL has a positive relationship with student achievement as measured by three-year (2013-2015) aggregate passing rate of GESLCE. Though the total TSL role, measured based on teachers' perceptions' rating, has a positive relationship (.065) with student achievement, its relation is not significant. Providing individualized support is negatively (-.008) correlated with student achievement.

Moreover, the components of total TSL were statistically not significant and explained only 5 % of the variance in student achievement.

Since the correlation was based on aggregate score of teachers' rating, the researcher picked teachers' ratings that were 'agree' and 'strongly agree' to look at whether principals rated by their teachers 'transformational' has relationship as well as effect on student achievement. As a result, teachers' ratings of their principals broadly related to the aggregate result of students in GESLCE. While schools led by principals who were rated by teachers as transformational showed that improvement by student performance from year-by-year, schools led by principals who were not fully rated by teachers as transformational showed that declining or inconsistent in improving their students' performance. In Figure 4.1, it appears that the TSL has relation to student achievement and if principals employ transformational leadership behaviours sufficiently, students' achievement could improve.

Moreover, discussion with supervisors and teachers revealed that principal's leadership style has positive effect on student achievement. The principal leadership would make or break school effectiveness, particularly student performance. They concurred that the more the principal leadership style is transformational, the better the student achievement results would be.

Thus, while the quantitative analysis showed that the relationship between TSL role and student achievement was not statistically significant, empirical analysis of interviews and FGD revealed that principals' leadership role has strong relationship with student achievement and principals' roles determine the performance of student achievement. Studies of Day et al. (2001b; 2001b); Griffith, (2004); Mark and Printy (2003); Rose (2004) found that transformational leadership had a positive relationship with student achievement. This study also confirmed that TSL styles have positive relationship with student achievement.

On the other hand, though computing demographic data of principals were not included in the basic questions of this study, the researcher believes that looking at potential relationships with student achievement would provide some insight. For this reason, principals' social and demographic data were analyzed using Pearson correlation. The result showed that student achievement has no significant relationship with the demographic data, except with number of students in the school (-.240). A standard multiple regression analysis showed that the number

of students in the school was statistically significant and explained 15% of the variance in student achievement. The negative correlation between student achievement and the number of students in the school tells us that, the larger the size of students in a school, the lower the student performance; or vice-versa. This result is consistent with (Howely, 2000: 15; Niedermeyer, 2003: 151) research on school size that found that smaller size schools are associated with higher achievements.

### **5.3 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

The conclusions from the findings were presented based on this study's basic research questions (cf. 1.4.2); research aims and objectives (cf. 1.4).

#### **5.3.1 What Constitutes the Transformational School Leadership Role of School Principals? (cf. 1.4.2)**

It was concluded that TSL and its dimensions (Sharing school vision and building consensus, Building high performance expectation, Modelling Behaviour, Providing Individualized Support, Providing Intellectual Stimulation, and Building collaborative structure and culture) existed in secondary schools of SNNPR, Ethiopia. The results of this study confirmed that Leithwood and his colleagues' model of TSL is recognized by principals, teachers and school supervisors as a specific set of practices. Rutledge (2010:75) determined that TSL and its dimensions are stable and can have a positive impact on school effectiveness. It was considered the best model in situations essentially in schools targeted for reform (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2010: 452). The practice of reforming the organization may include shaping and properly matching the organization and the vision (Kiper, 2007: 19).

Among the six dimensions, principals gave high rank particularly to three dimensions (Sharing School Vision and Building Consensus, Building Collaborative Structure and Strengthening School Culture and Modelling Behaviour) and low rank to Individualized Support. It is true that as principals confirmed, to transform school systems, the leader needs to set out a vision, properly plan and put activities in a sequential order, and clearly spell out how the restructured process can shape the employees. In most cases, transformational leaders start the activities of changing the institutions by focusing on the structures of the organization before planning for change in the organization (Kiper, 2007: 19). One can agree that as a starting point, principals

must envision better schools, articulate the vision to others and orchestrate consensus on the vision (Cheng, 2005:342). They must have a vision for what their schools should look like and what their students should achieve. But they should have the ability to persuade their followers to join their vision and share their ideals. It is by their actions that they convey their beliefs and commitments they speak of (Kim, 2012: 870).

However, dimensions such as Intellectual Stimulation and Individualized Support should get equal or more consideration to exhibit high transformational leadership and to have effective schools. Castro et al. (2008: 1847) assert that transformational school leaders use intellectual stimulation to challenge their followers' thoughts, imagination and creativity. They also use individualized considerations to help bolster teachers' achievements and growth, encouraging them to take on increasingly bigger responsibilities to reach their potential. Similarly, Barth (2002:6) argues that it is only when a transformational principal considers individual follower's needs and concerns while stimulating and inspiring their teachers to become converted from followers to leaders within the school. He/she unites the teachers to ascribe to the common vision of being the architects of the school life now and in the future.

Key aspects of transformational leadership involve stimulating followers to broaden their thinking and widen their perspectives. It involves assisting subordinates to grow and perform efficiently, and inspiring them through more demanding goals. Such actions can facilitate creation of cultures and values that stimulate individual initiatives, instigate new views, and help to create new innovative ideas (Charbonnier et al. 2010: 700).

Bass and Riggio (2006:6) argue that transformational leaders succeed by committing themselves to satisfying and empowering their followers, by giving more attention to individual needs and personal development and by allowing followers to exert their leadership potential, they raise followers' leadership abilities to higher levels. Transformational principals inspire their followers to commit to shared visions and goals by questioning assumptions and restructuring problems (Bass & Riggio, 2006: 7), showing their soft parts by self criticizing and to be criticized (Northouse, 2010: 178) and by continually highlighting the mission of the school to staff, parents, and students (Kirk & Terry, 2004:3).



### **5.3.2 How Do Principals in SNNPRS Secondary Schools Implement Transformational Leadership (cf. 1.4.2)**

Several strategies could be examined for positive change in schools. Principals in secondary schools of SNNPR, Ethiopia employed eight strategies when implementing transformational leadership in their schools. Though transformational leadership practices existed in secondary schools of SNNPR, principals were not practicing all TSL behaviours.

Dedicated and visionary principals choose best practices from the TSL model. Successful principals work with and encourage their subordinates to promote teaching and learning by personally getting involved in the development of their teachers including through mentorship programmes. Principals who focus on administrative duties and undermine the value of mentorship may inadvertently promote negative impact on school climate (Devos & Bouckennooge, 2009: 191). In this regard, the transformational leadership role is promoting the success of all teachers by acting with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manner (Gupton, 2003:3).

Leithwood and his colleagues (2006: 212-216) suggest that school effectiveness could be accomplished through strategies that engage staff in the collective development of a shared vision; developing school goals jointly; considering individual situations and conditions; recognizing staff efforts; providing support and encouragement for the teaching-learning process; modelling good educational practices and techniques; distributing power and responsibilities appropriately; and instituting a participatory decision-making process. The desired outcome must be achieved collectively by inspiring the school community as a whole (Cheng, 2005:342).

Transformational principal regularly engages his/her staff in goal setting and reviewing, clarifying the meaning of the vision and communicating the vision to school community using all available opportunities. The principal apportions tasks and responsibilities to unit leaders, department heads and teachers. Through performance evaluation mechanisms, principals have the opportunity to shape and enhance staff skills and behaviours. Performance evaluations enable the staff to understand the relation between external initiatives for change and the school's vision, to establish and review individual professional growth goals and to work together and to exchange their practices (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006:212).

Transformational principals take the lead in developing functional school relationships by modelling best practices and important organizational values. They reinforce key values such as respect for others, integrity, and impersonal judgement. Moreover, principals can demonstrate leadership by constructively taking and giving feedback and displaying energy and enthusiasm themselves. Leaders practicing TSL also facilitate teachers by offering support based on individual needs by treating everyone equally, having open-door policy, being approachable, encouraging individuals to try new practices consistent with their interests and providing recognition for staff work (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006:212).

Transformational principals are aware of the importance of encouraging school members to come up with new initiatives, individually or collaboratively. Creative principals may take action to overhaul school norms that might constrain out of the box thinking, and challenge inefficiencies in the system. They need to create the climate for teachers and staff to feel unshackled and empowered to be creative and experiment potential ideas. Moreover, transformational principals mobilize the school community (teachers, students, administrative staff, parents and other stakeholders) by instituting cooperative processes and plans that bring together the stakeholders to maximize resources or school achievements and development (Cheng, 2005:387). Transformational school principals toil to create a productive school culture and develop structures to foster participation in school decisions through sharing decision-making powers with staff, providing autonomy for teachers, delegating responsibility with authority, creating opportunities for staff development and celebrating success (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006:212). Empowering teachers by giving space on organizational decisions, giving them opportunities to shape organizational goals, purposely providing forums for staff input, acting on staff input and giving real leadership opportunities are situations that really matter and should be among the roles of transformational principals (Harris, 2005: 53).

### **5.3.3 How Do Principals in SNNPRS Secondary Schools Perceive Their Transformational Leadership (cf. 1.4.2)?**

The self-rating results of principals showed that collectively, the principals in secondary schools of SNNPRS in Ethiopia believed they were practicing transformational leadership. Except the provision of Individualized Support, they rated themselves high in all TSL dimensions. The possible explanation for the exceptionally low rating of principals regarding the provision of

Individualized Support could be from lack of sufficient resources in the school, low motivation, culture and knowledge on the importance of human consideration, or it might emanate from their non-transformational leadership behaviour.

The overall results indicated that supervisors and teachers expect from their transformational principals more shared relationships and more moral and material support, more assistance on professional growth, keen demonstration of vulnerability and open-door policy, quick response to staff members' initiatives for change. They expect from their principals knowing individual teachers well enough to understand their problems, making decisions jointly, room to make mistakes, encouraging new initiatives, help staff to make personal sense of change, culture of requesting open feedback from staff about their work. To claim adherence to TSL dimensions, principals should show willingness to change their practices in light of new understandings, and resolving conflict through the use of shared values, and sharing power and responsibility and taking staff opinion into account (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006:212). To declare TSL dimensions, principals ought to be more open with fellow workers, receptive to input from colleagues, and have to be inclined to think beyond the status quo (Hauserman, 2005:59).

Transformational principals are those who allow teachers to take on leadership roles by giving value to teachers' ideas, by involving them in decision making, by encouraging them to be innovative. Transformational principals mostly try to persuade rather than impose authority. Transformational principals are not characterized by providing large amount of directives and by deciding the roles of teachers, rather by allowing involvement, by sharing responsibility, by allowing teachers to be involved in decision making, by challenging status quo, and by keeping teachers abreast of current theories and information (Leithwood & Jantiz, 2010: 471; Bass & Riggo, 2006: 7).

Transformational principals take a leading role in developing and articulating an organizational vision, illicit cooperation, unwavering in the practice of student-centred decision making, recognizes that making mistakes is part of the improvement process, accessible, do what they expect from others, care and respect to students and staff, facilitate opportunities to participate in school decisions (Leithwood & Jantiz, 2006: 204).

To teachers and supervisors in secondary schools of SNNPRS in Ethiopia, transformational principal are those who involve their staff in goal setting, inspire by sharing vision and engaging them in school activities, motivating staff towards development opportunities, encouraging exerting more effort while trying to solve problem, principal who demands excellence from teachers. They believe that transformational principal is who is not leading by driving hard but by collaboration and persuasion.

#### **5.3.4 What are Teachers Perceptions regarding Their Principals' Transformational Leadership in Selected Secondary Schools (cf. 1.4.2)?**

Teachers' perceptions of their principals did not match with those of principals' rating of themselves. This mismatch might have come up from the difference between what principals desire or think and what they actually practice. The qualitative data analyses also showed that only a minority of principals were practicing transformational leadership style.

The rating of teachers discourages principals from adopting self-centred approaches in favour of participatory approaches and professional respect. It implies that transformational school leaders who empower teachers find greater commitment, performance and participation from teachers (Northouse, 2010: 179). Transformational principal who permits teachers to try new ideas and encourages students to be creative and critical thinkers will enhance student achievements. In the process, principals must recognize that making honest mistakes is part of the risk professionals make (Leithwood & Jantiz, 2006: 204).

The most important responsibility a school leader has in today's school environment is inculcating a culture of excellence in the school. Culture of sharing responsibility and the vision (Cheng, 2005:342), involving teachers as part of the school leadership (Northouse, 2010:179), culture of values, promoting professional ethics are part of what the principal is expected to build (Gupton, 2003:3). Transformational school principals consider teachers and school community to be self-motivated and influenced more by the school culture than by direct management intervention because such an environment has significant impact on student achievement (Cheng, 2005: 343).

Transformational principals encourage their teachers to take intellectual risks and re-examine assumptions. They influence the majority of school staff's attitude by keeping consistency

between words and deeds, lead by example and by transparent decision making (Day et al., 2011:25). Teachers are expecting their transformational principals to consistently reach out to enhance their ability and skills to make decisions (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006:212). To teachers and supervisors who are working in secondary schools of Ethiopia, transformational principals those who are open-minded and ready to learn from others, keen to provide individual support and allowing teacher to take decision on their own professional growth rather than domineering. They believe that school effectiveness emanates from the principal's leadership styles.

### **5.3.5 What is the Nature of the Relationship between the Transformational Leadership Role of School Principals and Student Achievement (cf. 1.4.2)?**

To determine the relationship between transformational leadership with student achievement was the fifth objective of this study. The relationship between TSL and student achievement was analyzed based on teachers' ratings of their principals. The findings showed that there is moderately positive relationship, but it is not statistically significant. The findings of this study also showed that the more the principals exercise the transformational leadership style, the higher the performance of the students. Research conducted previously showed that transformational leadership style had a positive relationship with student achievement (Day et al. 2001b; 2001b; Griffith, 2004; Mark & Printy, 2003; Rose, 2004).

Moreover, further examination of teachers' rating and student achievement at individual school level showed a progressive pass of students on GESL examinations. Schools that are led by transformational leaders improved their student achievement more than those led by non-transformational leaders (see figure 4.1). Both supervisors and teachers who participated in the interviews and FGDs agreed that principals' transformational leadership role is a core component for student achievement. During the interview with the supervisors and teachers, the researcher noted several instances of behaviour consistent with effective principals.

Transformational principals were aware that consistently improving students' performance was their central mission. They achieve this mission through clarifying the meaning of the school's vision in terms of its practical implications for programmes and instruction, providing necessary information to their staff on how to improve student achievement, and instilling in staff a sense of belonging and ownership of the school. Transformational principals align school goals with

individual goals and stimulate teachers to think more deeply about what they are doing for their students. It is through establishing meaningful relationship with parents, educational leaders and community to get their support to maintain the norms of excellence and quality of teaching and learning that transformational principals improve student achievement. A transformational school leader motivates teachers by providing support and recognition and mobilizes students by classroom observation and permanently discussing with them about their results (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006:212).

Conclusively, there appears to be an overall link between the principals' transformational leadership style and student achievement in secondary school of SNNPRS of Ethiopia. The study also sought to determine to the extent to which relationships existed between the principal demographic data and student achievement, though it was not included in the research questions. Correlation analysis between the number of students in the school and student achievement indicated significant correlation, but the correlation was negative and small ( $r = -.214$ ). Number of students in the school was also statistically significant and explained 15% of the variance in student achievement. From schools (76 schools) that participated in this study, almost 57.9% of schools enrolled more than 1000 students each. To ensure successful students learning outcomes, schools need sufficient educational inputs, motivated and committed teachers, parents and school community support, and above all high, transformational leadership role of the principal. Equally, it is possible to conclude that the number of students in the school would also affect student achievement, especially if the size was not matched with sufficient educational resources (Howely (2000: 15; Niedermeyer, 2003: 151).

#### **5.4 PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS**

In this study, the transformational school leadership role of the principal was explored in the context of secondary schools of SNNPR in Ethiopia. Core consensus was established that the principals' leadership role is the primary ingredient that makes schools effective. Also established is that transformational leadership style provides the strongest link to school effectiveness and improved student achievement (Leithwood & Jantiz, 2005;2006;2010; Leithwood, et al. 2004; Rose, 2004; Mark & Printy, 2003; Griffith, 2004; Day et al., 2001a; 2001b).

What do the findings of this study for educational leaders? The results suggest that if transformational leadership styles were implemented in schools, schools as a whole, teachers and students in particular will be positively impacted. A winning culture will prevail and positive attitudes emanating from school community will produce happier and productive teacher and consequently, student achievement will improve. Such transformation in few schools can create model schools thereby carving the way for mainstreaming school effectiveness widely. It means the education and training programmes of educational/school leadership would be revisited. It means that the way school leaders are trained will be reshaped towards participatory and transformational leadership approaches. Overall, the study results indicate that there is a need to replicate such studies in other regions and that attempts should be made to revise the curriculum at Colleges of Teacher Education and Universities.

The researcher concluded that, vulnerability (sharing personal weakness, ready to be emotionally challenged, demonstrating real life rather than pretention, ready to contain the views and ideas of his/her staff, not wasting time in protecting himself from the observation of others) is an appreciated quality that teachers are looking for from their principals. Supervisors and teachers frequently explained that a vulnerable leader is one who is courageous enough to admit and show his/her weaknesses.

As with this study, other research works corroborated that the more principals exercise transformational leadership styles, the higher student performance goes. Regional Education Bureaus and MoE along with individual schools need to heed to the results of this study and continually train principals with the skills of transformational leadership.

Ethiopia is marching forward towards lower middle-income economy status. In this regard, secondary education plays significant role in driving economic growth and poverty eradication. In GTP II, the target for industry growth is 18 % and the share of the workforce to be employed in the sector is 2%. The gap for skilled workforce can only be filled by education. Secondary education in particular is key to preparing a workforce that the industry demands. Cutting-edge technologies can be adapted to produce a certified workforce who meets industry standard and demand.

Lack of laboratories, workshops, libraries, and large number of students in schools were major challenges identified by all participants. What does it mean to educational leaders and for policy makers? It clearly means that in order to reach middle-income economy status, the country must intensively investment in education and particular focus must be given to secondary schools. Transformational leaders supported with well-endowed schools can prepare students for the 21<sup>st</sup> century world of work.

Finally, from among 76 principals involved in this study, the researcher did not encounter a single female principal. As it is clearly described in Education and Training Policy (1994) of Ethiopia, this reality overlooks the participation of women in educational leadership roles must be seriously overhauled.

## **5.5 FUTURE RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS**

To the researcher's knowledge, this is the first study conducted using Leithwood and his colleagues' construct of TSL particularly focusing on secondary schools of SNNPRS in Ethiopia. These findings have implications for the other regional states. What type of principals and leadership styles does the education system need? What kind of leadership style should be employed when educational systems are challenged? Which type of principal is effective in improving student learning outcome? This study has made a significant contribution towards answering these and similar questions. However, further study is recommended for better understanding of the nuances of our educational system and the full extent of the impact due to behaviours of school leaders.

This study measured the relationship between principal's role and student achievement based on teachers' ratings. Another study must be conducted based on self-ratings employing the mixed research approach. Since this study was based on three years' GESLE data, a more longitudinal look at the data may show more valuable information on the relationship between TSL and student achievement.

Another interesting study would be on the impact the number of students may make on student achievement in schools. This study found that a larger number of students in schools had a negative effect on student achievement. Howely (2000) and Niedermeyer (2003) reported that the smaller school size was associated with higher achievement. Further research is warranted to



explore the effect of transformational leadership on student achievement in schools that have different enrolment sizes.

## 5.6 RECOMMENDATIONS

In Ethiopia, the education system is undergoing transformation. Federal as well as Regional governments are striving to provide quality education. To ensure this, several school-based reforms have been launched (SIP, CPD, Teachers' and Leaders' development, ICT, Curriculum, Teaching and Learning Materials, Quality assurance), and the results are encouraging (MoE, ESDP-V report, 2015). The government as well as the society believe that behind all successes and failures of the reforms, the principals' leadership role is there. From the very onset of its policy, the government of Ethiopia gave high emphasis to the decentralization of school leadership "promote effective leadership, management and governance at all levels in order to achieve educational goals by mobilizing and using resources efficiently". The principals hand book (Blue Book) prepared by MoE and adopted by regional education bureaus clearly describes how the school and its community should be governed. Roles of the principal defined in this book corresponds with transformational leadership behaviours called by Bass and Riggio, 2006: 179, and particularly by Leithwood and Jantiz (2006:212-216) and Leithwood and Jantiz (2010:475).

This section presents the recommendations in accordance with the main research aim and the last of the six objectives of this study (1.4.1). The concluding objective of this study states thus: *to make recommendations that may serve as strategy for secondary schools leadership based on the findings of the study*. Thus, on the basis of the study results, the following recommendations are forwarded:

1. Leaders who wish to lead using transformational leadership styles must clearly understand the elements, processes and nuances of transformational leadership. Among other things, this involves an appreciation for the core dimensions studied in this study. Principals should focus on understanding teachers' perceptions of their behaviour.
2. The regional education bureaus are encouraged to prepare in-service and pre-service training that will enhance the principals' skills on transformational leadership.
3. The performance evaluation system in the region should include transformational school leadership behaviours.

4. Universities and regional colleges of teacher education must incorporate such findings in developing school leaders equipped with transformational leadership skills.
5. Selecting, assigning and training of school leaders must consider state of the art practices that meet school effectiveness demands.
6. Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that schools desiring to improve student achievement consider enhancing transformational leadership skills of their principals.
7. The federal and regional governments should endorse TSL model in education system for school effectiveness.
8. The researcher recommends further studies in other regions and related topics to enhance principals' leadership quality and enhanced student achievement.

## **5.7 SUMMARY**

In this study, TSL dimensions were found in secondary schools of SNNPRS. The result of research question one provided support that the six dimensions of TSL do indeed measure the construct (TSL). Strategies that principals used to place their school's objectives were mainly related to dimensions of TSL. Interviews and focus group discussions conducted with supervisors and teachers also revealed that if principals enhanced the provision of individual support, intellectual stimulation and more open and demonstrate vulnerability, their transformational leadership would improve. The finding revealed that principals lack certain transformational leadership behaviour, but if they improve on these behaviours, principals could be better transformational leaders, and then contribute to their schools' effectiveness. Above all, positive correlation between TSL and student achievement was found, though it was not statistically significant. Further probing of teachers' rating and qualitative data analysis helped the researcher to conclude that the higher the practice of transformational leadership the greater the performance of students in their GSLE. Finally, the study developed recommendations that would serve as strategy to improve the transformational leadership roles of principals in secondary schools of SNNPRS, Ethiopia.

## 5.8 REFERENCES

- Atton, J. (2004). *The Headship Game: The Challenges of Contemporary School Leadership*. London and New York: Routledge Flamer Publisher.
- Balyer, A. (2012). Transformational Leadership Behaviours of School Principals: A Qualitative Research Based on Teachers' Perceptions. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 2012, 4 (3), 581-591
- Barnett, K., McCormick, J. & Conners, R. (2001). Transformational leadership in schools: Panacea, placebo or problem? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(1), 24–46.
- Barth, R. S. 2002. The Culture Builder. *Educational Leadership*, 59(8): 6-15.
- Bass, B.M. (2002). *Forecasting Organizational Leadership: From back (1967) to the future (2034). To characteristic leadership: The road ahead (375-384)*. Boston, MA: Elsevier Science.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2),79-93.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggo, R.E., (2006). *Transformational leadership*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Beach, D. & Reinhartz, J. (2000). *Supervisory Leadership: Focus on Instruction*. Toronto: Allyn& Bacon.
- Blair, M. (2002). Effective School Leadership: The Multi Ethnic Context. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23(2), 179-191.
- Blanchard, K. (2007). *The heart of a leader: Insights on the art of influence*. David C. Cook. Colorado Springs, USA
- Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(5), 662–683.
- Bolman, L.G, & Deal, T.E. (2003). *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. (3rd Ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Bolton, D. A. (2010). The Relationship between Principals' Transformational Leadership

- Behaviours and School Culture. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.
- Bonaros, D. J. (2006). A study of transformational leadership and student achievement in inner-city elementary schools. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text. (Publication No. AAT3207798).
- Browning, P. D. (2014). Why trust the head? Key practices for transformational school leaders to build a purposeful relationship of trust. *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice*, 17(4), pp. 388-409.
- Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research methods*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. London: Oxford University Press.
- Bush, T. (2009). Leadership development and school improvement: contemporary issues in leadership development. *Educational Review* Vol. 61, No. 4, November 2009, 375–389
- Bush, T. (2008). *Leadership and management development in education*. London: Sage.
- Castro, C.B., Perinan, M.M.V. & Bueno, J.C.C. (2008). Transformational leadership and followers' attitude: The mediating role of psychological empowerment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19 (10), 1842-1863
- Catano, N., Atano, J. H. & Stronge, J. H. (2007). What do we expect of school principals? Congruence between principal evaluation and performance standards. *International Leadership Education*, 10, (4): 379–399.
- Creemers, B. P., M. & Kyriakides, L. (2008). *The Dynamics of Educational Effectiveness: A contribution to policy, practice and theory in contemporary schools*. London: Routledge.
- Charbonnier, V. A., Akremi, A. E., & Vandenberghe, C. (2010). A Multilevel Model of Transformational Leadership and Adaptive Performance and the Moderating Role of Climate for Innovation. *Group & Organization Management* 35(6) 699– 726
- Chin, J. P. (2007). Meta-analysis of transformational school leadership effects on school outcomes in Taiwan and the USA. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 8, 166-177.

- Chi, N.W. & Huang, J.C. (2014). Mechanisms Linking Transformational Leadership and Team Performance: The Mediating Roles of Team Goal Orientation and Group Affective Tone. *Group & Organization Management*. 39(3), 300–325
- Creswell, J. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Columbus, OH: Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. I. (2006). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approach* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). CA: Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. I. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*, (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publisher.
- Coetzee, I.E.M., & White, C.J. (editors). 2004. *Human Resource Management for Master's Degree Students in Education*. Pretoria: Ithuthuko Investments (Publishing).
- Daft, R. L., & Marcic, C. (2006). *Understanding management* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Mason, OH: Thomson Higher Education
- Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., & Meyerson, D. (2005). *School leadership study: Developing successful principals: Review of research*, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership
- Devos, C. & Bouckenooghe, D. (2009). An Exploratory Study on Principals' Conceptions about Their Role as School Leaders. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 8:2, 173-196, DOI: 10.1080/15700760902737196
- Day, C., Harris, A., & Hadfield, M. (2001a). Challenging the orthodoxy of effective school leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 4(1): 39–56.
- Day, C., Harris, A., & Hadfield, M. (2001b). Grounding knowledge of schools in stakeholder realities: A multi-perspective study of effective school leaders. *School Leadership and Management*, 21(1): 19–42.
- Doyle, M.E. & Rice, Dim. (2002). *A model for Instructional Leadership*, 3(3): 49-52.

Epps, C. D. (2002). Examining the leadership impact of a principal on student achievement. Doctoral dissertation, (Roosevelt University). Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text. (AAT 3034818)

Estapa, A. L. (2009). The Relationship between the Transformational Leadership Characteristics of Principals, as Perceived by Teachers, and Student Achievement on Standardized Tests. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.

Eyal, O. &Kark, R. (2004). How do transformational leadership transform organizations? A study of the relationship between leadership and entrepreneurship. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 3 (3), 211-235

Ethiopian Ministry of Education (1994). Education and Training Policy. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Author. ----- (1992). Education Sector Development Program. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Author.

----- (1997). Education Sector Development Program. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Author.

----- (2002). Education Sector Development Program. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Author.

----- (2002). Education and Training Policy Strategy. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Author.

.....(2002) “Directive for Educational Management, Organization, Public Participation, and Finance.” Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Author

.....Office of the president. (2000). “Strengthening of the Management and Administration of Schools (Amendment) Proclamation 217/2000.” MoE, Addis Ababa.

.....(2005) Successful Schools in Ethiopia. Addis Ababa: Andnet Printers.

----- (2007). School Improvement Program Guide. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Author.

- (2010). General Education Quality Assurance Package. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Author.
- ..... (2010b). “Education Sector Development Program IV 2010/11-2014/15, Program Action Plan”. Ethiopia, Addis Ababa.
- (2010/11). Annual Statistical Abstract. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Author.
- Fenn, L, W. (2011). An examination of self-perceived transformational leadership behaviours of Texas superintendents. . (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.
- Fink, A. (2003). *The survey handbook* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N.E. (2005) 6<sup>th</sup> edition. *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. McGraw-Hill.
- Geijsel, F., Slegers, P., Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2003). Transformational leadership effects on teachers' commitment and effort toward school reform. *Journal of Educational Administration* 41: 3
- Goodnow, J. E., & Wayman, J. C. (2009). The Intersection between Transformational Leadership and Data Use in Schools. Transformational Leadership and Data Use 1, Texas, Austin, USA.
- Greb, W. (2011). Principal Leadership and Student Achievement: What is the effect of transformational leadership in conjunction with instructional leadership on student achievement? (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.
- Griffith, J. (2004). Ineffective schools as organizational reactions in stress. *Social Psychology of Education*, 7, 257-287.

- Gulbin, K. M. (2008). Transformation Leadership: is it a factor for improving student achievement in high poverty secondary schools in Pennsylvania? (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.
- Gupton, S.L. (2003). *The instructional leadership toolbox: A handbook for improving practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading Educational Change: Reflections on the practice of Instructional & Transformational Leadership. *Cambridge journal of Education*, 33(3): 329-351.
- Hallinger, P. (2010). A Review of Three Decades of Doctoral Studies Using the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale: A Lens on Methodological Progress in Educational Leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 20(10) 1-36.
- Harris, A. (2010). *Effective Leadership in Schools Facing Challenging Contexts*. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Harris, A., & Muijs, D. (2004). *Improving schools through teacher leadership*. London: Open University Press.
- Harris, A. (2005). *Distributed Leadership: The essentials of school leadership* (ed. Brent Davis) SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.
- Harris, H. & Lambert, L. (2003). *Building Leadership Capacity for School Improvement*. Maidenhead. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Hargis, A. (2011). Roles of Responsibilities of a Transformational Leadership Superintendent: A case study. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.
- Hauserman, C. P. (2005). The Presence of Principal Transformational Leadership in the Province of Alberta, Canada-Teacher Perceptions. A Dissertation



- Holstad, T. J., Korek, S., Thomas, R. & Mohr, G. (2014). The relation between transformational leadership and follower emotional strain: The moderating role of professional ambition. *Leadership*, 10(3): 269–288
- Hornig, E. L., Klasik, D., & Loeb, S. (2009). Principal Time-Use and School Effectiveness. *Centre for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research*. Working Paper 39
- Howley, C. (2000). *Small high schools that flourish: Rural context, case studies and resources*. Charleston, WV: AEL, Inc. ERIC
- Jean-Marie, G. (2004) Black women administrators in historically black institutions: Social justice project rooted in community. *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership*, 2(2), 37–57.
- Johnson, B., Onwuegbuzie, A., & Turner, L. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Research*, 33 (7): 14-26.
- Jordan, D. (2009). An investigation of leadership practices that promote academic achievement and success of schools in Upstate regions of South Carolina.(Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.
- Kim, H. J.(2001). The effects of transformational/transactional leadership on the organizational commitment: a comparison of public and private sector employees. *Korean Public Administration Review*, 35 (2): 197–216.
- Kim, H. J. (2012). Transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour in the public sector in South Korea: The mediating effect role of affective commitment. *Local government studies*, 38 (6): 867-892.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The Leadership Challenge* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kiper, R. S. (2007). Teachers' perceptions of principals as transformational leaders and AYP testing mandates for No Child Left behind Act of 2001: A correlational study using Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, St. Mary's University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
- Kirk, D. J., & Terry, L. J. (2004). *Effective Schools*. New Jersey: Pearson.

- Koestenbaum, P. (2002). *Leadership: The inner side of greatness. A philosophy for leaders*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, USA.
- Ladkin, D. (2010). *Rethinking Leadership: A New Look at Old Leadership Questions*. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, London, UK.
- Lazzaro, K. E. (2009). The Relationship between Principal Transformational Leadership Practices and Teacher Retention. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.
- Lea, G. P. (2011). High school principal leadership and student achievement: The effects of transformational leadership on the Illinois Prairie state achievement examination. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses. (3457284 ).
- Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2005). *Practical research: planning and design* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). New Jersey: Pearson.
- Leithwood, K., Aitken, R. & Jantzi, D. (2001) *Making schools smarter: A system for monitoring school and district progress*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2006). *Seven strong claims about successful school leadership*. Nottingham, UK: National College of School Leadership.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2000). The effects of transformational school leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 112-129.
- Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2000). Principal and teacher leadership effects: A replication. *School Leadership and Management*, 20, 415-434.
- Leithwood, K., Aitken, R., & Jantzi, D. (2006). *Making Schools Smarter* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005) A Review of Transformational School Leadership Research 1996–2005. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4:3, 177-199, DOI: 10.1080/15700760500244769

- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17 (2), 201-227.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2007). A review of transformational school leadership research 1996-2005. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4 (3), 177-199.
- Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2010). Transformational School Leadership Effects: A Replication. *School Effectiveness & School Improvement: An International Journal of Research, Policy and Practice*, 10:4, 451-479.
- Leithwood, K. A., & Riehl, C. (2003, March). What do we already know about successful school leadership? *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*, Chicago, IL.
- Leithwood, K., Steinbach, R., & Jantzi, D. (2002). School leadership and teachers' motivation to implement accountability policies. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(1): 94-119.
- Leithwood, K., Seashore-Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *Review of research: How leadership influences student learning*. Minnesota and Toronto: The Wallace Foundation.
- Leithwood, K., & Sun, J. P. (2009). Transformational school leadership effects on schools, teachers and students. In W. Hoy & M. Dipaola (Eds.), *Research and theory in educational administration: Vol. 8. Studies in school improvement programs* (pp. 1-22). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Leithwood, K. & Sun, J. (2012). The nature and effects of transformational school leadership: A meta-analytic review of unpublished research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48 (3): 387-423.
- Lewis, J., Packard, T., & Lewis, M. (2007). *Management of human service programs* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thompson/Brooks Cole.
- Lezotte, L. (2001). *Revolutionary and evolutionary: The effective schools movement*. Okemos, MI: Effective schools products, Ltd.

- Lucas, S. & Valentine, J. (2002). Transformational Leadership: Principals, Leadership Teams and School Culture. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the AERA*, New Orleans, LA 2002.
- Marks, H. M., & Printy, S. M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An Integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 39(3), 370-397
- Martinez, P. G. (2003). "Paternalism as a Positive Form of Leader – Subordinate Exchange: Evidence from Mexico", *Management Research: Journal of the Iberoamerican Academy of Management*, 1 (3):227 – 242.
- Marzano, R., Waters, T., & McNully, B. (2005). *School leadership that works*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mazurkiewicz, D. (2011). Educational Leadership. Key Elements Supporting Teaching Learning. *Contemporary Management Quarterly*.2/2011
- McCarley, T. A. (2009). Transformational Leadership Related to School Climate. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.
- McLean, J. (2004). Management and leadership: Dispelling the myths. *Journal of Administrative Management*, 16, 149-166.
- McManus, J. (2006). *Leadership: projects and human capital management*. London, UK, Elsevier Ltd.
- Mills, M. J. (2008). Leadership and school reform: The effects of transformational leadership on Missouri assessments. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses. (3290981)
- Mulford, W., Silins, H., & Kenneth, Liethwood. (2004). *Educational Leadership for Organizational Learning and Improved Student Outcomes*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- Mulla, Z.R., & Krishnan, V. R. (2012). Transformational Leadership and Karma-Yoga: Enhancing Followers' Duty-orientation and Indifference to Rewards. *Psychology and Developing Societies* 24(1) 85–117.

- Munoz, K. (2013). High School Principals as Transformational Leaders: A Phenomenological Approach to Examining Leadership Style and Practice. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.
- Nguni, S., Slegers, P. & Denessen, E. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviour in primary schools: The Tanzanian case. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement: An International Journal of Research, Policy and Practice*, 17 (2): 145-177
- Niedermeyer, B. H. (2003). The relationship of principal leadership style and student achievement in low socio-economic schools. PhD dissertation, (Purdue University). Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (AAT3113852).
- Northouse, P. G. (2001). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (2<sup>nd</sup>ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership theory and practice* (5<sup>th</sup>ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership theory and practice* (6<sup>th</sup>ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Oterkiil, C., & Ertesvag, S.K. (2014) Development of a measurement for transformational and transactional leadership in schools taking on a school-based intervention. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42(4S): 5–27.
- Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS Survival Manual*. New York, NY: McGrawHill.
- Plunkett, W. R., Attner, R. F., & Allen, G. S. (2008). *Management: Meeting and Exceeding Customer Expectations*, ( 9<sup>th</sup> ed.)Thomson South Western Publication, New York, USA, 2008
- Robinson. M. J. (2003). Teachers as researchers: A professional necessity? *EST Research Information for Teachers* 1, 27-290.

- Ross, J. (2004). Effects on early literacy achievement of running records assessment: Results of a controlled experiment. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.*
- Ross, J., & Gray, P. (2006). School leadership and student achievement: the mediating effects of teacher beliefs. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 29 (3), 798-822.
- Rutledge, R. D. (2010). The Effects of Transformational Leadership on Academic Optimism within Elementary Schools. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.
- Sahin, S. (2004). Leadership Styles of School Principals and School Culture (The case of Izmir, Turkey). *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice* 4 (2) • Kasým / 387-396.
- Sashkin, M. & Sashkin, M. 2003. *Leadership That Matters*. San Francisco: Berrett koehler Publishers Inc.
- Scheerens, J. (2000). Improving School Effectiveness. Fundamentals of Educational Planning- No.68, UNESCO, IIEP.
- Scheerens, J. (2012). (ed.) *School leadership effects revisited: Review and meta-analysis of empirical studies*. Enschede, NL, Springer.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2005). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective*. (5<sup>th</sup>ed.). Needham Heights, MD: Allyn and Bacon.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2007). *Rethinking Leadership: A collection of articles* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed) Thousand Oaks, CA: Carwin Press
- Silins, H., & Mulford, B. (2002) Leadership and school results. In Leithwood, K (ed.), *The second international handbook of educational leadership and administration* (Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers), pp. 561-612.
- Silins, H., Mulford, B., Zarins, S., & Bishop, P. (2000). Leadership for organizational learning in Australian secondary schools. In K. Leithwood (ed.), *Understanding schools as intelligent systems* (pp. 267-292). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Smikins, T. (2005). Leadership in Education: 'What Works' or 'What Makes Sense'?

*Educational Management Administration & Leadership* ISSN 1741-1432 DOI:  
10.1177/1741143205048168

South Nations, Nationalities, and Peoples' Regional State Education Bureau (SNNPRSREB). (2010). General Education Quality Assurance Package: Peoples' Movement Creation Plan. Hawassa: Author.

----- 2010/11. Annual Statistical Abstract. Hawassa, Ethiopia. Author.

----- (2011). Education Sector Overall Assessment. Hawassa, Ethiopia. Author.

Stone, A.G., & Patterson, K. (2005). The history of leadership focus. School of Leadership Studies. Retrieved from: <http://www.regent.edu>.

Sun, J.& Leithwood, K. (2012). Transformational school leadership effects in student achievement. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 11(4): 418-451.

Tesfaw, A. T. (2014). The relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction: The case of government secondary school teachers in Ethiopia. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* 2014, 42(6): 903–918.

Tashkkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (eds.). (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioural research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Teddlie, C. & Reynolds, D. (2000). *The International Handbook of School Effectiveness Research*. London: Falmer Press.

Tekleab, A. G., Sims, H. P., Yun, S., Tesluk, P. E., & Cox, J. (2008). Are we on the same page? Effects of self-awareness of empowering and transformational leadership. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 14, 185-201.

Trochim, W.M.K. (2005). *Research Methods: the Concise Knowledge Base*. Cincinnati: Ohio, Atomic Dog Publishing.

Yemer, H. (2009). Applicability of transformational leadership models in the Ethiopian context. PhD dissertation, Walden University, 3366956

- Yukl, G. A. (2010). *Leadership in Organizations*. (7<sup>th</sup>ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G.A. (2006). *Leadership in Organizations*. (6th Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G.A. (2002). *Leadership in Organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Wang, G., Oh, I., Courtright, S.H., & Colbert, A.C. (2011). Transformational leadership and performance across criteria and levels: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of research. *Group and Organization Management*, 36 (2): 223-270.
- Waters, T., & Grubb, S. (2004). Leading Schools: Distinguishing the essential from the important. *Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning. Australian Educational Leaders*, 27 (5)
- Witziers, B., Bosker, R., & Kruger, M. (2003). Educational leadership and student achievement: The elusive search for an association. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 39(3): 398-425.
- Zagorsek, H., Dimovski, V., & Skerlavaj, M., 2009. "Transactional and transformational leadership impacts on organizational learning", *Journal for East European Management Studies*, (JEEMS)14, (2): 145-165.



## 5.9 APPENDICES

### Appendix A: Letter to Regional Education Bureau

Berhanu Belayneh Beyene

P. O. BOX 5648

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Cell no. +251 935 998680

The South Nations, Nationalities & Peoples' Regional State Education Bureau, Hawassa

#### **Re: Request for permission to conduct research study**

I, Berhanu Belayneh Beyene, am studying towards a D.Ed. degree (Doctor of Education in Education Management) at UNISA under the supervision of Professor P. Mafora. My research topic is:” *The transformational leadership role of the principal in Ethiopian Secondary Schools*”

My study concerns finding out how transformational leadership role of a principal is manifested in secondary schools of SNNPRS. I will seek answers to this main question by investigating if principals know what transformational leadership is; how they do perceive the effectiveness of their leadership, what do they do when they implement transformational leadership; how teachers describe their principals; what are the qualities of transformational leaders and their relationship with students GSLCE result.

For this purpose I would like to conduct questionnaire and hold in-depth interviews of about 45 minutes, with the supervisors and focus group discussion with teachers. The principals will be selected from eighty schools each with at least three years' experience as a principal. All participating schools and individuals are guaranteed anonymity.

For more information regarding my request, please contact my supervisor. His contact details are as follows:

Professor P. Mafora

University of South Africa

Department of Educational Leadership and Management

Tel : +27 (0)12 429 6962.

E-mail : pmafora@unisa.ac.za

Yours faithfully,

Berhanu Belayneh Beyene (Mr)

---

## Appendix B: Letter to Woreda Education Office

Berhanu Belayneh Beyene

P. O. BOX 5648

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Cell no. +251 940 608290/ 935 998680

**The Woreda Education Office Head /City Administration Education Head**

**Re: Permission to conduct research Study**

Dear Sir/Madam,

I, Berhanu Belayneh Beyene, am currently studying towards a D.Ed. degree (Doctor of Education in Education Management) through UNISA, under the supervision of Professor P Mafora. Part of my study requires that I conduct research. My research topic is: *“The transformational leadership role of the principal in Ethiopian Secondary Schools”* The findings and recommendations of the study will contribute to the improvement of the principals’ transformational leadership role, which will have a positive impact on teaching and learning.

I would like to conduct questionnaire, and hold interview and focus group discussion with principals, teachers and supervisors in selected secondary schools in your Woreda/City Administration. The questionnaire will take 30 minutes to fill. Selected supervisors and teachers will be interviewed and do focus group discussion for about 45 minutes each. All participating schools and individuals are guaranteed anonymity.

For more information regarding my request, please contact my supervisor. His contact details are as follows:

Professor P. Mafora

University of South Africa

Department of Educational Leadership and Management

Tel : +27 (0)12 429 6962

E-mail : pmafora@unisa.ac.za

Yours faithfully,

Berhanu Belayneh Beyene (Mr)

.....

---

## Appendix C: Letter to Principal

Berhanu Belayneh Beyene

P. O. BOX 5648

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Cell no. +251 940 608290/ 935 998680

THE PRINCIPAL

.....Secondary School

### **Re: Permission to conduct research Study**

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am currently studying towards a D.Ed. degree (Doctor of Education in Education Management) through UNISA, under the supervision of Professor P. Mafora. Part of my studies requires that I conduct research. My research topic is: “*The Transformational leadership role of the principal in Ethiopian secondary schools: the case of SNNPRS*” The findings and recommendations of the study will contribute to the improvement of the principals’ transformational leadership role, which will have a positive impact on teaching and learning.

Part of my study requires me to explain how transformational leadership role of a principal is manifested in secondary schools of SNNPRS. For this purpose I would like to get permission to conduct questionnaire with you and teachers in your school. The questionnaire will take 30 minutes to fill. Selected teachers will hold focus group discussion for about 45 minutes. All participating teachers and individuals are guaranteed anonymity. The identity of your school and all participating teachers and their views shall be kept anonymous. Moreover, I need your permission to get your school plan and some management minutes.

For further information about this research, please consult my supervisor whose details are as follows:

Professor P. Mafora

University of South Africa

Department of Educational Leadership and Management

Tel : +27 (0)12 429 6962,

E-mail : pmafora@unisa.ac.za

Yours faithfully,

Berhanu Belayneh Beyene (Mr)

.....

## Appendix D: Interview with School Supervisors

**Dear Supervisor,**

This letter is an invitation to consider participating in a study. I, Berhanu Belayneh Beyene, am conducting as part of my research as a doctoral student entitled: “The transformational leadership role of the principal at Ethiopian Secondary Schools” at the University of South Africa. Permission for the study has been given by Regional and Woreda Education Offices and the Ethics Committee of the College of Education, UNISA. I have purposefully identified you as a possible participant because of your valuable experience and expertise related to my research topic.

I would like to provide you with more information about this project and what your involvement would entail if you should agree to take part. The importance of principal leadership in education is substantial and well documented. My study which focuses on transformational leadership role will provide information that can be used to examine the transformational leadership roles of school principals in SNNPRS of Ethiopia to determine how transformational leadership is manifested in secondary schools. In this interview I would like to have your views and opinions on this topic. This information can be used to improve school effectiveness and the leadership practices in Ethiopian secondary schools.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. It will involve an interview of approximately 45 minutes in length to take place in a mutually agreed upon location at a time convenient to you. You may decline to answer any of the interview questions if you so wish. Furthermore, you may decide to withdraw from this study at any time without any negative consequences.

With your kind permission, the interview will be audio-recorded to facilitate collection of accurate information and later transcribed for analysis. Shortly after the transcription has been completed, I will send you a copy of the transcript to give you an opportunity to confirm the accuracy of our conversation and to add or to clarify any points. All information you provide is considered completely confidential. Your name will not appear in any publication resulting from this study and any identifying information will be omitted from the report. However, with your permission, anonymous quotations may be used. Data collected during this study will be retained

on a password protected computer for 12 months in my locked office. There are no known or anticipated risks to you as a participant in this study.

If you have any questions regarding this study, or would like additional information to assist you in reaching a decision about participation, please contact me at Berhanu Belayneh Beyene, P.O. BOX 5648, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, Cell no. +251 940 608290/ 935 998680, or e-mail: ber5112000@yahoo.com

I look forward to speaking with you very much and thank you in advance for your assistance in this project. If you accept my invitation to participate, I will request you to sign in the following consent form.

Yours sincerely,

Berhanu Belayneh Beyene

.....

#### CONSENT FORM

I have read the information presented in the information letter about the study, The transformational leadership role of principals in Ethiopian Secondary Schools. I have had the opportunity to ask any questions related to this study, to receive satisfactory answers to my questions, and add any additional details I wanted. I am aware that I have the option of allowing my interview to be audio recorded to ensure an accurate recording of my responses. I am also aware that excerpts from the interview may be included in publications to come from this research, with the understanding that the quotations will be anonymous. I was informed that I may withdraw my consent at any time without penalty by advising the researcher. With full knowledge of all foregoing, I agree, of my own free will, to participate in this study.

Participant Name (Pleaseprint):

Participant Signature:

Researcher Name: (Berhanu Belayneh Beyene)

Researcher Signature: .....

Date: .....



## INTERVIEW GUIDE

### BASIC INTERVIEW QUESTIONS WITH SUPERVISORS

1. What was a possible key happening in the school that you would describe as transformative change?
2. How do you describe the change processes in this school?
3. How do you describe the role of the principal in transforming this school?
4. How would you describe the principal, teachers, and staff collaboration to make this school run as expected by government?
5. How would you describe the principal's leadership style? Do you think the principal's ways of leadership is important in his/her school's progress?
6. How would you describe the principal, teachers, and staff collaboration to make this school run as expected by government?
7. How would you describe the principal's leadership style?
8. How important do you think the principal's ways of leadership is in this school's progress?
9. Do you have any additional thoughts that we did not talk about your principal leadership and the student achievement/school effectiveness?

## Appendix E: Focus Group Discussion with Secondary School Teachers

### Dear Teacher,

This letter is an invitation to consider participating in a study. I, Berhanu Belayneh Beyene, am conducting as part of my research as a doctoral student entitled: “The transformational leadership role of the principal in Ethiopian Secondary Schools” at the University of South Africa. Permission for the study has been given by Regional, Woreda Education Offices/City Administration and the Ethics Committee of the College of Education, UNISA. I have purposefully identified you as a possible participant because of your valuable experience about the principal, the school and expertise related to my research topic.

I would like to provide you with more information about this project and what your involvement would entail if you should agree to take part. The importance of principal leadership in education is substantial and well documented. My study which focuses on transformational leadership role will provide information that can be used to examine the transformational leadership roles of school principals in SNNPRS of Ethiopia to determine how transformational leadership is manifested in secondary schools. In this interview I would like to have your views and opinions on this topic. This information can be used to improve school effectiveness and the leadership practices in Ethiopian secondary schools.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. It will involve focus group discussion approximately 45 minutes in length to take place in a mutually agreed upon location at a time convenient to you. You may decline to answer any of the FGD questions if you so wish. Furthermore, you may decide to withdraw from this study at any time without any negative consequences.

With your kind permission, the FGD will be audio-recorded to facilitate collection of accurate information and later transcribed for analysis. All information you provide is considered completely confidential. Your name will not appear in any publication resulting from this study and any identifying information will be omitted from the report. However, with your permission, anonymous quotations may be used. Data collected during this study will be retained on a password protected computer for 12 months in my locked office. There are no known or anticipated risks to you as a participant in this study.

If you have any questions regarding this study, or would like additional information to assist you in reaching a decision about participation, please contact me at Berhanu Belayneh Beyene, P.O. BOX 5648, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, Cell no. +251 940 608290/ 935 998680, or e-mail: ber5112000@yahoo.com

I look forward to speaking with you very much and thank you in advance for your assistance in this study. If you accept my invitation to participate, I will request you to sign the following form which witnesses your consent to participate and keeping the secret not to tell others what were discussed.

Yours sincerely,

Berhanu Belayneh Beyene

.....

FOCUS GROUP CONFIDENTIALITY FORM

I \_\_\_\_\_ grant consent that the information I share during the group discussions (focus group interviews) may be used by the researcher, Mr. Berhanu Belayneh Beyene, for research purposes. I am aware that the group discussions will be digitally recorded and grant consent for these recordings, provided that my privacy will be protected. I undertake not to divulge any information that is shared in the group discussions to any person outside the group in order to maintain confidentiality.

Participant’s Name (Please print):

Participant Signature: .....

Researcher’s Name: (Please print):

Researcher’s Signature: .....

Date: .....

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION QUESTIONS WITH TEACHERS

1. Does your school have a vision? What are the main elements of that vision? What strategies are employed in the communication and implementation of the vision?
2. Are you involved in the development of the school’s vision, If so, how?
3. What do you understand by transformational leadership?
4. How the principal communicates his/her expectations for improving student learning?
5. What are your works that you feel most proud of at the school? What was the role of the principal?
6. How would you describe the principal, teachers, and staff collaboration to make this school run as expected by government?
7. How would you describe the principal’s leadership style?
8. How important do you think the principal’s ways of leadership is in your school’s progress?
9. Would you please describe challenges that the school principal faces when he/she is exercising transformational leadership?
10. What specific challenges do you face regarding enhancing student achievement? What was the role of the principal?

11. Do you believe that the exiting practices of leadership that the principal is exercising enhance school's performance (teaching and learning and improved learner achievement)? How?
12. Do you have any additional thoughts that we did not talk about your principal leadership and the school effectiveness?

## Appendix F: Questionnaire to School Principal

**Dear principal,**

This questionnaire forms part of my doctoral research entitled: “The transformational leadership role of the principal in Ethiopian Secondary Schools” for the degree of D.Ed. at the University of South Africa. You have been selected by a purposive sampling strategy from the population of 341 principals in the region. Hence, I kindly invite you to take part in this survey.

The aim of this study is to examine the nature and manifestation of the transformational leadership role of the principal in Ethiopian secondary schools and measuring the effect this principal leadership constructs has on student achievement. The findings and recommendations of the study will contribute to the improvement of the principals’ transformational leadership role, which will have a positive impact on teaching and learning.

You are kindly requested to complete this survey questionnaire, comprising four sections as honestly and frankly as possible and according to your personal views and experience. No foreseeable risks are associated with the completion of the questionnaire which is for research purposes only. The questionnaire will take approximately 25 minutes to complete.

You are not required to indicate your name or organisation and your anonymity will be ensured; however, indication of your age, gender, occupation position etcetera, will contribute to a more comprehensive analysis. All information obtained from this questionnaire will be used for research purposes only and will remain confidential. Your participation in this survey is voluntary and you have the right to omit any question if so desired, or to withdraw from answering this survey without penalty at any stage. After the completion of the study, an electronic summary of the findings of the research will be made available to you on request.

Permission to undertake this survey has been granted by the Regional and Woreda Education Offices and the Ethics Committee of the College of Education, UNISA. If you have any research-related enquiries, they can be addressed directly to me or my supervisor. My contact details are: Berhanu Belayneh Beyene, P. O. BOX 5648, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, Cell no. +251 935 998680, e-mail: ber5112000@yahoo.com and my supervisor (Prof. P. Mafora) can be reached at +27 (0)12 429 6962, Department of Educational Leadership and Management, College of Education, UNISA, e-mail: pmafora@unisa.ac.za.

By completing the questionnaire, you imply that you have agreed to participate in this research.

I \_\_\_\_\_ grant consent to participate in the study on the transformational leadership role of principal in Ethiopian Secondary Schools: the case of SNNPRS, as proposed by Mr. Berhanu Belayneh Beyene and described above.

Participant's Name (Please print):

Participant Signature:

Researcher's Name: (Berhanu Belayneh Beyene):

Researcher's Signature: .....

Date: .....

# UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA (UNISA)

## Questionnaire for Principals

Dear principal,

The purpose of this study is to explore the transformational leadership role of the principal in Ethiopian secondary schools: the case of SNNPRS. The findings and recommendations of the study will contribute to the improvement of the principals' transformational leadership role, which will have a positive impact on school effectiveness.

Thank you for your time to answer my questionnaire. I would like to assure you that all the information supplied by you would be treated confidentially. Thus in order for me to obtain reliable and scientific information, it is necessary that you answer the questions as honestly as you can. Your opinion is important. Please answer all the questions in the following way:

### SECTION ONE: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Dear principal, please give response for the following questions by placing a (X) mark in a box.

1. Your Occupation

Principal

Vice Principal

2. Gender

Male

Female

3. Age (Years)

18-35

36-55

56-65

66+

4. Your educational level

Diploma

Bachelor

Master

Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

5. Total years of service as a principal or Vice Principal

0-2

3-6

7-10

10+

6. Total years of experience

0-2

3-6

7-10

10+

7. How many students are in your school?

<500

501-800

801-1,000

1,001-1,500

>1,500

8. Grades that are housed in your school

9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup>

11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup>

9<sup>th</sup> up to 12<sup>th</sup>



## SECTION II: CONSTITUTES OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP ROLE OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

This survey measures what constitutes most of the transformational leadership role of school principals in SNNPRS of Ethiopian secondary schools. Be honest about your choices as it is a self-assessment tool to learn and grow. It has rating scales that range from 5, Almost always to 1, Never. (5. **Almost always**, 4. **Often**, 3. **Sometimes**, 2. **Rarely**, and 1. **Never**). Using the below scale, mark (X) on the number to the right of each question that you believe comes closest to your level of proficiency and comfort.

As a principal, my role is	5	4	3	2	1
2.1. Formulate and articulate future goals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2. Creating and communicating the school vision.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.3. Sharing the school vision with community.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.4. persuade my followers to join my vision and share ideals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.5. promoting the success of all teachers by acting with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manner	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.6. Transforming the follower into a good leader.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.7. Developing followers' leadership skills.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.8. Taking risk in times of crises or confusion.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.9. Spend time coaching & mentoring teachers regarding ways to improve Student learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.10. Allowing teachers to exert their leadership potential by raising their commitment to shared vision and goals.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.11. Articulating the mission of the school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.12. using individual consideration to help strengthen teachers achievements and growth	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>5 = <i>Almost Always</i>      4 = <i>Often</i>      3 = <i>Sometimes</i>      2 = <i>Rarely</i>      1 = <i>Never</i></p>					

2.13. Acting on staff input and giving real leadership opportunities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.14. Giving more attentions to individual needs and personal development.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.15. Applying facilitative and demonstrative approach.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.16. Involving teachers in decision making, creating opportunity to them to learn from each other and reducing their stress level.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.17. Empowering teachers by giving them opportunities to shape organizational goals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.18. Providng forums for staff input purposely.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.19. Delegating authorities and responsibility to teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.20. Providing teachers with opportunities for professional growth and development through feedback, reward, recognition, training, seminars, conferences and workshops	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.21. Raising teachers' willingness to go beyond the usual requirements of teaching	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.22. Influencing teachers using my professional expertise	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.23. provide meaning and challenge in the follower's work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.24. Using intellectual stimulation to challenge their followers' thoughts, imagination and creativity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.25. encouraging them to take on increasingly bigger responsibilities to reach its potential in full	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.26. Motivating teachers to do more by setting more challenges	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5 = Almost Always

4 = Often

3 = Sometimes

2 = Rarely

1 = Never

- 2.27. Actively encourage parents and community to become involved in their children's education
- 2.28. Stimulate professional dialogue on new ideas that is relevant to school's effectiveness

*5 = Almost Always      4 = Often      3 = Sometimes      2 = Rarely      1 = Never*

2.29. What other factors constitutes the transformational leadership role of school principals in your school?

---



---

Please comment on the reasons for the above mentioned constitutes?

---



---

2.30. Please explain your positive experience as a principal? (relate and give examples)

---



---



---



---

2.31. Please explain your negative experience as a principal? (relate and give examples)

---



---



---



---

### PART III: TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP IMPLEMENTATION

The following statements are designed to assess how principals in SNNPRS of Ethiopia secondary schools are implementing Transformational Leadership. It has rating scales that range from 5, Almost always to 1, Never. (5. **Almost always**, 4. **Often**, 3. **Sometimes**, 2. **Rarely**, and 1. **Never**). Please Mark (X) the appropriate number.

	5	4	3	2	1
<b>As a principal, I have</b>					
3.1. spent time coaching people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2. assumed people know why the team's work is important	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.3. encouraged people to lead	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.4. talked about my vision and values	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.5. taken decisions on my own	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.6. shown my appreciation for the team's efforts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.7. made people feel they are engaged in something important	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.8. communicated the idea that we are involved in something bigger than ourselves	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.9. recognized each individual's successes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.10. conveyed a collective sense of mission	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.11. initiated change	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.12. demonstrated that I value people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.13. involved people in planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.14. acted ethically	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.15. reviewed team members' performance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.16. checked that every person has challenging objectives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>5 = Almost Always      4 = Often      3 = Sometimes      2 = Rarely      1 = Never</i>					

3.17. overlooked people's ideas and suggestions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.18. displayed drive to meet my goals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.19. spent the majority of time with the best performers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.20. maintained standards of integrity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.21. committed to delivery regardless of the impact on the team	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.22. rewarded team successes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.23. concentrated solely on the task	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.24. encouraged people to come up with ideas and solutions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.25. looked to others to communicate the larger mission	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.26. been unable to take time out to celebrate team achievement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.27. lacked energy and drive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.28. built trust through being reliable and genuine	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.29. treated people as individuals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.30. assumed individuals know what is required of them	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.31. assumed people feel that they are doing something worthwhile	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5 = *Almost Always*    4 = *Often*    3 = *Sometimes*    2 = *Rarely*    1 = *Never*

3.32. instilled a sense of purpose in the team's work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.33. showed people how they can make a difference	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.34. treated people fairly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.35. pursued goals beyond what's required	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.36. offered assignments to grow people's skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.37. agreed key goals with the team	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.38. instilled pride by celebrating our achievements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.39. emphasized the importance of providing a service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.40. checked that people understand the team's goals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.41. told people precisely what to do	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.42. given direction to people's efforts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*5 = Almost Always*     *4 = Often*     *3 = Sometimes*     *2 = Rarely*     *1 = Never*

3.43. What do you do to transform your teachers from follower to leaders? (Please give concrete examples.)

---

---

---

3.44 Highlight and discuss some of the challenges that were encountered in monitoring progress and transformation in the school.

---

---

---

---

**SECTION IV: PRINCIPAL’S EFFECTIVENESS OF THEIR TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

The following statements are designed to assess how principals in SNNPRS of Ethiopia secondary schools perceive their effectiveness as a Transformational Leaders.

It has rating scales that range from 5, strongly agree 1; strongly disagree. (5. **Strongly agree**, 4. **Agree**, 3. **Undecided**, 2. **Disagree**, and 1 **Strongly disagree**). Please Mark (X) the appropriate number.

**5            4            3            2            1**

**As a Principal, I**

4.1. Excite teachers with visions of what we may be able to accomplish if we work together to change our practices/programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.2. Regularly encourages teachers to evaluate their progress toward achieving school goals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.3. Rarely take others opinion into account when I am making decisions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.4. Lead by 'doing' rather than simply by 'telling'	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.5. Provide resources to support teachers professional development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*5 = Strongly agree    4 = Agree    3 = Undecided    2 =Disagree    1 = Strongly disagree*



- 4.6. Encourage teachers to re-examine some basic assumptions they have about their work
- 4.7. Give high priority to developing within the school a shared set of values, beliefs and attitudes related to teaching and learning
- 4.8. Distribute leadership broadly among the staff, representing various viewpoints in leadership positions
- 4.10. Have high expectations for teachers as professionals
- 4.11. Provide staff with a process through which they generate school goals
- 4.12. am a source of new ideas for staff's professional learning
- 4.13. Hold high expectations for students
- 4.14. Give teachers a sense of overall purpose
- 4.15. Take followers opinion into consideration when initiating actions that affect their work

5 = Strongly agree    4 = Agree    3 = Undecided    2 = Disagree    1 = Strongly disagree

- 4.16. Show respect for staff by treating them as professionals
- 4.17. Stimulate teachers to think about what they are doing for their students
- 4.18. Ensure that teachers have adequate involvement in decision making related to programs and instruction
- 4.19. Support an effective committee structure for decision making
- 4.20. Make an effort to know students (e.g., visits classrooms, acknowledges their efforts)
- 4.20. Set a respectful tone for interaction with students.
- 4.21. Encourage teachers to pursue their own goals for professional learning.
- 4.22. Encourage ongoing teacher collaboration for implementing new programs and practices.
- 4.23. Help clarify the specific meaning of the school's vision in terms of its practical implications for programs and instruction.

*5 = Strongly agree    4 = Agree    3 = Undecided    2 = Disagree    1 = Strongly disagree*

- 4.24. Encourage teachers to develop/review individual professional growth goals consistent with school goals and priorities
- 4.25. Expect teachers to engage in ongoing professional growth
- 4.26. Display energy and enthusiasm for own work
- 4.27. Lack awareness of teachers unique needs and expertise
- 4.28. Encourage teachers to evaluate their practices and refine them as needed.
- 4.29. Expect teachers to be effective innovators
- 4.30. Demonstrate willingness to change own practices in light of new understandings
- 4.31. Encourage teachers to try new practices consistent with their own interests
- 4.32. Rarely refer to school goals when we are making decisions related to changes in programs or practices
- 4.33. Stimulate discussion of new ideas relevant to school directions

5 = *Strongly agree*    4 = *Agree*    3 = *Undecided*    2 = *Disagree*    1 = *Strongly disagree*

- 4.34. Facilitate effective communication among staff
- 4.35. Establish working conditions that inhibit staff collaboration for professional growth and planning
- 4.36. Communicate school vision to staff and students
- 4.37. Encourage the development of school norms supporting openness to change
- 4.38. Show favouritism toward individuals or groups
- 4.39. Facilitate opportunities for staff to learn from each other
- 4.40. Reinforce isolation of teachers who have special expertise
- 4.41. Provide an appropriate level of autonomy for teachers in their own decision making
- 4.42. Provide moral support by making teachers feel appreciated for their contribution to the school

5 = Strongly agree    4 = Agree    3 = Undecided    2 = Disagree    1 = Strongly disagree

- 4.43. Help teachers understand the relationship between their/our school's vision and board or Ministry initiatives
- 4.44. Model problem-solving techniques that teachers can readily adapt for work with colleagues and students
- 4.45. Promote an atmosphere of caring and trust among staff
- 4.46. Symbolize success and accomplishment within staff profession
- 4.47. Support the status quo at the expense of being at the cutting edge of educational change
- 4.48. Work toward whole staff consensus in establishing priorities for school goals
- 4.49. am open and genuine in dealings with staff and students

*5 = Strongly agree    4 = Agree    3 = Undecided    2 = Disagree    1 = Strongly disagree*

## Appendix G: Questionnaire to Secondary School Teacher

### Dear Teacher,

This questionnaire forms part of my doctoral research entitled: “The transformational leadership role of the principal in Ethiopian Secondary Schools” for the degree of D.Ed. at the University of South Africa. You have been selected by a purposive sampling strategy from the population of 341 principals. Hence, I invite you to take part in this survey.

The aim of this study is to examine the nature and manifestation of the transformational leadership role of the principal in Ethiopian secondary schools and measuring the effect this principal leadership constructs has on student achievement. The findings and recommendations of the study will contribute to the improvement of the principals’ transformational leadership role, which will have a positive impact on teaching and learning.

You are kindly requested to complete this survey questionnaire, comprising two sections as honestly and frankly as possible and according to your personal views and experience. No foreseeable risks are associated with the completion of the questionnaire which is for research purposes only. The questionnaire will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

You are not required to indicate your name or organisation and your anonymity will be ensured; however, indication of your age, gender, occupation position etcetera will contribute to a more comprehensive analysis. All information obtained from this questionnaire will be used for research purposes only and will remain confidential. Your participation in this survey is voluntary and you have the right to omit any question if so desired, or to withdraw from answering this survey without penalty at any stage. After the completion of the study, an electronic summary of the findings of the research will be made available to you on request.

Permission to undertake this survey has been granted by the Regional and Woreda Education Offices and the Ethics Committee of the College of Education, UNISA. If you have any research-related enquiries, they can be addressed directly to me or my supervisor. My contact details are: Berhanu Belayneh Beyene, P. O. BOX 5648, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, Cell no. +251 935 998680, e-mail: ber5112000@yahoo.com and my supervisor (Prof. P. Mafora) can be reached at +27 (0)12 429 6962, Department of Educational Leadership and Management, College of Education, UNISA, e-mail: pmafora@unisa.ac.za.

By completing the questionnaire, you imply that you have agreed to participate in this research.

I \_\_\_\_\_ grant consent to participate in the study on the transformational leadership role of principal in Ethiopian Secondary Schools: the case of SNNPRS, as proposed by Mr. Berhanu Belayneh Beyene and described above.

Participant's Name (Please print):

Participant Signature:

Researcher's Name: (Berhanu Belayneh Beyene):

Researcher's Signature:

Date:

# UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA (UNISA)

## Questionnaire for Teachers

Dear teacher,

The purpose of this study is to explore the transformational leadership role of the principal in Ethiopian secondary schools: the case of SNNPRS. The findings and recommendations of the study will contribute to the improvement of the principals' transformational leadership role, which will have a positive impact on school effectiveness.

Thank you for your time to answer my questionnaire. I would like to assure you that all the information supplied by you would be treated confidentially. Thus in order for me to obtain reliable, scientific information, it is necessary that you answer the questions as honestly as you can. Your opinion is important. Please answer all the questions in the following way:

### SECTION ONE: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Dear teacher, please give response for the following questions by placing a (X) mark.

1. Gender

Male

Female

2. Age (Years)

18-35

36-55

56-65

66+

3. Your educational level

Diploma

Bachelor

Master

Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

4. Total years of service as a teacher

0-2

3-6

7-10

10+

5. With how many principals have you worked for?

1

2

3

4+

6. What is your current position/level in the school?

Teacher

High teacher

High Head

Head  
Teacher

other

7. Years of service with current principal?

1-2

2-3

3+



**SECTION II: TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS REGARDING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THEIR PRINCIPALS' TRANSFORMATION LEADERSHIP**

The following statements are designed to assess how teachers in SNNPRS of Ethiopia secondary schools perceive their principals effectiveness as a Transformational Leaders.

It has rating scales that range from 5, strongly agree to 1; strongly disagree. (5. **Strongly agree**, 4. **Agree**, 3. **Undecided**, 2. **Disagree**, and 1 **Strongly disagree**). Please Mark (X) the appropriate number.

	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>The Principal of my School,</b>					
2.1. Excites us with visions of what we may be able to accomplish if we work together to change our practices/programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2. Regularly encourages us to evaluate our progress toward achieving school goals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.3. Rarely takes our opinion into account when making decisions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.4. Leads by 'doing' rather than simply by 'telling'	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.5. Provides resources to support my professional development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.6. Encourages me to re-examine some basic assumptions I have about my work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*5 = Strongly agree    4 = Agree    3 = Undecided    2 Disagree    1 = Strongly disagree*

- 2.7. Gives high priority to developing within the school a shared set of values, beliefs and attitudes related to teaching and learning
- 2.8. Distributes leadership broadly among the staff, representing various viewpoints in leadership positions
- 2.9. Has high expectations for us as professionals
- 2.10. Provides staff with a process through which we generate school goal
- 2.11. Is a source of new ideas for my professional learning
- 2.12. Holds high expectations for students
- 2.13. Gives us a sense of overall purpose
- 2.14. Takes my opinion into consideration when initiating actions that affect my work
- 2.15. Shows respect for staff by treating us as professionals
- 2.16. Stimulates me to think about what I am doing for my students

*5 = Strongly agree    4 = Agree    3 = Undecided    2 Disagree    1 = Strongly disagree*

- 2.17. Ensures that we have adequate involvement in decision making related to programs and instruction
- 2.18. Supports an effective committee structure for decision making
- 2.19. Makes an effort to know students (e.g., visits classrooms, acknowledges their efforts)
- 2.20. Sets a respectful tone for interaction with students.
- 2.21. Encourages me to pursue my own goals for professional learning.
- 2.22. Encourages ongoing teacher collaboration for implementing new programs and practices.
- 2.23. Encourages us to develop/review individual professional growth goals consistent with school goals and priorities
- 2.24. Helps clarify the specific meaning of the school's vision in terms of its practical implications for programs and instruction.

5 = *Strongly agree*    4 = *Agree*    3 = *Undecided*    2 = *Disagree*    1 = *Strongly disagree*

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2.25. Expects us to engage in ongoing professional growth  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2.26. Displays energy and enthusiasm for own work  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2.27. Lacks awareness of my unique needs and expertise   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2.28. Encourages us to evaluate our practices and refine them as needed.                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2.29. Expects us to be effective innovators  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2.30. Demonstrates willingness to change own practices in light of new understandings                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2.31. Encourages me to try new practices consistent with my own interests                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2.32. Rarely refers to school goals when we are making decisions related to changes in programs or practices | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2.33. Stimulates discussion of new ideas relevant to school directions                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2.34. Facilitates effective communication among staff  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

5 = *Strongly agree*    4 = *Agree*    3 = *Undecided*    2 = *Disagree*    1 = *Strongly disagree*

- 2.35. Establishes working conditions that inhibit staff collaboration for professional growth and planning
- 2.36. Communicates school vision to staff and students
- 2.37. Encourages the development of school norms supporting openness to change
- 2.38. Shows favouritism toward individuals or groups
- 2.39. Facilitates opportunities for staff to learn from each other
- 2.40. Reinforces isolation of teachers who have special expertise
- 2.41. Provides an appropriate level of autonomy for us in our own decision making
- 2.42. Provides moral support by making me feel appreciated for my contribution to the school
- 2.43. Helps us understand the relationship between our school's vision and board or Ministry initiatives

*5 = Strongly agree    4 = Agree    3 = Undecided    2 Disagree    1 = Strongly disagree*

- 2.44. Models problem-solving techniques that I can readily adapt for work with colleagues and students
- 2.45. Promotes an atmosphere of caring and trust among staff
- 2.46. Symbolizes success and accomplishment within our profession
- 2.47. Supports the *status quo* at the expense of being at the cutting edge of educational change
- 2.48. Works toward whole staff consensus in establishing priorities for school goals
- 2.49. Is open and genuine in dealings with staff and students

5 = *Strongly agree*    4 = *Agree*    3 = *Undecided*    2 = *Disagree*    1 = *Strongly disagree*

## Appendix H: Percentage of Pass in GESLCE (2005/2013-2007/2015)

School Name #	Average % Passing (2005)	Average % Passing (2006)	Average % Passing (2007)
1	39	25	34
2	59	59	87
3	78	80	87
4	89	96	99
5	56	51	62
6	49	55	74
7	73	63	73
8	60	52	77
9	95	91	96
10	89	90	92
11	87	67	80
12	68	68	84
13	79	42	67
14	77	46	71
15	53	21	39
16	56	56	80
17	65	29	40
18	81	64	74
19	63	69	73
20	74	64	84
21	72	78	92
22	43	61	75
23	85	81	87
24	65	66	86
25	71	70	95
26	88	74	89
27	75	74	88
28	58	77	89
29	41	28	65
30	79	75	69
31	79	74	54
32	80	48	87
33	54	64	58
34	83	43	74
35	91	83	70
36	66	61	77

37	67	59	75
38	75	67	89
39	62	44	64
40	86	91	92
41	39	46	63
42	88	76	96
43	54	53	93
44	97	73	87
45	70	32	78
46	51	52	67
47	99	93	100
48	66	42	80
49	37	45	53
50	56	50	81
51	69	32	49
52	86	67	85
53	63	57	61
54	57	73	81
55	78	61	71
56	60	46	50
57	81	55	67
58	92	56	80
59	80	87	85
60	60	62	86
61	49	50	62
62	71	70	85
63	68	61	84
64	81	71	91
65	64	80	100
66	69	41	86
67	66	51	72
68	60	80	92
69	66	39	48
70	93	44	84
71	76	68	98
72	94	72	98
73	67	56	92
74	53	93	83
75	53	42	62
76	56	34	62



