

2022-09

# የሥራ ማሰባሰቢያ ማሰባሰቢያ ማሰባሰቢያ Implementation in East Gojjam Administrative Zone Secondary Schools

Birku, Kassahun

---

<http://ir.bdu.edu.et/handle/123456789/14289>

*Downloaded from DSpace Repository, DSpace Institution's institutional repository*



**BAHIR DAR UNIVERSITY**

**College of Education and Behavioral Science**

**Department of Educational Planning and Management**

**Leaders' EPolicy Understandings and Implementation in East Gojjam Administrative Zone**

**Secondary Schools**

**By**

**Kassahun Birku**

**September, 2022**

**Bahir Dar, Ethiopia**

**BAHIR DAR UNIVERSITY**

**College of Education and Behavioral Science**

**Department of Educational Planning and Management**

**Leaders' Education Policy Understanding and Implementation in Secondary Schools of East  
Gojjam Administrative Zone**

**By**

**Kassahun Birku**

**A Master Thesis submitted to the Department of Educational Planning and Management in partial  
fulfillment of the requirements of Degree of Master of Arts in Educational Planning and  
Management**

**Advisor: Asrat D**

**August, 2022**

**Bahir Dar, Ethiopia**

**©2022[Kassahun Birku]**

### **Declaration**

This is to certify that the thesis entitled “Leaders policy understanding and implementation in secondary schools of East Gojjam Administrative Zone”, submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Educational Planning and Management, Bahir Dar University. It is a record of original work carried out by me and has never been submitted to this or any other institution to get any other degree or certificates. The assistance and help I received during the course of this investigation have been duly acknowledged.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of the candidate

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Place

**BAHIR DAR UNIVERSITY**

**College of Education and Behavioral Science**

**Department of Educational Planning and Management**

**Approval of Thesis for Defense**

I hereby certify that I have supervised, read, and evaluated this thesis titled “Leaders policy understanding and implementation in secondary schools of East Gojjam Administrative Zone” by Kassahun Birku prepared under my guidance. I recommend the thesis be submitted for oral defense.

\_\_\_\_\_

Advisor’s name

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

Department Head

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

**BAHIR DAR UNIVERSITY**

**College of Education and Behavioral Science**

**Department of Educational Planning and Management**

Approval of thesis for defense result

As members of the board of examiners, we examined this dissertation/thesis entitled “Leaders policy understanding and implementation in secondary schools of East Gojjam Administrative Zone” by Kassahun Birku. We hereby certify that the thesis is accepted for fulfilling the requirements for the award of the degree of “Educational Planning and Management”.

**Board of Examiners**

External examiner name

Signature

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Internal examiner name

Signature

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Chair person’s name

Signature

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## **Acknowledgement**

It would not have been possible to undertake this thesis without the support, encouragement, guidance, and love from my family, governmental organizations and friends. To be more specific, first, I would like to thank Mr. Asrat Derib for being my thesis advisor and for providing invaluable assistance on the paper by shaping only the contents from the beginning to the end. He gave recommendations and corrections on the literature review, especially on the theoretical background. In addition, he also helped me to improve the research methodology part, for example, on the data collection details; the proper interpretation of the results; conclusion of the study and the recommendation section. It would not have been as it was presented without his assistance. The interpretation of the statistic results would have been difficult without his helping hand. Second, I would like to convey my gratitude and appreciation to Dr. Melaku for being my proposal examiner and for providing special comment on the research methodology from the beginning. He provided tremendous comment and help in shaping the conceptual framework and with the research methodology the design and approach.

Third, I would like to appreciate my study participants, principals, vice principals, supervisors and department head teachers for receiving the data, opinions, and suggestions during the data collection process in the study area. In addition, I thank the Woreda education head offices, East Gojjam Zone education department head and school offices, for providing secondary data to support my research. Their information was invaluable for the completion of my thesis. My special gratitude goes to my brother ,Tazebachew Birku , to my wife,Mulunesh Ambelu and to my daughter, Hana kassahun ,to my son Tewodros Kassahun , for their consistent support.

## Table of Content

Declaration .....	i
Acknowledgement .....	iv
List of table .....	ix
List of Abbreviations and Acronyms .....	x
<i>Abstract</i> .....	xi
CHAPTER ONE .....	1
INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1. Background of the study .....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem .....	3
1.3. Objective of the Study .....	6
1.3.1. General Objective .....	6
1.3.2. Specific Objectives .....	6
1.4. Significance of the study .....	7
1.5. Delimitation of the Study .....	7
1.6. Limitation of the Study .....	8
1.7. Operational Definition of Terms .....	8
1.8. Organization of the Thesis .....	9
CHAPTER TWO .....	10
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE .....	10
2.1. Concepts of Education Policy .....	10
2.2. Policy Understanding .....	10
2.3. Policy Implementation .....	11
2.2.1. The Ethiopian Education Sector Development Programs .....	13
2.2.2. The General Quality Education Improvement Program (GEQIP) .....	15
<b>2.5. Theories and Studies of Policy Implementation .....</b>	<b>15</b>



2.5.1. Top-down Theory .....	15
2.5.2. The Bottom-up Theory .....	16
2.6. Studies on Educational Policy Understanding and Implementation .....	16
2.6.1. International Research Report on Education Policy .....	16
2.3.1. Local Research Report on Education Policy .....	17
2.4. Determinant Factors for Leaders Policy Understanding .....	19
2.4.1. Experience and Qualification .....	19
2.4.2. School Leaders Readiness/Attitude, knowledge and Skill .....	19
2.4.3. Training and Development .....	20
2.4.4. The Presence of Policy Related Documents /Materials.....	21
2.5. Determinant Factors for Leaders Policy Implementation .....	22
2.5.1. Policy Objectives .....	22
2.5.2. Implementing Agency’s Capability.....	22
2.5.5. Concern for Safety.....	25
2.6. Major challenges of Educational Policy implementation .....	25
2.7. Summary of Literature Review .....	26
CHAPTER THREE .....	29
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....	29
3.1. Research Design.....	29
3.2. Sources of Data .....	29
3.3. Population, Sample, and Sampling Techniques .....	29
3.3.1. Population of the study.....	29
3.3.2. Samples and Sampling techniques .....	30
3.4. Data Gathering Instruments .....	31
3.4.1. Interview .....	32
3.4.2. Questionnaire.....	32

3.4.3. Document Analysis.....	33
3.5. Data Collection Procedure .....	33
3.6. Validity and reliability Check .....	33
3.7. Method of data analysis.....	34
3.8. Ethical Considerations.....	35
CHAPTER FOUR.....	36
PRESENTATION, ANNALYSIS AND INTERPRETETION OF DATA.....	36
4.1. Demographic Characteristics of the Participants .....	36
4.2. School Leaders’ Policy Understanding .....	40
4.2.1. Conceptualization of Education and School Policies .....	40
4.2.2. Demographic Profiles of Participants and Policy Understanding.....	42
4.2.3. Support System and Policy Related Document and Policy Understanding .....	43
4.2.4. Data from Document Investigation Checklist .....	44
4.3. Leaders Policy Implementation.....	45
4.4. The Major Challenges Hindering policy implementation.....	49
5.1.1.4. Data from Document Investigation Checklist.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
CHAPER FIVE.....	52
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	52
5.1. Summary.....	52
5.1.1. Leaders’ Policy Understanding .....	52
5.1.1.1. Conceptualization of Education and School Policies .....	52
5.1.1.2. <i>Demographic Profiles of Participants and Policy Understanding</i> .....	53
<b>5.1.1.3. Support System and Policy Related Document and Policy Understanding</b> .....	53
<b>5.1.2. Level of Leaders Policy Implementation</b> .....	53
<b>5.1.2.1. Policy objectives in term Clarity and Relevance</b> .....	54
<b>5.1.2.2. Implementing Agency’s Capability</b> .....	54
5.1.2.3. Availability of Educational Resources .....	54
<b>5.1.2.4. Safety Concern for Policy Implementation</b> .....	54

<b>5.1.2.5. Incentive Concern for Policy Implementation</b> .....	54
5.1.3. Major Challenges Hindering policy implementation .....	55
5.2. Conclusion.....	55
5.3. Recommendations .....	56
References.....	58
Appendix -I.....	63
Appendix -II.....	68
Appendix III.....	73
Appendix IV.....	74

## List of table

Table 3. 1: The <i>Samples and Sampling Techniques of the Study</i> .....	31
Table 3. 2: The Reliability Measured through Cronbach’s alpha coefficient.....	34
Table 4. 1 (a) the <i>Characteristics of Respondents (Sex, age, services, education qualification)</i> .....	37
Table 4. 2 (b) the Characteristics of Interviewees(Sex, age, services, education qualification).....	39
Table 4. 3 Policy Objective (One-Sample test) N=70 .....	45
Table 4. 4: Implementing Agency’s Capacity (One -Sample test) N=70.....	46
Table 4. 5: Availability of Educational Resources (One -Sample test) N=70.....	47
Table 4. 6: Availability of Safety Concern (One -Sample test) N=70.....	48
Table 4. 7: <i>Availability of Incentive Concerns</i> (One -Sample test) N=70 .....	49
Table 4. 8: Independent Sample t test for Policy Objective Clarity .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Table 4. 9: Independent Sample t -test for Implementing Agency’s Capacity.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Table 4. 10: <i>Independent Sample t test for Resource Availability</i> .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Table 4. 11: Independent Sample t test for Safety Concerns .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Table 4. 12: <i>Independent Sample t test for Availability of Incentives</i> .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Table 4. 13: The Challenges Facing that Hindering of Policy Implementation .....	50

## **List of Abbreviations and Acronyms**

ANRSEB	Amhara National Regional State Education Bureau
EDPM	Educational Planning and Management
EGAZ	East Gojjam Administrative Zone
EPI	Education Policy Implementations
ESDP	Education Sector Development Program
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Sciences
ESIP	Education Sector Investment Program
ETP	Education and Training Policy
GEQIP	General Education Quality Improvement Program
MoE	Ministry of Education
WEOs	Woreda Education Office

### **Abstract**

*The purpose of this study was to assess the leaders' policy understanding and implementation in secondary schools of East Gojjam Administrative Zone. To accomplish this purpose, the study employed a mixed research approach and sequential design. The data collection instrument was structured closed and opened ended questionnaires, semi-structured interview and along with document analysis. About 72 principals and vice principals and 78 department heads were involved in the study as respondents selected through stratified and random sampling techniques, and about 9 supervisors and 10 principals and vice principals were involved in the study as interviewees selected through comprehensive and purposive sampling respectively. The study used the SPSS, V-26 in order to analysis quantitative data, and then was carried out the mean; standard deviation; and one sample t-test method of data analysis. The main finding of this study shows that leaders have a critical problems in policy understanding due to lack of readiness, knowledge, experience, qualification and absences of available training and documents; low level of policy implementation due to lack of education policy objective clarity and relevance, implementing agency incapability's, lack of safety and incentive concerns and major factors like non-reliability of data, insufficient students income and economic condition, lack of educational technology and facilities. Accordingly, the conclusion drawn is that the school leaders policy understanding and implementation under consideration was found in problematic and below at lower level respectively. The present study recommends that the EGAZ education department experts should give training, policy related material to increase their policy understanding and implementation. The ARSEB had better increase the standards of secondary school leaders' pre- and post-assigning and recruitment guideline and the MOE had better improve short and long term training to discharge leaders incapability's. To minimize the major challenges faced in the study area, the WEOs and regional government had better support based on the severity.*

*Key words /phrases: Policy objective clarity, relevance, implementing agency, capability*

# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with the overview of the background, the statement of the problem, objective of the study, significance of the study, scope of the study, limitation of study, ethical consideration of the study, organization of the paper.

### 1.1. Background of the study

Education can be understood as the actions taken by governments in relation with educational practices, and how governments address the production and delivery of education in a given system (Romane & Beatriz, 2017).

Educational policies provide the direction for educational activities. Policy brings about a meaningful relationship between objectives and organizational functions as it discourages deviations from planned courses of action. A policy ensures consistency of action because an organization is governed by approved principles (Okoroma, 2018).

Promoting a wider understanding of education policy means acknowledging the facts and policy description as it usually proposes a vision to achieve, sets goals to meet, and spell out the means to reach them (Romane & Beatriz ,2017). Educational policy determines the principles and actions for achieving the aims which should be requested and followed. The policy in education has a considerable impact on what happens and the experiences gained at the school. The school principals have a considerable role in developing and implementing the policies, they are expected to develop the action plans of policies, motivate teachers and other staff for collaboration, determine the needed resources, and give feedback.

Policy understanding is the conceptualization of policy in complex, dynamic, and diverse sociopolitical systems. It is a process to resolve ambiguity and manage uncertainty like the conflicting goals, an absence of measures to evaluate the success of the policy, and limited resources for enactment (Bergmark & Hansson, 2021).

The conceptualization of policy is more problematic than merely describing it as the set of executive and administrative that direct education at the various hierarchical levels of government. But, the education policy documents can clearly reflect the values of the dominant power/group, seldom guarantee a practice conforming to the expectations that shaped their

development. So, policy as text (the language of policy) contains divergent meanings, contradictions, and structured omissions, then, producing different effects that why different readers decode text in different ways, so they construct different meanings, depending on the contexts in which they read the text (Berkhout & Wielemans, 1999).

School leaders and teachers' sense making or understanding about education policy as an initiative relates to the way a policy message is interpreted and negotiated. How teachers and principals learn, understand and enact about the policy relates to their existing beliefs, knowledge, and experiences. In turn understanding and enacting the policy, then can draw on their previous experiences (Bergmark & Hansson, 2021).

Related with this, the other study conducted in Sweden by the authors-Bergmark and Hansson (2021) similar results were reflected as the insufficient allocation of resources to enable the efficient implementation of policy is often given as the reason for the discrepancy between policy objectives and practice. Apart from this rather functional interpretation of the inability of policy to translate into practice, the discourse of the market increasingly shapes and filters policy processes. The capacity to plan, manage and monitor the education system demands knowledge and skill in collecting, processing, analyzing and managing educational information at all levels of the system. But there are weak capacities in strategic planning and leadership, implementation, monitoring and evaluation that hinder the education system to be responsible for non-policy implementation. The education leadership capacity is generally weak, limited leaders' capacities of educational authorities at the regional, zonal, Woreda and school levels to implement the intended policy objectives as the drafting Road Map reflected (MoE ,2019).

Another qualitative study conducted in Oromoa region by Demie, Basha and Hundessa (2021) regarding to school leaders shows that the leaders were made to lead the school without a clear understanding of theories related to education policy and principles of educational leadership .This also contravenes what (MoE,2007) is stipulated in the blue print of teachers and school leaders development program that the document states, the school leaders need to have adequate knowledge, skills and attitude in the area of educational leadership.

To overcome the gap identified regarding to leaders policy understanding and its implementations at secondary schools level for school effectiveness is the rational that initiated the researcher to undertake this Study. This study is therefore, aimed at assessing of school leader



policy understanding and implementation in East Gojjam Administrative Zone Education Department Secondary Schools.

## **1.2. Statement of the Problem**

Currently MOE has given high priorities on the professional development of principals in charge of education at different level to keep quality. In ESDP-IV, the ministry stated that educational leaders are professionals and those who equipped the necessary skills to exhibit proper professional ethics, knowledge and skill of leadership that are necessary to achieve school goals and objectives (MOE, 2010).

As Margaret and Glenda (2007) described that policy implementation is directly linked to the specific understandings of key implementing agents. If there is a full understanding the way in which policy is implemented, in turn, reforms are understood by individuals working at school. Taking account of teachers' sense making of new ideas (policy), and their actions based on the ideas they construct, together with the human and material resources provided by the school, and provides a different perspective to understanding policy implementation. Understanding where policies come from, what they seek to achieve, how they impact on the learning experience and the consequences of implementation are all essential features which are expected from school leaders.

The foreign study conducted on the problem of educational policy in Nigeria (Okoroma, 2011), the finding as constraints were the following. Most educational policies are well focused but the planning is often defective, making implementation difficult; Resources available for the implementation of a given educational policy are often over-and under estimated ( unrealistic expectations that fail to materialize) ; Non-reliable of data to facilitate the effective implementation of educational plans; Inadequate number of teacher in term of qualified and quantity in the entire educational system of secondary school; Inadequate facilities such as classrooms, offices, laboratories, workshops, libraries, electric power, water supply etc ;Insufficiency of funds for implementing educational policies .

In the Ethiopian context different studies on the education policy were conducted by the issues for examples, language policy and Mother Tang Education (Yared , 2017), Daniel and Abebayehu (2011) and Hirut (2007) reported the potential problems of language policy .The difficulty to find words to express key education concepts in the mother tongue and the policy

also has the potential to cause problems for students and teachers whose mother tongue is different from that used at the school; poor English language skills and they have limited grasp of English in schools where the MoI is English.

The studies conducted on the curriculum policy implementation ,for example by Verspoor and Dhoj Joshi (2013),the finding are indicated that that the general secondary curriculum in Ethiopia was not designed with universal access in mind rather it is academically demanding and closely tied to university entry requirements. Such a curriculum is no longer appropriate because universal secondary education requires a much wider range of abilities and aspirations. Evaluative processes are absent. This makes it difficult to track records of success and failure because of the absence of research evidence about whether impacts have been made or not cannot be directly checked through the process.

The study conducted on the role of ICT for education policy quality implementation by Panigrahi and Wagari (2013), the report revealed that the institutional readiness in capacity building and skilled manpower is not promising currently in relation to high skill gap. The ICT materials like plasma TV, internet laboratory, computers and specialized libraries for ICT are insufficient to students number and need .The plasma instruction is the high pacing of the program which makes the students dissatisfied sometimes disparate with the lesson since it is faster than the students understanding pace at all.

The study conducted on the development and barriers of Education policy by author-Alemayehu (2012) and Meskerem (2017) and the study conducted on the Identifying Factors that Affect Ethiopia's Education Crisis (Lemlem, 2010).And Most of the problems are associated with the following: problems with current education policy, organization, learning cycle, system of educational evaluation, system of quality assurance, academic freedom, intellectual migration (brain drain) and political control of the education system; Difficulty of making education equitably accessible to all regions; The quality of education had gradually started to deteriorate, due to a number of factors; Educational quality was decreasing as compared with the previous periods.

These studies were focused on only the status and challenges of policy implementation based on each provision here above. But, no studies conducted regarding to policy understanding by leaders especially in the study area. Therefore, the researcher has believed that his study topic is

unique and new from the previous in terms of the context (focused on both policy understanding and implementation) and location (delimited on EGAZ secondary schools).

Based on the four –point scale (level one, two, three, and four) ,the Amhara Regional State Education Bureau (ARSEB) and the East Gojjam Administrative Zone Education (EGAZ) department inspection core process report ( academic year 2012/20130),the total 70 secondary schools were classified in to abased on the school inspection standards as lower achiever(level-one) ,medium achieve(level two ),high achiever (level three) and very high achiever(2four). level the cumulative achievement of input, process and output/outcome. These are six (9%) of the secondary schools were classified as the lower achiever, 55(78%) of the total secondary schools as medium achiever and 9(14%) of them as high achiever. This is in contrast that what the document ESDP-V targeted 55% and above secondary schools were to be reported as higher achiever (level-3). This is what it mean by the document in the study area, the 55 % or 39 of the total secondary schools should be level-3 and above. But, in practical only 9 (14%) of the zonal secondary schools were reported as higher achiever as intended. Therefore, this also leads the researcher as one rational to conduct a study, as he believed that this is mainly related with the leaders understanding and implementing of the policy.

Generally ,the researcher Okoroma ( 2011) as international study, Yared ( 2017),Jimma and Tarekegn (2016) ,Meskerem (2017) in relation to education and school policy that differ in concepts ,variables ,objectives methodology and research setting (time ,place, participants), and so on. Study findings on the past education policy in schools indicated that there are some problems within its practice.

However ,this research was different from the aforementioned studies, because it focuses on the leaders policy understanding and implementation in secondary schools in East Gojjam Administrative Zone .It is concerned with the conceptualization and understanding of leaders about education policies ,implementation level and the problem faced for policy implementation In addition to the above rational of the study, the researcher has also 19(nineteen) years of experience in which eight years in teaching and 11(eleven) years in leadership position. During these service years, he has his own personal observations as lack different policy related documents used as a guideline for policy understanding and implementing the day to day

activities, insufficient number of qualified and competent school leaders, high turnover or leaving the school leadership after serving for few years.

Besides, from the researcher knowledge of the researcher, no study focused on leaders' education policy and implementation. For this reason, the researcher is initiated to attempt to partially fill the empirical research gaps in the study context by find root cause of less policy understanding and implementation by school leaders in East Gojjam Administrative Zone. Besides, to researcher's knowledge, there was scarce research conducted on leaders understanding of educational policy in Ethiopia and in East Gojjam Administrative Zone. Since, the purpose of this study is to assess Leaders policy understanding and implementation, the researcher try to forward the following questions in order to attain its purpose.

1. How do the school leaders understand education and school policy in East Gojjam Administrative Zone?
2. To what extent school leaders implement the education policy in their everyday work?
3. What are the major challenges faced that hinder education policy implementation?

### **1.3. Objective of the Study**

#### **1.3.1. General Objective**

The general objective of the study is to assess the leaders' policy understanding and implementation in secondary schools of East Gojjam Administrative Zone Education department.

#### **1.3.2. Specific Objectives**

To achieve the purpose of the study, the following specific objectives have been formulated.

1. To investigate school leaders' education policy understanding in their everyday work.
2. To assess the extent to which school leaders implement the education policy in their respective schools.
3. To identify the major challenges facing that hinder level of policy implementations.

#### **1.4. Significance of the study**

Policy subject in general and policy implementation in particular is both important and timely in Ethiopia (Dereje & Tiruye, 2018). The study for policy makers, it may provide information about the status of policy understanding and level of implementation and initiate to do in improving leader's attitude /understanding and level of performing on the government secondary school of East Gojjam Administrative zone. To academics, it may also give pertinent and timely information to school leaders on how education and school policies being conceptualized and then implemented in the study area. Besides, the study is considered to create awareness among policy implementing agencies like principals, supervisors, department teachers, woreda education office heads about the existing problems and to take common responsibility for taking action. Moreover, the study may serve as a spring board for other researchers who are interested to do for their research in the area.

#### **1.5. Delimitation of the Study**

To conduct any research work, delimiting the study both conceptually and geographically into manageable size is important as the researcher has believed. This study geographically delimited to 29(twenty nine) secondary school of EGAZ of the Amhara National Regional State Education Bureau (ANRSEB). The study was also delimited itself because the concept of the policy understanding and implementation in education system is wide that the researcher does not cover all the secondary schools in a short period of time .The Zonal administrative is selected as the researcher who worked in one of its woreda as WEO heads, supervisors and teachers for the last 17(seventeen) years. This helped the researcher to easily obtain information about leaders policy understanding and implementation.

The study consisted only WEOs heads principals and department head teachers; therefore, the finding might not be applied in other geographical region outside EGAZ unless prevalent circumstances exist. It did not include primary schools. Conceptually, the scope of the study also focuses only on leader's policy understanding, implementation and major challenges that hinder the performance.

## **1.6. Limitation of the Study**

This study has a number of its own limitations; the first important limitation was the scarcity of relevant local review literature, especially, on leaders' policy understanding. The researcher feels that it had been possible to access this literature; it would have been possible to substantiate the sense making of education policy and implementation more and come up with better work. Another important constraint of this study was failure to incorporate teachers and WEOs experts as data sources who are important stakeholders of education system and believed to have some information regarding to the issue explained here above. The third limitation, the refusal by management of some WEOs head and school office heads to formally permit the distribution of the questionnaire and interview for unconvincing reasons and the reluctant of participants for correctly filling the questionnaire. If these limitations did not occur, the study could have been more objective and comprehensive

## **1.7. Operational Definition of Terms**

The following key terms are defined according to the meaning they have in the study as follows.

**Administrative zone:** is one of an administrative division of the ANRS and managed by the regional government, it has its own authorities and responsibilities to managed and support the woreda and city administration education offices.

**Education Policy:** the national and school policies which started from (MoE,1994) and has implemented at a movement by different implementing agencies based on its objectifies ,strategic programs ,projects and guided by different rules / proclamations ,

**Policy implementation:** The process of implementing all intended activities designed by education and school policies to accomplish the intended out come and measured in terms of objective clarities and relevance, capabilities of agency, availability of resources, safety and incentives.

**School Leaders:** are leaders like the secondary school principals, vice principals, cluster supervisors and department heads who participated in policy understanding and implementing.

**Secondary School:** Structure of educational system that includes general secondary education which is a school of four years duration consisting of two years general secondary education (grade 9-10) and two years of preparatory education (11-12).

**Supervisors:** are coordinators of school, organized in secondary school clusters, and involved in conducting instructional leadership and appointed by the Woreda education office

**Principals:** Is the title of the head administrator of the school under guide line and policies, who are responsible for leading secondary school and appointed by the Woreda education office

**Policy Understanding:** Is a process or the ways how the school leaders describe, define, remember and explain the education and school policy ( principles, decisions that influence the field of education, collection of laws and rules that govern the operation of education systems) so as to clearly implement and undertake in their respective schools.

**Vice principal:** An officer who is posted to have responsibilities for managing and leading the schools next to the main principal of the school and whose specific powers and duties vary according to the local situation.

**Woreda education office:** the local administrative with high degree of authority and responsibility for administrating educational organization.

### **1.8. Organization of the Thesis**

The study was organized into five chapters. The first chapter consisted of background of the study, the statement of the problem, research questions, and objective of the study, significance of the study, the scope of the study, limitations of the study and operational term of the paper. The second chapter deals with a review of the related literature. Chapter three explained the research design and methodological framework upon which the study was conducted. Moreover, a detailed protocol addressing procedures, participant selection, data collection and analysis techniques as well as issues were included. Chapter four dedicated to presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data and the last chapter consisted of summary, conclusion and recommendations of the study.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

This chapter explains and discuss the different concepts /points which can be related with the study issue .These are: implementation, related(top-down and bottom up theory),foreign and local implementation, determinant which are qualification, school, training and the presence of policy related documents and objectives, implementing, concern, major and summary of literature review.

#### **2.1. Concepts of Education Policy**

Policy is defined as the road map to reach or realize the development goals as the national concepts. The national policies are broad courses of action adopted by governments in pursuit of their objectives. Policy is an action program directed towards the accomplishment of some intended or desired sets of goals. A policy consists of plans of action intended to influence and determine decisions, actions and other matters. It is made up of rules and regulations that serve as guidelines or plan that are used to achieve objectives (Terefe & Alemu, 2018).

School policies can thus be defined as instruments that give direction to the day-to-day operations of a school by guiding the behaviors of educators, learners and parents whilst clarifying the school's expectations as stated by Hanekom (1987 cited in MoE (2013)).School policies provide the basis for the structures and organization of the school and are effective ways of communicating the core values that are inherent in a school's vision and mission statement. The following issues or aspects are usually covered by school policies. They are the common and mandatory. These are : (i) school budgets; (ii) developmental priorities; (iii) school uniforms; (iv) code of conduct for learners;(v) staff and parents;(vi) broad goals on the educational quality; (vii) school-community relations; (viii) the curriculum program and others MoE(2013).

#### **2.2. Policy Understanding**

Policy understanding is a process to resolve ambiguity and manage uncertainty like the conflicting goals, an absence of measures to evaluate the success of the policy, and limited resources for enactment .But, the conceptualization of policy is more problematic than merely describing it as the set of executive and administrative that direct education at the various hierarchical levels of government. But, education policy documents can clearly reflect the values



of the dominant power/group, seldom guarantee a practice conforming to the expectations that shaped their development. So, policy as text (the language of policy) contains divergent meanings, contradictions, and structured omissions, then producing different effects that why different readers decode text in different ways, so they construct different meanings, depending on the contexts in which they read the text(Bergmark & Hansson, 2021).

Understanding or Sense-making is an ongoing process through which people work to understand issues or events that create ambiguities in routine (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014 cited in Ganon-Shilon & Schechter, 2017). It means that as they added, sense making is an active process of constructing meaning from present stimuli, mediated by prior knowledge, experiences, beliefs and values that are embedded in the social context within which people work. When individuals encounter moments of uncertainty, they frame their environment through an interpretive mental model in order to 'make sense' of what has occurred.

Sense-making, as a key element of leadership, enables all formal leaders, principals and middle leaders, to transform schools into effective educational environments .Namely, sense-making is a key leadership capability for the dynamic world we live in today, as it allows school leaders a better grasp of what is going on in their environments .And the little about the sense-making process of school leaders and their role in influencing teachers' sense-making (Black & Shircliffe, 2013).

### 2.3. Policy Implementation

Policy implementation has been defined by many remarkable scholars. The researcher tried to review some of them as follow: (1) Policy implementation is the process of interactions between the setting of goals and the actions geared to achieving them that the degree of goals accomplished through a specific decision could be a measurement of the success of policy implementation (Pressman & Wildavsky, 1979). (2) Policy implementation is the carrying out of the basic policy decision, usually incorporated in a statute but which can also take the form of important executive orders or court decisions. Ideally, that decision identifies the problems to be addressed, stipulates the objectives to be pursued, and in a variety of ways. Implementation process normally runs through a number of stages, beginning with the passage of the basic statute, followed by the policy outputs of the implementing agencies, the compliance of the target groups with those decisions, the actual impacts of those outputs, the perceived impacts of agencies decisions, and finally important revisions in the basic statute (Mazmanian & Sabatier ,1983). (3) Policy implementation encompasses actions by public and private individuals/ groups that are directed at the

achievement of objectives set forth in prior policy decisions. It means that the effort to transform decisions into operational terms, and also the effort to achieve large and small changes, are mandated by policy decisions. Specifically, policy implementation is a relationship of concern among stake holders (Van Meter & Van Horn, 1975).

## **2.4. Educational Policy Development in the Ethiopian Context**

Traditional Ethiopian education has a rich history of literature and philosophy dating back to before the 13th century. Charting the educational history of the country, both Christian and Islamic cultures provided traditional education in churches and mosques. Modern education was introduced at the end of the 19th century and comprehensive high schools were introduced in the country following the American school model in the early 1960s (Tizazu, Turuwark & Sperandio, 2020).

### **2.4.1. The New Education and Training Policy**

The educational sector in Ethiopia has been given powerful impetus after the overthrow of the military government in 1991. Since then education has been a development priority on the national agenda. Ethiopia is embarking on its fourth macroeconomic development program since 1995, the central objectives of these national strategies are to address the human development needs; achieve the millennium development goals and future sustainable development goals; and move Ethiopia towards a middle-income economy by 2025. These national development plans had been : (1) sustainable development and poverty reduction program (1995 to 2005 ), (2) plan for accelerated and sustained development to end poverty (2005 to 2010), (3) first growth and transformation plan -including millennium development plan attainment (2010 to 2015) and (4) second growth and transformation plan (2015 to 2020) (MoE, 2015).

The Government of Ethiopia has developed Education Training Policy (ETP) and Education Sector Strategy in 1994 (Transitional Government of Ethiopia, 1994; Ministry of Education, 1996) and , she had been working towards achieving the EFA (Education For All) goals as defined in the EFA Dakar Framework in (2000) which introduced the six educational goals: (1) expanding and improving comprehensive early childhood care and education, especially for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged children; (2) ensuring that by 2015 all children, particularly girls, children in difficult circumstances and those belonging to ethnic minorities,

have access to and complete free and compulsory primary education of good quality; (3) ensuring that the learning needs of all young people and adults are met through equitable access to appropriate learning and life skills programs; (4) achieving a 50% improvement in levels of adult literacy by 2015, especially for women, and equitable access to basic and continuing education for all adults; (5) eliminating gender disparities in primary and secondary education by 2005, and achieving gender equality in education by 2015, with a focus on ensuring girls' full and equal access to and achievement in basic education of good quality; and (6) improving all aspects of the quality of education and ensuring excellence of all so that recognized and measurable learning outcomes are achieved by all, especially in literacy, numeracy and essential life skills (MoE, 1996).

#### **2.4.2. The Ethiopian Education Sector Development Programs**

The Education Sector Development Program (ESDP) is a program of action for the realization of the goals of the Education Training Policy. The ESDP starting from, 01 July 1997 that provides a sector-wide policy and implementation framework for educational development as a vehicle for implementing the 1994 Education and Training policy, which envisaged to improve education quality, relevance, efficiency, equity and expand access to education, with special emphasis on primary education in rural and disadvantage areas, as well as the promotion of education for girls as a first step to achieve universal primary education as stated ESDPI document (MoE, 1997).

In the year (1997-2002), the Education Sector Development Program (ESDP I) was designed to address the very poor conditions and performance of the education system in the context of widespread poverty. ESDP I attempted to put into action the 1994 education policy which included a sector plan designed to enhance enrolment, particularly in primary schools, decentralization, and community empowerment.

Ethiopia reviewed the Dakar Frame of Action (2000) and made Education for All (EFA) the major component of the education sector development sector of Ethiopia. Therefore, EFA goals were treated within ESDP II in an integrated manner through a sector wide approach. The six major components of the EFA were given prominence and considerable attention throughout the proposed program of action for achieving ESDP II goals. In ESDP II, increasing primary enrolment, with quality and equity, was the basic theme of primary education. However, programs for achieving quality and equity were not only confined to primary education alone, but

they also influenced the programs and investment in secondary education. ESDP II paid special attention to the question of equity. Strategies were designed to improve gender equity, access to education for children of highly marginalized and pastoralist communities and narrowing the urban and rural gap in access to education, and reducing regional disparities as also stated in ESDP II document (MoE,2005).

As a substantial expansion of secondary education also took place under ESDP I and ESDP II, in order to enhance the quality of education at secondary level, ICT infrastructure were provided to schools to receive satellite education transmission with the objective of improving the quality of education and supporting teachers. However, in the Education Sector Development II in secondary schools the most prominent and persistent challenges facing the education system were lack of quality education; lack of a sufficient number of qualified teachers; weak program management and implementation capacity which has contributed to lower budget utilization in civil works and procurement; and inadequate planning and management capacity at lower levels of the organizational structures.

In the Education Sector Development Program (ESDP III), the main challenges in the education sector were the failure of schools in addressing students' right to quality education. In these cases, the key factors that contributed to low student achievement in secondary schools include: poor school organization and management, inadequate training on subject mastery and pedagogical skills for teachers, inadequate school facilities, insufficient curricular and instructional materials, and large class size. Access at all levels of the education system increased at a rapid rate in line with a sharp increase in the number of teachers, schools and institutions. There were important improvements in the availability of trained teachers and some other inputs which are indispensable for a high quality education system (MoE, 2008).

The main goals of the Education Sector Development Program (ESDP IV) in secondary schools were to improve access to quality education in order to make that all youngsters, with particular emphasis on females, acquire the competencies, skills, values and attitudes enabling them to participate fully in the social, economic and political development of the country and to sustain equitable access to quality secondary education services as the basis and bridge to the demand of the economy for middle level and higher level human resources (MoE,2010).

In the current ESDP V (2015/16-2019/2020), priorities are selected to be addressed such as, Capacity development for improved management; quality, access and equity issues starting from the lower level of education to the higher levels of education ( MOE, 2015). In the document regarding the education sector analysis it is described as follows.

*The fact that a large majority of the Ethiopian population lives in rural areas and in fairly dispersed communities poses specific problems for the education sector: spreading education and ensuring equitable access to education presents specific challenges in such a geographic context. In addition, the existence of many pastureland semi-pastoralist groups raises issues of organization of the school system and also of the relevance of the curriculum. The demographic pressures of the country increase the demand for quality education and offer a great window of opportunity for development if investments are made to ensure a fair distribution of education at all levels (p. 12).*

### **2.4.3. The General Quality Education Improvement Program (GEQIP)**

The GEQIP as a government education strategy was started during the ESDP III to give high priority to quality improvement at all levels of the education system. The overall purpose of the GEQIP is to improve the quality of general education (grades 1-12) throughout the country in the areas of teaching and learning conditions in primary and secondary education; and to improve the management, planning and budget capacity of the Ministry of Education and Regional Education Bureaus. Thus, in Ethiopia the NETP provided the bases for the specific goals and objectives of the country's education system. To achieve that it: Prepares individuals for the world of work; Prepares individuals for social and political participation in the context of a rapidly changing and dynamic global economy and society; and is learner-centered and non-authoritarian (MoE, 2008).

## **2.5. Theories and Studies of Policy Implementation**

### **2.5.1. Top-down Theory**

The top-down theory assumes that policy implementation begins with central government decisions with clear policy objectives. In addition, it is also influenced by system theory, which supports the idea that public policy is the input and policy implementation is the output. The administrative machinery which serves the government will decide which administration will

carry out the policy. The designated administration will carry out the policy to fulfill the policy objectives, which are assumed to be clear at all levels of the chain of command. In reality, policy objectives are often unclear or even self-contradictory. The focus on lower officials of this theory is neglected or minimal. Overall, the top-down theory is the ideal one, seeking perfect implementation as Pressman & Wildavsky (1973) and Sabatier and Mazmanian (1983) cited in Pülzl & Treib (2017).

Therefore, the researcher has used the top-down theory to explain the implementation of this study because part of successful implementation should come from the clear policy objectives of the government. Clear policy objectives will guide implementer's to accomplish policy goals. In this study of school leader's policy understanding and implementation, clear and relevant educational policy will make local implementer's that are educational officials in the areas, particularly in schools, able to complete the specified policy's goals.

### **2.5.2. The Bottom-up Theory**

This theory has been established to argue against the top-down one. The bottom-up theory begins with those directly involved in policy implementation. Those public and private players involved in the implementation process will examine the goals, strategies, and programs they have created. The theory suggests that local implementer's are those that bring the policy to successful implementation, and implementation depends on the bargaining among local implements. The implementation works its way upward to find the goals, strategies, and contracts of those involved in executing the programs (Winter, 2006) cited in (Madani, 2019).

## **2.6. Studies on Educational Policy Understanding and Implementation**

Under this section, the researcher tried to review some of the education policy implementation related studies which have been conducted at international, national and regional level.

### **2.6.1. International Research Report on Education Policy**

The finding from the study conducted on problems related to education policy implementation by Yala (2006) are presented as follows: (1) Problems related to school management system, these are: (a) Lack of organization responsible for registered school's management system (b) School board lacks management skills (c) Inadequacy in school buildings, and proper environment (d) Government funding goes to schools (e) Many teachers quit due to violence in

the areas;(2) Curriculum problems, these are:(a)Teaching-related problems (b) Different schools have different curricula (c) Teachers teach courses that are not of their specialty (d) Inadequacy in teaching aids, laboratory, etc. (e)Teachers lack new knowledge and teaching skills (many skilled teachers leave schools due to frequent violence in the areas).

The study conducted by the authors- Pluddemann et al. (2004) regarding to a language survey of schools in Western Cape of south Africa ,the most significant finding is the beginnings of a language shift to English in the family and at school and as the researchers' recommendations which were included: (a) Include student's view and attitude on formal language usage;(b)Take into account a local language in producing multilingual citizens;( c) Update databases as there is an immediate need for educational databases;(d) Strengthen implementing agencies as the schools should be sufficiently supported for language policies. The finding from the study conducted on problems related to education policy implementation by Yala (2006) are presented as s follows:(1)Problems related to school management system, these are :(a) Lack of organization responsible for registered school's management system (b) School board lacks management skills (c) Inadequacy in school buildings, and proper environment (d) Government funding goes to schools (e) Many teachers quit due to violence in the areas;(2) Curriculum problems, these are:(a)Teaching-related problems (b) Different schools have different curricula (c) Teachers teach courses that are not of their specialty (d) Inadequacy in teaching aids, laboratory, etc. (e)Teachers lack new knowledge and teaching skills (many skilled teachers leave schools due to frequent violence in the areas).

### **2.3.1. Local Research Report on Education Policy**

The finding from different Language policy and MTE studies , Daniel (2013) , Daniel and Abebayehu (2011) and Hirut (2007) reported the potential problems of language policy .The difficulty to find words to express key education concepts in the mother tongue and the policy also has the potential to cause problems for students and teachers whose mother tongue is different from that used at the school; poor English language skills and they have limited grasp of English in schools where the MoI is English; Level of adherence to use of English as MoI was not used exclusively (or, sometimes, at all) in schools where it served as the MoI and View as to whether EETP language provisions ought to be revised ,generally, the foregoing findings present an apparent paradox. On the one hand, there is evidence of strong support for some degree of

MTE. On the other hand, an overall majority of surveyed teachers believed that English should be introduced as the MoI in the first cycle of primary education so that students can cope better in secondary school.

The studies conducted on the curriculum policy implementation ,for example by Verspoor and Dhoj Joshi (2013),the finding are indicated that that the general secondary curriculum in Ethiopia was not designed with universal access in mind rather it is academically demanding and closely tied to university entry requirements. Such a curriculum is no longer appropriate because universal secondary education requires a much wider range of abilities and aspirations. Evaluative processes are absent. This makes it difficult to track records of success and failure because of the absence of research evidence about whether impacts have been made or not cannot be directly checked through the process.

The study conducted on the role of ICT for education policy quality implementation by Panigrahi and Wagari (2013), the report revealed that the institutional readiness in capacity building and skilled manpower is not promising currently in relation to high skill gap. The ICT materials like plasma TV, internet laboratory, computers and specialized libraries for ICT are insufficient to students number and need .The plasma instruction is the high pacing of the program which makes the students dissatisfied sometimes disparate with the lesson since it is faster than the students understanding pace at all.

The study conducted on Constitutional and Policy Provisions (Tefera, 2017). The findings were summarized as follows: Constitutionally given and recognized right is not sufficiently institutionalized and implemented. Given the formulation of Notional Policy of women, but there is an inherent problems in the policy itself, its implementation and institutions and institutional capacity of structure meant for the realization of the objectives of the policy; Most of the improvements are in numerical representation of women in all spheres because of formulation and implementation of the National Policy and some of the constitutional provisions; Despite improvement in numerical representation, substantive representation and their decision making power is still face critical challenges; Challenges in achieving gender equality remain significant, and recent policy initiatives are silent on many of the critical issues of quality and mainstreaming gender within the education system as a whole.



The study conducted on the development and barriers of Education policy by author-Alemayehu (2012) and the study conducted on the Identifying Factors that Affect Ethiopia's Education Crisis (Lemlem, 2010). And Most of the problems are associated with the following: problems with current education policy, organization, learning cycle, system of educational evaluation, system of quality assurance, academic freedom, intellectual migration (brain drain) and political control of the education system; Difficulty of making education equitably accessible to all regions; The quality of education had gradually started to deteriorate, due to a number of factors; Educational quality was decreasing as compared with the previous periods.

## **2.4. Determinant Factors for Leaders Policy Understanding**

### **2.4.1. Experience and Qualification**

Experience and qualification are required to increase roles of school principals to achieve goals of education and keep the pace of educational reform. Experienced school principals are expected to play the roles as for being an agent of policy implementation, they are considered as -goal achievement leader. A goal achievement leader is aimed at ensuring achievement of stated education policy goals and confirmation of students' academic achievements and ensures personal developments. A qualified and good administration is the key to the successful achievement of educational goals and objectives laid out in the national education policy and the policy is translated into action to ensure that children throughout a country are getting into school and receiving an education of a good quality as the (UNESCO, 2008) cited in Dano and Arfasa (2020).

### **2.4.2. School Leaders Readiness/Attitude, knowledge and Skill**

Readiness for change /policy was defined as a comprehensive attitude that is influenced simultaneously by the content, the process the context and the individuals involved Individual's readiness collectively reflects the extent to which a person is cognitively and emotionally inclined to accept and adopt a particular plan to purposefully alter the status quo and move forward. Readiness for change is a multidimensional construct influenced by beliefs among employees that (a) they are capable of implementing a proposed change, (b) the proposed change is appropriate for the organization, (c) the leaders are committed to the proposed change (i.e., management support), and (d) the proposed change is beneficial to organizational members (i.e.,

personal valence) ,as stated by Armenakis et (2007) cited in Ting, Dianne, Olivier & Chen (2020).

### **2.4.3. Training and Development**

Training is the systematic approach to affecting individuals' knowledge, skills, and attitudes in order to improve individual, team, and organizational effectiveness whereas ,development is systematic efforts affecting individuals' knowledge or skills for purposes of personal growth or future jobs or roles. School leaders must have the professional competence for the job, that is, the knowledge, skills together with desired attitudes and values in order to provide a sound direction to the school. Skilled and talented school leaders can make a substantial difference to various aspects of school organization, such as in terms of ownership and purpose in the way teachers handle their professional responsibilities, developing shared leadership and building collegiality, providing professional autonomy, developing professionally and helping teachers achieve job satisfaction as (Aguinis & Kraiger (2009) cited Govinda ( 2011).

School leaders need suitable managerial knowledge and skills to effectively carry out the main roles and responsibilities required of them. The relevant knowledge of the school leaders' work and management skills and competencies are vital in order to operate school organization successfully. School leaders are in the situation where most educational plans and policies are implemented and if they do not know how to effectively carry out their roles and responsibilities then surely children will ultimately suffer in their learning. For school leaders today, competence in managerial tasks is imperative for the purpose of achieving school development planning and other associated aspects related to school improvement. The training and development program, therefore helped to uplift the participants in terms of knowledge and skills to manage and lead their schools. The training and development program thus contributed positively towards school leaders' preparation for leading schools (Hallinger (2003 and West-Burnham (2009) cited Govinda (2011).

But, in the study area, the preexisting lack of relevant knowledge and skills of school leaders to effectively undertake managerial and administrative responsibilities are factors for non-implementation and understanding of education policy at school level.

#### **2.4.4. The Presence of Policy Related Documents /Materials**

Educational leaders must be knowledgeable about policy and policy document because in educational organizations, almost every function of the organization is dictated by policy that has both national and local ramifications. Policy at a national level sets out broad statements that define a particular stance and these governmental level policies, in turn, determine organizational level policies or require the development of such policies, especially in self-managed school systems (UNESCO (2013 cited in Cardno (2018)).

It is consequently implicit that educational leaders should understand what policy is and why it is important and they need to be able to look behind the policy to know what forces brought it into being; to tap into policy history to know how it was constructed; and most importantly, evaluate the way it is working to achieve its stated purposes. Policy in its simplest sense is a guideline for action that is underpinned by a belief system associated with a particular value set normally aligned with a political or ideological position (Stephenson, 2006).

According to Alexander (2013) educational leaders should consider the conditions they want to influence and change and the way in which policy can help them pursue a better world and /but, for educational leaders, policy can be means for change and this requires active engagement with policy from documentation to action. And, the above author-added and stated:

*The complexities of leadership are particularly apparent in education policy, where leadership takes several forms, from the teacher in the classroom to the principal of a building, to the administrators of a school district, to the school board members, to the policymakers at the state level or their peers in the federal government (p.2.)*

Everyone in a school is impacted by policy guidelines whether these are externally or internally determined. Leaders need to be aware of the demands created by external policy as they mediate between the external and the internal policy contexts. It is policy documentation that provides guidelines for practice and consequently policy documents need to be understood at a depth that enables capable action to ensue. Thus, educational leaders need skills that span the interpretation of purposes and recognition of the values that drive the policy; a critical appreciation of the construction and elements of the policy; and competent implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the policy in practice. Policy Implementation

## **2.5. Determinant Factors for Leaders Policy Implementation**

Challenges in policy implementation have their own causes rooted in lack of knowledge and capacity by policymakers, implementing institutions, ambitious goals, human and material requisites, commitments and personal interests, and lack of policy continuity (Gemechu, 2021).

Policy implementation encompasses actions by public and private individuals/ groups that are directed at the achievement of objectives set forth in prior policy decisions. It means that the effort to transform decisions into operational terms, and also the effort to achieve large and small changes, are mandated by policy decisions. Specifically, policy implementation is a relationship of concern among stake holders. In this study the policy implementation is tried to measure using the following variables as determinant factors.

### **2.5.1. Policy Objectives**

A major factor in the success of the implementer agency of education policy has been clarity of purpose and direction. To be served as a consensus and shared with other key stakeholders about policy objectives. The implementer's framed its education efforts as a social issue that needed to be better understood and addressed by everyone in promoting the belief that education reform was critical to a successful future for children(Richard, Williams & Eckardt,2012).

Policy objectives should be clearly identified and relevant to the problems for high opportunity of successful implementation and critically analysis the degree policy implementation success. It is better to see one by one. The clarity of policy objectives is important, resulting in the success of policy implementation and leading to a realistic and consistent outcome whereas the relevance of Policy is also important and requires as a basis for analysis by identifying correctly the causes of and possible solutions to the problems .The connectivity of social conditions and other conditions iscrucial for analysis in order to find the root cause of the problem and finally to find a solution (Chompucot ,2011).

### **2.5.2. Implementing Agency's Capability**

The implementing agency's capability is an important factor in terms of bringing effectiveness to policy implementation. The competence- implementing agency can bring effectiveness to policy implementation Under this, it is better to discuss about four points/variables .These are: Agency Collaboration: Collaboration or inter-dependency among government agencies is also

an important factor for implementation success because an agency may not possess all necessary resources. Agency collaboration is a concept derived from an open system, which stresses that an organization must interact with the environment in order to acquire the necessary resources (Kalz and Kahn, 1978 cited in Chompucot, 2011).

Different styles of leadership :( 1) Autocratic or Authoritarian Style: All decision-making powers are with the leaders. They do not take suggestions from subordinates. The autocratic management has been successful since it allows quick decision-making and provides motivation for the whole group. Decisions are kept to the leaders until they feel it is necessary to be shared with the group. (2) Participative or Democratic Style: The democratic leadership style favors the group's decision-making, with the leader giving instructions after consulting with them. This leadership style is effective in winning the co-operation and motivating the group. Some examples include: 1) Using an authoritarian style on new employees. The employees are motivated to learn a new skill. 2) Using a participative leadership style with a team of workers that knows its job. Since the leader does not have all the information, it is effective to let the team involve in the decision-making. 3) Using a laissez-faire or free rein style with workers knowing more about the job than a leader. This leadership style allows workers to take ownership of their job (Chompucot, 2011). .

The attitude of implementer plays an important role in the success or failure of the policy. People's personal value, beliefs, self-interest, and disposition directly impact policy implementation results as Edwards (1980) cited in Chompucot, 2011) stated. Therefore, for front-line implementer or street level bureaucrats that do the execution of the daily work, their compliance with the policy is crucial for policy implementation success. Regarding educational policy implementation, the teacher's attitude plays an important role in the student's success. Various studies have shown that teachers are influential figures in the learning environment. Therefore, teachers' positive attitude is one of the main factors that influence successful educational policy implementation, and it is important in supporting student's academic success as a positive role model.

Knowledge and skill of implementer's: In addition, there is no doubt that the knowledge and skills of the educational staff are vital to implementation success. Knowledge and skills, especially the latter, take time to build. It has been reported that the educational staff members in

the areas lack either managerial skills or skillful knowledge, or that there is an insufficient number of teachers to achieve the schools' goals.

### **2.5.3. Resources**

Policy resources are considered fundamental inputs for any policy implementation which include personnel, budget, infrastructure, and machinery and equipment. As a result, the adequacy of resources is necessary for successful implementation of policy. Financial resources are one of an important factor in order to implement successfully a policy, the implementer's need to be supplied with sufficient tools, including financial ones. For successful educational policy implementation, supporting resources need to be adequate. Schools may need additional financial support to run activities that are vital for students' achievement (Chompucot, 2011).

Whereas, high student performance depends on many capacity dimensions, it is technical resources, for example, a high-quality curriculum, books, and other instructional materials, assessment instruments, laboratory equipment, computers, and adequate work space. The others are human resources which are vital as part of the organization to successfully implement policy as another important factor that affects implementation effectiveness. As local officials, teachers are the closest persons to students in the schools. As a result, the sufficiency of government officials is important and necessary to bring about educational policy implementation success (2011)

### **2.5.4. Incentives**

Remunerative power is usually the most effective means of inducing in policy implementer's the willingness to achieve satisfactory standard of enforcement and compliance as the author-Pairote and Patranarakul (2003) stated. Sufficient incentives provided to policy implementer's will likely make them more willing to comply with government policy. Incentives can be in both monetary and non-monetary forms. Monetary incentives such as salary increments and rewards are important in helping governmental officials get their work well done. And Career Path development such as promotion and relocation, as well as other benefits, plays a key role in strengthening professional growth and skills, and has an impact on students.

### **2.5.5. Concern for Safety**

In policy implementation, the concern for safety can be a main factor that impacts the performance of policy implementer's if the safety issue is life threatening. According to Maslow's need-hierarchy theory (1943), employees have five levels of needs: physiological, safety, social, ego, and self-actualizing. Even though the lowest level of needs is satisfied, safety will be a critical aspect for those living in a life-threatening environment. MoE (2013) .School should be a safe place, free of crime and violence. But that's not always the case. Different Studies show that School Crime, victimization, fights, bullying, weapons, drugs, and alcohol are increasing. The study found that students aged 12-18 were more likely to be robbed in school, than away from school. One in 10 male high school students reported being threatened or injured with a weapon on school property in the past year. Almost one in four students reported the presence of gangs in their schools. And one-quarter of all high school students had been offered drugs on school property (MoE).

### **2.6. Major challenges of Educational Policy implementation**

As it is obvious, policy implementation is surrounded by countless problems and challenges. Hence, the researcher tried to review related with major factor that hinder the education and school policies.

Educational technology is defined as the use of technology and educational resources for teaching and learning. Technology can take the form of computer software and hardware, digital devices, platforms or any kind of digital tool aimed at facilitating learning. The subject interest of educational technology has often been set on contemporary or emerging educational technology tools, their learning potential and their efficient implementation in education settings (Player-Koro, 2012).

The study conducted on the role of ICT for education policy quality implementation by Panigrahi and Wagari (2013), the report revealed that the institutional readiness in capacity building and skilled manpower is not promising currently in relation to high skill gap. The ICT materials like plasma TV, internet laboratory, computers and specialized libraries for ICT are insufficient to students number and need .The plasma instruction is the high pacing of the program which makes the students dissatisfied sometimes disparate with the lesson since it is faster than the students understanding pace at all.

The major problems related to education policy implementation are:(1)Problems related to school management system (Lack of organization responsible for registered school's management system, school board lacks management skills , inadequacy in school buildings, and proper environment, government funding goes to schools and many teachers quit due to violence in the areas) and in the in the other way ,there are problems relate with curriculum problems (teaching-related problems ,different schools have different curricula ,inadequacy in teaching aids, laboratory, etc. teachers lack new knowledge and teaching skills (many skilled teachers leave schools due to frequent violence in the areas).

## **2.7. Summary of Literature Review**

The researcher has started reviewing of the concepts of educational policy in terms of its understanding and implementation .Education and school policy can be defined in different ways in different time by different researchers. Policy is defined as the road map to reach or realize the development goals as the national concepts. Policy is an action program directed towards the accomplishment of some intended or desired sets of goals (Terefe & Alemu, 2018).

Whereas School policies can thus be defined as instruments that give direction to the day-to-day operations of a school by guiding the behaviors of educators, learners and parents whilst clarifying the school's expectations. School policies provide the basis for the structures and organization of the school and are effective ways of communicating the core values that are inherent in a school's vision and mission statement. The following issues like school budgets, developmental priorities , school uniforms , code of conduct for learners , staff and parents , broad goals on the educational quality , school-community relations , the curriculum program or aspects are usually covered by school policies listed by Hanekom (1987) cited in MoE (2013) .

Policy understanding is a process to resolve ambiguity and manage uncertainty like the conflicting goals, an absence of measures to evaluate the success of the policy, and limited resources for enactment .In this study, the issues related to leaders policy understanding, that help as determinant factors are reviewed here below. Experience and qualification are required to increase roles of school principals to achieve goals of education and it is a key the successful achievement of educational goals and objectives laid out in the national education policy and the policy is translated into action to ensure that children throughout a country are getting into school



and receiving an education of a good quality as the (UNESOC, 2008) cited in Dano and Arfasa (2020).

Skilled and talented school leaders can make a substantial difference to various aspects of school organization, such as in terms of ownership and purpose in the way teachers handle their professional responsibilities, developing shared leadership and building collegiality, providing professional autonomy, developing professionally and helping teachers achieve job satisfaction as (Aguinis & Kraiger (2009) cited Govinda (2011).

Educational leaders must be knowledgeable about policy and policy document because in educational organizations, almost every function of the organization is dictated by policy that has both national and local ramifications. Policy at a national level sets out broad statements that define a particular stance and these governmental level policies, in turn, determine organizational level policies or require the development of such policies, especially in self-managed school systems (UNESCO (2013 cited in Cardno (2018).

Related to policy implementation, the top-down and bottom –up theory were reviewed. Top down perspectives assumes that policy implementation begins with central government decisions with clear policy objectives. In addition, it is also influenced by system theory, which supports the ideathat public policy is the input and policy implementation is the output. Whereas bottom up theory reflects as it has been established to argue against the top-down one. The bottom-up theory begins with those directly involved in policy implementation and suggests that local implementer's are those that bring the policy to successful implementation, and implementation depends onthe bargaining among local implements. The implementation works its way upward to find the goals, strategies, and contracts of those involved in executing the programs by Madani (2019) and Pülzl & Treib (2017).

Challenges in policy implementation have their own causes rooted in lack of knowledge and capacity by policymakers, implementing institutions, ambitious goals, human and material requisites, commitments and personal interests, and lack of policy continuity (Gemechu, 2021). With related to policy implementation, the status of policy objective clarity and relevance, the implementers agency capability as collaboration, leadership, attitude and knowledge, the educational resources, incentive and safety concern also revived for the purpose of discussion.



## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This part of the study was concerned with research methods, presented the research design, methods of data collection, population, sample and sampling techniques source of data, data gathering instrument, validity and reliability of tools, procedure of data collection, method of data analysis and ethical consideration.

#### **3.1. Research Design**

This study aimed at examining school leaders' policy understanding and implementation in east Gojjam administrative zone. As Johnson, & Christensen (2019) stated that in order to select the research design, there may be two major decisions: The decision to operate largely in one primary paradigm or not and the decision to conduct Qualitative and Quantitative components concurrently or sequentially. Then, the researcher had selected the (qual→ QUAN= sequential design) as indicated by the above authors as *"quantitative paradigm is emphasized and that a qualitative phase is followed sequentially by the quantitative phase"* (p.659). This was also indicated that the researcher used a mixed approach to offset the weaknesses inherent within either of the two approaches (quantitative & qualitative) and to triangulate the findings to arrive at sound conclusion.

#### **3.2. Sources of Data**

Both primary and secondary sources were used to gather relevant data. Based on the above assumptions, Secondary school head teachers, Principals, vice principals and supervisors were considered as unit of analysis and major source of data. Secondary sources of data were relevant documents, like school-based policy documents, reports and records.

#### **3.3. Population, Sample, and Sampling Techniques**

##### **3.3.1. Population of the study**

The target area for this study includes secondary school principals ,supervisors, department head teachers in e East Gojjam Administrative Zone .The researcher believes that they are the right sources of information on the policy understanding and implementation in the study area.

According to 2020/2021 school performance report of both the ANRS education Bureau and EGAZ education department inspection ,there are 70(seventy ) the secondary schools, which are classified

based on the school inspection standards and their level of performance as level- 1 (one), level -2(two) and level- 3(three). These are six secondary schools as the lower achiever, 55 secondary schools medium achiever and 9 secondary schools high achiever.

However, due to financial, time and other constraints, the participants of study were focused on nine wereda education offices which can have two or three levels of secondary schools. That means, the WEOs which did not have the level two or three schools are excluded, that means the school which must have at least level one and two or level one and three or level one, level two and level three schools. Then, according to the report ,there are only 33(thirty three) secondary schools which fill filed this criteria .These sample schools consisted 33(thirty three) principals ,49(forty nine) vice principals ,nine supervisors and 355 department head teachers which accounted 426 were acted as a total population of the study.

### **3.3.2. Samples and Sampling techniques**

Firstly ,all 29(88%) secondary schools ,29(88%) principals and 43(88%) vice principals as sample respondents were selected from the selected nine WEOs by using random sampling techniques based on the randomization table ( Krejcie and Morgan,1970):it was stated how to determining random samples from respective population with the confidence level of 95% and sampling error of 5 %.

The interviewees of the study were nine cluster supervisors which were selected by using compressive sampling, four principals and six vice principals were purposelessly selected. Finally, out of 355 (100%) secondary school department head teachers, 88(25%) were proportionally selected through stratified random sampling technique with the assumption that the number of sample teachers from each schools were proportional to the size of department head teachers in each secondary schools. After the size of sample department head teachers from each school was known, the selection of individual department teacher sample was conducted by using simple random sampling (lottery) techniques in order to provide equal chance for each department head teachers from their school.

To determine the total sample size of department head teachers to be drawn from the selected schools, the researchers used the formula of William (1977): For details information see appendix

$$P_s = (n/N)x$$

X=Number of department teacher in each school

$P_s$ = Proportional allocation to size

n=Total dept head teachers sample size of in each school (88)

N= Total number of dept head teachers in selected sample schools(355)

The study participants as respondent and interviewees and the sampling techniques that the researcher used presented in the table below.

**Table 3. 1: The Samples and Sampling Techniques of the Study**

Categories	Population	Participants	Sampling techniques	Participants
Weredas	19	9	Purposive	Respondents
Schools	33	33	Purposive	Respondents
Principals	33	29	Random	Respondents
Vice principals	49	43	Random	Respondents
Dept head	355	88	Stratified and then random	Respondents
Total	437	160		Respondents
principals		4	Principals which were not involved for questionnaires are selected purposelessly	Interviewees
Vice principals	49	6	Vice principals which were not involved for questionnaires are selected purposelessly	Interviewees
Supervisors	9	9	Comprehensive	Interviewees
<b>Total</b>		<b>19</b>		

### 3.4. Data Gathering Instruments

For obtaining relevant data, the researchers used primary data using closed and opened questionnaires, semi-structure interview and document investigation checklist. These can provides a precise means of

evaluating sample information and an appropriate data to illustrate conclusion about the generalization from a samples of the entire population (Crewell,2014).

The data were obtained from principals, vice principals and department head teachers through questionnaires and semi-structure interview and from document analysis through investigation checklist which were considered as important to triangulate the data and/or to combine the strengths of each instrument by minimizing their weakness.

### **3.4.1. Interview**

Interview was the first the main important data gathering instrument in this study. To collect the qualitative data from supervisors, principals and vice principals, a semi-structured interview protocol was used. After review of the related literature/ documents (by adopting the ANRSEB, 2002) and discussion with the adviser, the researcher prepared a semi-structured interview protocol. In first part of the interview protocol, respective participants were requested to provide some biographical information which included their name, academic and professional qualification; teaching and administrative experiences. In second part of the interview protocol, total eight questions and some sub questions were included related to conceptualization knowledge / skills of leaders about policies , the status of training and development program related to education policy ,the presences and availability of policy related documents and usages. They were also requested to give their suggestions that how a good leader understand and implement education policy. The interview question was discussed with the interviewee in Amharic language to reduce communication barriers and gets more information.

### **3.4.2. Questionnaire**

The other important data collecting instrument employed in this study was questionnaire, it is the most widely used types of instrument in educational research (Crewell, 2014). The questionnaire consists of both open and close ended items prepared by partially adopting and modifying found from free online- Study of education policy and Instructional Improvement Survey Services Lab (University of Michigan,2001) and the secondary school inspection guideline ( ANRSEB,2002). Responses from participants were taken by using Likert Scale method of rating and the respondents were expressed their degree of agreement and distributed for principals, vice principals and department head teachers. Open ended questions were included because; it gives freedoms to respondents to provide their extended views on the issue.

### **3.4.3. Document Analysis**

In addition to semi-structure interview and questionnaires, document analysis was the other instrument of data for the study. The information obtained from official documents using format or through observation checklist were more valid and more reliable than other information gathered through other means (Best and Kahn, 2005). Thus, the researcher developed an investigation checklist by adopting ANRSEB (2002) inspection guideline, because it asks the school leaders to have and show all policy related document that used for a day to day activities as guidance. The researcher reviewed different documents and assess the presences of policies and related documents like frameworks, blueprints, guidelines, the proclamations and inspection reports.

### **3.5. Data Collection Procedure**

Before distributing the questionnaires, asking the interview and investigating the documents from different offices, the researcher asked formal permission paper from the department of educational planning and management (EDPM) and had visited the letter to EGAZ education department and discussed the purpose of the Study .Then, the asked the ZED to write a letter of recommendation to WEOs and secondary schools. The researcher also visited the participants and discussed the purpose of the research by showing the letters to create awareness about the objectives of the study and gave directions how to the questionnaires was completed and interview conducted .Document analysis was also completed held with officials based on the outlined schedules

### **3.6. Validity and reliability Check**

Before starting a full scale data collection process, the researcher tried to check the validity and reliability of instrument. First the researcher, prepared self-developed interview protocol for interviewee (supervisors, vice and principals) was validated by experts' opinions. After development of interview protocol, it was presented to the adviser .Some ambiguities in the format, sequence and language of the items were pointed out and improved the instrument. These were discussed with experts and improved the instrument accordingly. The pilot interview itself was done with the provisional schedule and it lasted for a span of time from 20 - 40 minutes among Enebsie Sarmider Woreda education office secondary schools two supervisors, two principals and two vice principals. Majority of the questions were clear except some of the probes for questions.

Second ,to ensure validity, the researcher developed and partially adopted the questionnaire under close guidance of the adviser .The purpose of the pilot test is to check if the design of the questionnaire works in practice, and to identify and adjust problematic questions and also to refine the questionnaire (Kothari, 2004). Thus, the researcher was performed pilot survey of the designed questionnaires on one government secondary schools before administering the main questionnaires to the sample respondents. Then, its reliability of the tools as a pilot study was carried out at Sarmider cluster schools; which was found in Enebsie Sarmider Wereda/district for three principal, six vice principals ,one supervisor ,ten department head teachers which accounted 20(twenty) which were not included in this study. To these effect 20 questionnaires was distributed for purposelessly selected respondents. After this, to measure the reliability of the questionnaire, Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was calculated for all parts of the questionnaire. Concerning the acceptance level of Cronbach’s alpha results Cohen et al. (2007), suggested to use the alpha coefficient results on the basis of the following guidelines: >0.90=Very high reliable; 0.80–0.89=Highly reliable; 0.70– 0.79=Reliable; 0.60–0.69=Marginally reliable; and <0.60=Lowly reliable or unacceptable. Accordingly, the reliability measured through Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for all items found one table-3.2 below.

**Table 3. 2: The Reliability Measured through Cronbach’s alpha coefficient**

No	Variables	No of items	Cronbach’s alpha	Decision
1	Policy objective clarity and relevance	7	0.806	Highly reliable
2	Policy implementing agency’s capability	15	0.829	Highly reliable
3	Educational resource availability	5	0.837	Highly reliable
4	Availability of incentives	3	0.767	Reliable
5	Availability of safety Concern	3	0.852	Highly reliable
6	Major challenges of policy implementation	10	0.764	
	Total	43	0.809	Highly reliable

### 3.7. Method of data analysis

Before the collected data were edited, narrated coded, classified and tabulate, the researcher tried to check the normality (normal distribution) of data. The data analysis techniques were both qualitative and quantitative approach. The collected qualitative data of the interviewees was performed through



thematic analysis method, and then the data collected from respondents through the questionnaire, was checked and organized for tabulation. The tabulation of the data was made using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS-V26) software. Then, the tabulated data was analyzed and interpreted using descriptive statistics like percentage and item mean, inferential statistics like one sample t- test were used to analyze the given data. In addition, direct quotations of the respondents' views from open ended and interview were used to enhance credibility and authenticity of findings.

### **3.8. Ethical Considerations**

The researcher has firstly shown the full respect ion to the all respondents and interviewees by asking the permission and willingness to fill and respond the instrument before disgusting. This study was conducted on leaders' policy understanding and implementation and all information from participants were only used for research purpose. Considerable effects were made to keep participants anonymous and maintain the maximum confidentiality. Overall each and every source that was used in the study under investigation was acknowledged.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **PRESENTATION, ANNALYSIS AND INTERPRETETION OF DATA**

This section deals with presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data collected from interviewees, respondents and different documents through interviews, questionnaires item questions and investigation checklists respectively to answer the specific objectives. About 96 % of the interview questions and 97% of dispatched 44(forty four) closed ended and three open ended questions were returned. The rating scale used for the study were; Very Low, Low, Medium, High, Very high and four discussion purpose the researcher used the rating scales as VL=Very Low=(1.0-1.85),L=Low=(1.86-2.60),M=Moderate =(2.61-.3.40), H=High=(3.41-4.20) and VH=Very High=(4.21-5.0).Respondent. The data obtained from all sources were organized, analyzed and discussed in the following manner.

The chapter began with a description of the characteristics of the participants and went through the analysis of responses regarding to leader's understanding, implementation, and factors hindering of policy implementation.

#### **4.1. Demographic Characteristics of the Participants**

This section explains the demographic characteristics of the respondents and interviewees which are detailed in table 4.1(a) and 4.1(b) respectively on gender, age, educational level, professions (educational background), and work experiences.

**Table 4. 1 (a) the Characteristics of Respondents (Sex, age, services, education qualification)**

Variables	Categories	SP (n=29)		SVP (n=43)		DHT(n=88)		Total( n=160)	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Sex	Male	28	96	38	88	76	86	142	89
	Female	1	4	5	12	12	14	18	11
Age in Years	20-30	8	28	6	14	14	16	28	18
	31-40	17	59	20	47	37	42	74	46
	> 40	4	13	17	39	37	42	58	36
Experience in current position	1-5 years	3		42		12		57	35
	6-10years	16		1		24			25
	11-15 years	8		-		36		44	28
	16 -20years	2		-		13		15	9
	>20	-		-		5		5	3
Academic qualification	MA/MSc	24		41		73		138	86
	BA/BSc.	5		2		15		22	14
Professional background	Subject	21		40				21	13
	EdPM/SL	8		3		88		139	87

As shown in the table 4.1(a), the item 1-gender characteristics of the respondent indicated that males made up 89 percent while females made up 11% of the total respondents. It can be concluded that more males worked in executive positions than females in secondary schools. Referring to table 4.1(a), the ages were classified into three groups: age 20-30, age 31-40, age 41 and over and accounted for 28(18%), 74(46%), 38(36%) respectively. The average age of respondents was 46.0, with 24 as the youngest and 65 the oldest. The very young and over sixty years of age group referred to directors of private schools. The age information also suggested that the young generation was moving up to take executive positions.

As indicated the item 3 of table 4.1(a), the educational statistics of the respondents reveal that about 14 percent of them received a bachelor degree, and almost 86% received a master degree. The respondents school principal, specially suggested that a few only six (8%) of those in executive positions at the schools earned at least a bachelor degree, with almost all 66(92%) of them earning a master degree. This also implies that those in the schools' executive positions realized the importance of a higher education. This is in line with the school leaders (directors and supervisors) number -43/2001 and 31/2010 –recruitment, selection and assigning guidelines as indicated that the educational level of secondary school leaders should be the 2<sup>nd</sup> degree (be at the first priority).

As item 4 of the above table 4.1(a), indicated, the professions (background of the education) of school leaders: 85 % of school principals and vice principals have the 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> degree in teaching (academic and non-academic subject), but only 15% of them have the 2<sup>nd</sup> degree in educational planning and management or school leadership.

**Table 4. 2 (b) the Characteristics of Interviewees(Sex, age, services, education qualification)**

Categories			SVp (n=6)		P (n=9)		SP r (n=4)		Total (n=19)	
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Sex	Male		4	60	8	100	4	100	16	89.50
	Female		2	40	-	-	-	-	2	9.5
Age	31-40		4	60	3	38	2	100	9	50
	41-50		2	40	5	62	2	50	9	50
Experience in Leading	1-2		4	60	2	25	1	25	7	39
	3-5		2	40	2	25	1	25	5	28
	>5		-		4	50	1	25	5	28
Experience in Teaching	1-5		-				1	25	1	5
	6-10		2	33	3	38	1	25	6	33
	11-15		2	33	3	38	1	25	6	33
	15-20		2	34	2	24	2	50	6	34
Educational qualification	EDPM/SL	MSc	1	17	3	38		25	5	28
	Subject	MSc	5	83	5	62	3	75	13	72

Note: SVP =School Vice principals, CS=Cluster supervisors, SP r=school principals and n=umber of Respondents

As shown in the table **4.2(b)**, the item 1-gender characteristics of the respondent indicated that males made up 89.5 percent while females made up 9.5% of the total respondents. It can be concluded that more males worked in executive positions than females in secondary schools. Referring to table **4.2(b)**, the ages were classified into two groups: age 31-40 and age 41-50 accounted for 9(50%) and 9(50%) respectively.

The rest demographic statistics data (table 4.2(b) item 3 & &) about educational qualification, background, professional services of the interviewees will be discussed the next section 4.1.2.

## 4.2. School Leaders' Policy Understanding

To answer the research question posed at chapter one of the study, the researcher tried to collect data through interview from school principals, vice principals and supervisors. After the process of interviews, the researcher has coded, categorized, and interpreted thematically here bellow as follow.

### 4.2.1. Conceptualization of Education and School Policies

In order investigate leaders' policy understanding, about seven questions were posed. The first on was about defining what education policy and school policy are meant. Hence, the majority of interviewees have tried to define both education and school policy based on their understanding. The researcher tried to check their know-how and concepts with regards what has been defined and described as education and school policies in all of the interviewees. The definition set in each participant has more difference than similarities. Some of the explanation about policy: *"it is a predetermined document that is prepared to responded single action in given situation" [ISP1]*. The other say about it as *"I do not know, is there school policies? I cannot define. But, education policy is a general guide line" [IVSP3]*.

The majority of the participants and their description/ definition they have given are quite different from education policy: *"education policy may mean collection of laws and rules that govern the operation of education systems"* MoE (2013, p.21). To deepen the research finding, the researcher asked the interviewees to list out the common and mandatory school policies which are found in their schools with their respective definitions. The majorities of participants were not remembering and describing about them. Some of them, for example, tried to explain as *"I am not sure, they may be PTAs and KETB, what mandatory school policies!! No more explain about it, I am fresh, to tell the truth, no one has informed me specifically" [ICSP-4]*. Here above, the parts school based management bodies and their members, like PTAs, and KETB considered as mandatory school policies.

From the given lists and ideas, it is possible to grasp that the school leaders have critical problem in describing, listing and remembering of the common mandatory school policies, because the above lists that the participants have reflected is quite different from the realities.

According to the MoE(2013),some of the mandatory school policies *"...school attendance policy ,dressing uniform policy ,cells phone ,leaving school during the school day, healthy service pupil*

*discipline, registration of pupils, sex and relationships education, special educational needs, staff appraisal, staff discipline and grievance, etc”(p,26). But, as educational leaders, they must have a clear understanding of any kinds of policies. As it is stated by MoE (2003) “the rationale behind all school policies is to effectively achieve the national and local goals of education .Therefore, to run schools effectively it is necessary to have an understanding of the available school policies” (P.26).*

Besides, for further investigating of the finding, the participant had been again invited the questions to explain how they conceptualized the education in terms of their objectives, programs, projects and school vision, mission and value that helped them managing the day to day activities. The majority of the interviewees have critical problem in conceptualizing and defining education and school policies, they did not remember different programs and projects implemented with their respective schools.

Some of saying regards, for example, pointing out as follow:

*Now, I am trying to manage my schools blindly, because, I did not know anything about education policy in general and school policy in particular. I faced plenty of difficulty in setting schools vision, mission, goals, values, and objectives. Besides, I am also suffering to build professional school learning community. As a school head I do not know about what a leader is supposed to be doing. I do not know how I was picked to take up such a responsibility. To tell the truth, I am targeted on salary rather the profession, I have always preferred to teach my subject” [ISP-3].*

Then from the above data, it is possible to grasp that the school leaders have no readiness, knowledge and skills to understand the education policy and school policies, so as they reflected that no readiness to know what they are expected from them: “ *I am targeted on salary rather ... preferred to teaching my subject” [ICSP5, ISP3 and IVSPI]. From this, one can infer that leaders in the study area have less understanding of the education and school policies, because of having less knowledge , skill and readiness to conceptualize .This is in consistent with , “the capacity to understand , plan, manage and monitor the education system demands knowledge and skill”(p.26) as discussed by the Drafting Road Map(MoE,2018).*

And, it is also in lined with the finding of Wang, Olivier & Chen( 2020) summarized as “*readiness for change/policy is a multidimensional construct influenced by beliefs among employees; the leaders who had the higher the readiness, they were be able to understand and capable of implementing the proposed change with its time bounded” (p.67).*

Then ,the researcher can interpret based on the analysis and narration here above ,the majority of school leaders have less understanding of the education and school policies because of their less readiness for leadership position, inadequate knowledge and skill about the policy and management skill.

#### **4.2.2. Demographic Profiles of Participants and Policy Understanding**

The researcher tried to categorize the data based on the demographic profiles, the educational qualification, the department they came from and the experience. Similar question posed for interviewees like defining, explaining, listing and remembering the education and school policies, to investigate their conceptualizations.

The majority of the participants have not been well experienced in leading schools well, not assigned based on their department, school leadership or EDPM they have. Some of them ,for example ,pointed as: “ I have 2nd degree in mathematics, and experienced only one year in leading school [starting this year,September,2022], so as I cannot define and explain the policy well ”[ISVP-6] .Besides ,the same finding again reflected as

*“Dear brother [referring me] I am not experienced and informed a lot, the department I came from is Biology, not from leadership or EDPM. To tell the truth as I said before I was trained to teach inside the classroom for lasted 13 years, know nothing about policy and school management because I was never been introduced or at least to have a bit of knowledge about policy from informal meeting. I tell that I could not do a lot of things for my school because of not knowing them” [ISpr4].*

From the finding here above reveal that the school leaders are not experienced in leading school. This also hinders them for their policy understanding and implementation. Their experience they had, the department they came from, the educational background they specialized before loss leaders to have a clear conceptualization of policy for managing schools.

As it is observed the data from the table 4.2(b), item 3 and 4, the educational qualification and background and professional services statistics of the interviewees reveal that 100% of them had received have 2nd degree of bachelor of Art in BSc/MA. But, only 23 % of the participant have been specialized in educational planning and management or school leadership and in educational planning and management or school leadership and 28 % of them have been experienced for only five years and below in leading and administrating of their respective schools.



The statistical finding about the demographic profiles of school leaders were not found in with what school leaders -recruitment, selection and assigning guidelines (31/2010) has ordered as *“The participants in pre- and post-selection and recruitment of school leaders will at least full fill the educational qualification of 2<sup>nd</sup> degree, the 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> in EdPM /SL, the minimum five and above year experience in teaching”* (PP.25-26).

By supporting the above data of ISPr4, other participants had pointed out as follow: *“I came from the department chemistry, to lead the school .I am not be able to manage professionally, nothing know about policy, I need professional support”* [IVSP5].

However, the data found in small participants, for example are presented as *“that is good, as I am a school leader and master’s degree holder in school leadership, I can define and list them, Policy is a principle or protocol...I can also remember and describing the school mandatory policy that I have respected and used to guide decisions to achieve an intended outcomes”* [ICSP6].

From the above finding, the majority of interviewees reveal that their professional experience, the department they came from, their educational qualification hinders them for policy understanding and managing schools. They reflected that no one as professional expert assess their needs and support to fill any education and school policy gab that hinders them. This discussion is in consistent that experience and qualification are factors requiring for increasing roles of school principals to understand the education policy and achieve goals. But, inexperienced school principals are not expected to conceptualize the policy and to play the roles as for being an agent of policy implementation (Dano and Arfasa (2020).

#### **4.2.3. Support System and Policy Related Document and Policy Understanding**

In this section the short and long term training and policy related document availability, the responses of interview had been presented, analyzed/ narrated and discussed here bellow.

The majority of the participant who involved in this study supported that the absences of policy related training and documents. One of the interviews had reflected as *“yes, it is nice meeting ,if you be able to inform to the responsible bodies.no orientation ,no training ,no guide line ,even the inspection group had not tried to assess our need”*[ICSP 2]

From this data obtained from [ICSP2], one can grasp that school leaders have a critical problem in understanding and explaining education and school policy because of the policy-related training they involved, the administrative experiences they had been spent in.

This is in opposite to what the ministry of education tried to recommend as school leaders have to be developed before and after appointment to school leadership (MoE, 2002) and it is consistent with the finding as recommended (Demie, Engidasew, Basha & Hundessa (2021) “school leaders can only become school leaders if they have a Credential in school leadership before they posted in the position”.

One exceptional point reflected that as *“I am master holder in EDPM. I was a principal and served for seven years, and released/turned out before two years ago, and have joined when the top up wage was increased. And I have involved in different policy-related training to improve policy understanding then can define the education and school policy well”* [ICSP7].

#### **4.2.4. Data from Document Investigation Checklist**

The researcher tried to obtain information from different official documents of the WEOs, cluster center and school offices, through observation checklist/formats prepared before. He did not observe any availability of policy-related documents which must be required to be found in any schools as the MoE (2002) school inspection framework recommended like different frameworks, blueprints, guidelines, the proclamations documents and other records. But, reports like inspection performance, SIP and CPD framework were found. Without referring the different policy documents as a guideline, it is difficult to run and manage the schools as it is forwarded by MoE (2013) *“Document as a Policy framework is a tool, or road map, that anyone can use to guide policy in ways that will improve the health, learning, and economic outcomes”* (p.25).

Everyone in a school must be guided by policy guidelines, need to be aware of the policies, in order, there must be policy documentation that provides guidelines for practice and consequently policy documents need to be understood at a depth that enables capable action to ensue as summarized by Cardno (2018).

Therefore, the finding which investigated from policy-related documents reveal, that, the absence of related policy documents in the study area be able to be a factor for lack of leaders' policy understanding in their respective schools.

### 4.3. Leaders Policy Implementation

Whatever we prepared golden policy what it matters is its effective implementation at the ground. Due to this, the researcher wanted to know about the level of policy implementation. To achieve this objective he has collected data from school leaders (principals and vice principals) and the data were analyzed using one sample t-test.

**Table 4. 3 Policy Objective (One-Sample test) N=156**

No	Items	GM	SD	TV	T	Sig.
1	Policy objective Clarity	2.36	0.61	3.5	-23.26	0.00
2	Policy objective Relevance	2.67	0.69	3.5	-23.41	0.00

*Note:* VL=Very Low= (1.0-1.85), L=Low= (1.86-2.60), M=Moderate = (2.61-.3.40), H=High= (3.41-4.20) and VH=Very High= (4.21-5.0), GM=Grand Mean, SD=Standard Deviation, TV=Test Value, at  $P < 0.05$ =statistically significant

As the table 4.3, item-1 indicated, a one -sample t-test was to determine for the policy objective clarity .The result shows that the mean score (2.36) is significantly lower than the test value (3.5) at  $t = -23.26$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ).This implies that schools are not effectively engaged in education policy objectives clarity by policy implementer's. Besides, the item-2 in the above table 4.3 ,as the results of one sample t-test was to determine for policy objective relevance shows that the mean score(2.67) is significantly lower than the test value (3.5) at  $t = -23.41$ , $p < 0.5$ ) .This also implies that secondary schools are not engaged in educational policy objective relevance by policy implementer's. The commutative results indicated that policy objective in terms of its clarity and relevant are to be able to responsible for- non implementation of education and school policies in the study area.

**Table 4. 4: Implementing Agency’s Capacity (One -Sample test) N=156**

No	Items	GM	SD	TV	T	Sig.
1	Collaboration	2.93	0.59	3.5	-11.92	0.00
2	Leadership style	2.47	0.49	3.5	-25.92	0.00
3	Attitude	2.49	0.63	3.5	-19.73	0.00
4	Knowledge	2.27	0.76	3.5	-20.14	0.00

Note: VL=Very Low= (1.0-1.85), L=Low= (1.86-2.60),M=Moderate =(2.61-.3.40), H=High=(3.41-4.20) and VH=Very High=(4.21-5.0),GM=Grand Mean, SD=Standard Deviation, TV=Test Value, at  $P<0.05$ =statistically significant

As the table 4.4, item-1 indicated, and a one -sample t-test was to determine for the collaboration of policy implementer's. The result shows that the mean score (2.93) is significantly lower than the test value (3.5) at  $t=-11.92$ ,  $p<0.05$ ).This implies that schools are not effectively engaged in a collaboration work among policy implementer’s.

Education is an open organization the lack of cooperation among different organs of government hamper the overall organization and implementation of policy (Ali, 2006, p.7).

In the other way, the item-2 in the above table 4.4, as the results of one sample t-test was to determine for leadership style shows that the mean score (2.47) is significantly lower than the test value (3.5) at  $t=-25.92$ ,  $p<0.5$  ).This also implies that secondary schools leaders are not engaged leadership style to implement education and school policy.

And as the data in the table 4.4, item-3 indicated that the computed one –sample t-test result shows that the mean score (2.49) is significantly lower than the test value (3.5) at  $t= -19.73$ ,  $p<0.05$ ).This also implies that schools have not empowered staffs to improve attitude for implementing policy activities. Besides, the item-4 of table 4.4, the computed one-sample t-test result shows the mean score (2.27) is lower than the test value (3.5) at  $t=-20.14$ ,  $p<0.05$ ).This implies that schools are not engaged in improving implementer s knowledge for policy implementation.

Moreover the researcher tried to narrate the information gained from open ended questions of implementing agency capability as follow: There is lack knowledgeable and skill of teachers especially in language department and resulted less encouragement and supporting of school leader by different aspects. This is in consistent with the finding of (2009), the shortage of skilled manpower as a critical challenge of educational policy implementation.

As the Chompucot (2011) had assured as *“There is no doubt that the knowledge and skills of the educational staff are vital to implementation educational policy successfully”* (p.57). Because his explanation he also added that *“the educational staff in the areas must possess, technical knowledge, skills and understanding of the local culture, the environment and the policy as a whole”* (p.58).

Therefore, the discussion here above, the cumulative result shows that schools are not engaged in improving implementer's agency's capability in terms of collaboration, leadership, attitude and knowledge for better policy performance.

**Table 4. 5: Availability of Educational Resources (One -Sample test) N=156**

Items		GM	SD	TV	T	Sig.
Availability of educational Resources		2.22	0.95	3.5	-16.718	0.00

*Note:* VL=Very Low= (1.0-1.85), L=Low= (1.86-2.60), M=Moderate = (2.61-.3.40), H=High= (3.41-4.20) and VH=Very High= (4.21-5.0), GM=Grand Mean, SD=Standard Deviation, TV=Test Value, at  $P < 0.05$ =statistically significant

As the table 4.5, indicated, a one -sample t-test was to determine for the availability of educational resources .The result shows that the mean score (2.22) is significantly lower than the test value (3.5) at  $t = -16.718$ ,  $p < 0.05$ . This implies that schools are not supplied with adequate educational resource for policy implementation.

Besides, the researcher tried to narrate the information gained from respondents through open ended questions as follow. The financial management of the school is that much functional because its transactions did not record on the relevant document and check to any concerned bodies, which leads for corruption. Some schools did not have adequate technical resources like

internet access due to electric power, ICT rooms and apparatus, especially schools found in rural area.

Both financial and technical resources along with quality human resources are key factors that contribute to the proper implementation of any policy, particularly if a policy requires the creation of new structures and the hiring of new personnel (Sabatier & Mazmanian, 1983) cited in (Ali, 2006, p.7).

Low education funding is thus considered a major obstacle in realizing the implementation targets of education policy in Pakistan. Furthermore, there is a gap between allocated and actual expenditures on education, as

**Table 4. 6: Availability of Safety Concern (One -Sample test) N=156**

Items	GM	SD	TV	T	Sig.
Availability of Safety Concerns	2.55	0.72	3.5	-16.24	0.00

*Note:* VL=Very Low= (1.0-1.85), L=Low= (1.86-2.60), M=Moderate = (2.61-.3.40), H=High= (3.41-4.20) and VH=Very High= (4.21-5.0), GM=Grand Mean, SD=Standard Deviation, TV=Test Value, at  $P < 0.05$ =statistically significant

As the table 4.6, indicated, a one -sample t-test was to determine for the availability of safety concern .The result shows that the mean score (2.55) is significantly lower than the test value (3.5) at  $t = -16.24, p < 0.05$ ).This implies that schools are not secured for the staffs.

Besides, the researcher tried to narrate the information gained from respondents through open ended questions as follow. As school leaders confirmed that school staffs have freedom in school compound and work day .But, sometimes the violence related to female students has happened by different bodies in and out of schools and be able to an obstacle for students learning and the community trust by schools.

**Table 4. 7: Availability of Incentive Concerns (One -Sample test) N=156**

Items	GM	SD	TV	T	Sig.
Availability of Safety Concerns	2.32	.62	3.5	-23.35	0.00

*Note:* VL=Very Low= (1.0-1.85), L=Low= (1.86-2.60), M=Moderate = (2.61-.3.40), H=High= (3.41-4.20) and VH=Very High= (4.21-5.0), GM=Grand Mean, SD=Standard Deviation, TV=Test Value, at  $P<0.05$ =statistically significant

As the table 4.7, indicated, a one -sample t-test was to determine for the availability of incentive concern .The result shows that the mean score (2.32) is significantly lower than the test value (3.5) at  $t=-23.35$ ,  $p<0.05$ ).This implies that schools are not encouraged the staff incentives’.

#### **4.4. The Major Challenges Hindering policy implementation**

As it is obvious, policy implementation is surrounded by countless problems and challenges. Hence, to identify those expected challenges, the researcher collected data from department heads, school principals, and vice principals. After introducing the objective of the study to the respondents, the researcher invites respondents to respond on the challenges that embed the proper implementation of policy in their setting. Therefore, as responded by the respondents, the major hindering challenges were here bellow.

**Table 4. 8: The Challenges Facing that Hindering of Policy Implementation**

No	Items	Mean	SD	Rank
1	Lack of knowledge and skill related to policy	7.39	2.99	1
2	Lack of short and long term training support	6.38	2.10	2
3	Non reliability of data and absences of policy related documents	6.09	2.26	3
4	Insufficient students income and Economic condition	6.06	2.19	4
5	Lack of Educational Technology and Facilities	5.73	2.85	5
6	Turnover of staffs and students absenteeism	5.58	2.54	6
7	Corruption	5.00	3.06	7
8	Poor political and conducive working environment	4.70	2.25	8
9	Lack of Funding and resources Support	4.37	2.10	9

As the data in table 4.13 shows, respondents were asked to rank the major challenges facing that hinder policy implementation in schools. Consequently, Lack of knowledge and skill related to policy for leaders and staff members to understand the overall education policy and to as a guidelines in day to day activities in the organization was ranked 1<sup>st</sup> by mean score of (M=7.3937) or 73% (118) of the total respondents. Lack of short and long term training support was ranked by means scores of (M=6.387540) or 63% (102) of the majority respondents as the 2nd challenge or factors for non – implementation of educational policy in the school. Non reliability of data and absences of policy related documents by its mean score of (M=6.0687) or 60% of respondents for education was ranked the 3rd factor for non –implementation of policy in school. Insufficient students income and Economic condition by its mean score (5.7375) or 57% of respondents was ranked forth became the 4<sup>th</sup>. Besides, Lack of Educational Technology and Facilities; Turnover of staffs and students absenteeism, Corruption, Poor political and conducive working environment and Lack of Funding and resources Support to support schooling and poor political environment (the current issues of the country) 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> respectively.

In addition to rank order, the data obtained from open-ended questions and interviews were also presented to the respondents in order to help them write their responses to the item the way they think. So for question major factors affecting policy implementation , the respondents said that the reasons why policy are not implemented well as follows:(a) Good management /leadership of schools: the



majority respondents agreed that the schools' management of teachers both in quality and quantity has become an issue. Some teachers are not skillful in their profession; some are not good in using the medium of language, and making the quality of the teachers in the schools is a main issue. In terms of the quantity of teachers in some subject areas like history, technical drawing, the sufficiency of quality teachers is still a problem for schools found in rural areas. (b) Resources: Insufficient resources have been an issue for schools. For example, many classroom buildings are old and need improvement for the best teaching quality, and modern teaching materials are also needed. Lack of sufficient resources for local implementer (schools) could mean a lack of competitiveness even if recently, urban school parents have better understood the importance of school resource for their student's academic improvement. (c) Community participation / Parenting of children. Many parents, especially those in the rural areas, find themselves not having enough time to care for their children, especially in terms of education. Strong parental support in their schools can result in better performance of the students.

## CHAPER FIVE

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the analysis and interpretation of the data gathered from questionnaires, interviews and document analysis, the following summary, conclusions and recommendations were made.

#### 5.1. Summary

On the base of the three specific objectives and the major result obtained, the researcher had tried to summarize here bellow.

##### 5.1.1. Leaders' Policy Understanding

To answer the research question posed at chapter one of the study, the researcher tried to collect data through interview from school principals, vice principals and supervisors. After the process of interviews, the researcher has coded, categorized, and interpreted thematically here bellow as follow.

##### 5.1.1.1. Conceptualization of Education and School Policies

In order to check whether leaders have a clear understanding or not, different questions related to education policy and their know-how, skills and knowledge were posted for school leaders. The qualitative data, which regard in describing, defining, remembering about educational and school policies issues were less what must be expected from the participants as they are school leaders.

The majority participants did not have clear concepts and skills about their profession for leading schools concepts, with the exception ,only small participants are be able to have the knowledge in defining ,explaining and answering the majority of interview questions as “ *I have learn t about education policy ,then I can define it ,nothing is difficult to me regarding policy in leading my school*” [ICSP7].

Then ,the researcher was going to summarize based on the this discussion points that here above ,the school leaders in the study area have less understanding of the education and school policies because of their less readiness for leadership poison, inadequate knowledge and skill about the policy and management skill.

### ***5.1.1.2. Demographic Profiles of Participants and Policy Understanding***

Based on finding ,found from the demographic profile statistics, and the qualitative data ,it revealed that the majority of participants have joined in school leadership from less experience they have in leading schools and teaching subjects ,the department they came from were not EDPM and school leadership.

From the finding here above reveal that the school leaders are not experienced in leading school. This also hinders them for their policy understanding and implementation. Their experience they had, the department they came from, the educational background they specialized before loss leaders to have a clear conceptualization of policy for managing schools.

### **5.1.1.3. Support System and Policy Related Document and Policy Understanding**

The majority of the participant who involved in this study supported that the absences of policy related training and documents. One of the interviews had reflected as “yes, it is nice meeting ,if you be able to inform to the responsible bodies.no orientation ,no training ,no guide line ,even the inspection group had not tried to assess our need”[ICSP 2]

School leaders have critical problems in understanding and explaining education and school policy because of lack policy related training they involved, the administrative experiences they had been spent in. This is in opposite that what the ministry of education tried to recommend as school leaders have to be developed before and after appointment to school leadership (MoE, 2002) and it is consistent with the finding as recommended (Demie, Engidasew, Basha & Hundessa (2021) “school leaders can only become school leaders if they have a Credential in school leadership before they posted the in position”.

Therefore, the absences of short and long term training, the school leaders involved in the study area, the absences of facilitators in assessing the training needs, school leaders in the study area were factors to be responsible for less policy understanding in their work environments.

### **5.1.2. Level of Leaders Policy Implementation**

Whatever we prepared golden policy what it matters is its effective implementation at the ground. To answer the second objective, the collected data have been analysis using mean, grand mean, one – sample and independent sample T-test and interpret here above ,and the can be summarize below.

#### **5.1.2.1. Policy objectives in term Clarity and Relevance**

Both the finding of policy clarity and relevance resulted below the expected value as their one sample t-test shows ( $t=-12.48$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) and ( $t=-12.85$ ,  $p<0.5$ ) respectively. These imply that schools in the study area were not engaged in improving the clarity and relevance of education and school policies among staff members.

#### **5.1.2.2. Implementing Agency's Capability**

The capabilities of policy implementing agencies like collaboration, leadership style, attitude and knowledge are found also below the expectation test value. These imply that schools in the study area are not effectively engaged in a collaboration work among policy implementer's, used appropriated leadership, and encouraged staffs members attitude and knowledge for policy implementation.

#### **5.1.2.3. Availability of Educational Resources**

The finding of the availability of educational resources , a one -sample t-test report shows is significantly lower than the expected test value .This implies that schools are not supplied with adequate educational resource for policy implementation. Besides, the finding from qualitative data indicated that there is low financial resource management in addition to its scarcity, in adequate human resource in kind as well as in number, especially, English language teachers. This might affect language policy implementation.

#### **5.1.2.4. Safety Concern for Policy Implementation**

Coming to the safety concern ,the finding in terms its one sample t-test ( $t=-4.5$ ,  $p=.065$  at alpha value=.05) indicated that the issue in study area was rated below the expected averaged ,which means it was considered as a factor for non-implementation rather it might be responsible as positive factor.

#### **5.1.2.5. Incentive Concern for Policy Implementation**

Regarding to incentives, the researcher tried to compute using one sample t-test, the result shows (of  $t=-3.93$  and  $p=.055$  at alpha value=.05).This indicated that the incentive concern was rated below the expected test value. This might be responsible as factor for non-policy implementation.

### **5.1.3. Major Challenges Hindering policy implementation**

As it is obvious, policy implementation is surrounded by countless problems and challenges. Hence, to answer the forth study objective and to identify those expected challenges, the researcher collected data from department heads, school principals, and vice principals. After introducing the objective of the study to the respondents, the researcher invites respondents to respond on the challenges that embed the proper implementation of policy in their setting. Therefore, as responded by the respondents, the major hindering challenges were lack of knowledge and skill related to policy , lack of short and long term training support, non-reliability of data and absences of policy related documents, insufficient students income and economic condition , lack of educational technology and facilities which were considered as higher level and turnover of staffs and students absenteeism, corruption, Poor political and conducive working environment and Lack of Funding and resources Support to support schooling and poor political environment (the current issues of the country were considered as medium level .

### **5.2. Conclusion**

Based on the objectives and the finding of the study the following conclusions have been made.

The school leaders in the study area have a critical problem in understanding of education and school policies due to lack of knowledge, readiness, /skills and attitude resulted from their experience and qualification (the department they came from), lock of short and long term training they involved and related materials/documents that they used as guide line for day to day activities. And the status of education policy implementation was found at below level due to less policy understanding, lack of education policy objective clarity and relevance, the implementing agency's incapability, the scarcity of educational resources, the safety and incentive concerned problems. Besides, as it is obvious, policy implementation is surrounded by countless problems and challenges. These were lack of knowledgeable and skilled man power , lack of training and development program , non-reliability of data, insufficient students income and economic condition , lack of educational technology and facilities ,corruption, Poor political and conducive working environment and Lack of funding and resources .

### 5.3. Recommendations

Based on the objectives and the finding of the study the following conclusions have been made.

- School leaders in the study area have a problem of education and school policies. Then, the zonal education department experts should exploit policy related concepts, skills and experience of educational leaders, especially which of school leaders, cluster supervisor, principals and vice principals by involving policy related training, familiarizing with related document/guideline.
- From the study results, it was also seen that the school leaders viewed that resources were not generally adequate for schooling; one recommendation is to improve on these resources for schools. Particularly, classrooms and teaching materials should be more amply provided in secondary schools. Unless resources are sufficient, schooling will encounter a reduction in the number of students.
- The study results revealed that school leaders respond their schools as not capable of implementing educational policy. It is recommended, to strengthen the characteristics of the implementing agencies (schools), that schools should have a well-organized structure and should be related to each other, from the national to the local level. All academic personnel should possess positive attitude toward their work and environment.
- The study results also indicated that school leaders responded that clear and relevant policy had a direct effect on policy implementers. A recommendation is to apply clear and relevant educational policies for the implementers and the educational policies should be practical and relevant to local needs and problems.
- According to the study results, the schools leaders responded that incentives were important for the success of educational policy implementation. A recommendation is to have suitable incentives for all academic personnel. Incentives are necessary for implementers (teachers in schools) at all levels.
- The ARSEB had better increase the standards of secondary school leaders' pre- and post-assigning and recruitment guideline and the MOE had better improve short and long term training to discharge leaders incapability's. To minimize the major challenges faced in the study area, the WEOs and regional government had better support based on the severity.



## References

- Aguinis, H., & Kraiger, K. (2009). Benefits of training and development for individuals and teams, organizations, and society. *Annual review of psychology*, 60(1), 451-474.
- Alemayehu Bishaw (2012). Education in Ethiopia: Past, Present and Future Prospects. *African Nebula, Issue 5, pp.53-59, 2012*. 2. Ambissa Kenea (2014). Adult basic
- Alexander, I. K., & Hjortsø, C. N. (2013). Sources of complexity in participatory curriculum development: An activity system and stakeholder analysis approach to the analyses of tensions and contradictions. *Higher Education*, 77(2), 301-322.
- Ali, S. (2006). Why does policy fail? Understanding the problems of policy implementation in Pakistan a neuro-cognitive perspective. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 34(1).
- Bergmark, U., & Hansson, K. (2021). How teachers and principals enact the policy of building education in Sweden on a scientific foundation and proven experience: Challenges and opportunities. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 65(3), 448-467.
- Berkhout, S. J., & Wielemans, W. (1999). Toward understanding education policy: An integrative approach. *Educational Policy*, 13(3), 402-420.
- Cardno, C. (2018). Policy document analysis: A practical educational leadership tool and a qualitative research method. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 24(4), 623-640.
- Chompucot, M. C. (2011). Major factors affecting educational policy implementation effectiveness for the three southernmost provinces of Thailand as perceived by school directors. *National Institute of Development Administration, Thailand*.



- Cohen, S. M., Jacobson, B. H., Garrett, C. G., Noordzij, J. P., Stewart, M. G., Attia, A., ... & Cleveland, T. F. (2007). Creation and validation of the singing voice handicap index. *Annals of Otolaryngology, Rhinology & Laryngology*, 116(6), 402-406.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (Fourth; Pearson new international 4ed.). Harlow, Essex, 4.
- Demie, A., Engidasew, Z., Basha, G., & Hundessa, F. D. (2021). School Leadership Development Process and Its Implementations in Public Secondary Schools of Bale Zone, Oromia Regional State, Ethiopia. *Creative Education*, 12(10), 2301-2321.
- EDWARD III, G. C. (1980). *Implementing public policy*. Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Ganon-Shilon, S., & Schechter, C. (2017). Making sense of school leaders' sense-making. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 45(4), 682-698.
- Govinda, I. L. (2011). Professional preparation for school leaders in developing context: The case of Solomon Islands. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 3(9), 142-150.
- Jimma, T. T., & Tarekegn, W. M. (2016). The Prevailing Practices and Challenges of Curriculum Reform in Ethiopian Higher Education: Views and Responses from Within. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(10).
- Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, L. (2019). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. Sage publications.
- Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, L. (2019). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. Sage publications.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). The social psychology of perspective in social psychology. G. Lindzey & organizations (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley. E. Aronson (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology*.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 30(3), 607-610.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities: *Educational and psychological measurement*, 30(3), 607-610.

- Lemlem Telila (2010). Review of some recent literature: Identifying Factors that Affect Ethiopia's Education Crisis. *Ee-JRIF Vol 2, No 2 2010 - Education Issue: pp. 56-68*
- Madani, R. A. (2019). Analysis of Educational Quality, a Goal of Education for All Policy. *Higher Education Studies*, 9(1), 100-109.-policy facility
- Maslow, Abraham. 1943. A theory of Human Motivation. Psychological Review.50 (4): 370-396.**
- Mengisteab Teshome (2017). Ethiopia: The Issue of Mother Tongue 51 Local Languages in Use as Instructional Medium .*The Ethiopian Herald (Addis Ababa) December, 2017 pp.1-3, retrieved on 2, January, 2019.*
- Meskerem Lechissa (2017). Curriculum as Unquestioned Hegemony: Trends that Reveal the Exclusion of Ethiopian Primary School Curriculum Content from Researchers' Critical Look. *Bahir Dar University, Bahir Dar j educ. Vol. 17 No. 1 January 2017,pp.14-33.*
- Ministry of Education (1994). Education and Training Policy, Addis Ababa: Berhanena Selam Printing Enterprise.
- Ministry of Education (2002). The Education and Training Policy and its Implementation: Addis Abeba
- Ministry of Education (2002). The Primary and Secondary Schools Inspection Standard Manual : Addis Abeba .
- Ministry of Education (2005). Education sector Development program (ESDP III). Addis Ababa: Berhanena Selam Printing Enterprise
- Ministry of Education (2018).The New Drafting Road Map of Ehiopian Education:Adrafting Mannal.Addis Abeba.
- Ministry of Education (Ministry of Education). (2005). Education Sector Development Program III Program action plan. Federal Ministry of Education Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- Nir, A., Ben-David, A., Bogler, R., Inbar, D., & Zohar, A. (2016). *School autonomy and 21st century skills in the Israeli educational system: Discrepancies between the declarative and operational levels: International journal of educational management.*

- Okoroma, F. N. (2011). Towards effective management of gray literature for higher education, research and national development: *Library Review*.
- Okoroma, F. N. (2018). Awareness, knowledge and attitude of lecturers towards institutional repositories in university libraries in Nigeria: *Digital library perspectives*.
- Okoroma, N. S., & Orike, E. E. (2019). Influence of Availability of Facilities on Academic Performance of Undergraduate Students of Federal Universities in South-South Zone: *Nigeria as Perceived by Academic Staff, Senior Administrative Staff and Final Year Students in the Study Area*.
- Ozmusul, M., & Baskan, G. A. (2013). School Policies and Practices at Upper Secondary Schools in Turkey According to PISA 2009 Data: *Online Submission*, 3(4), 186-199.
- Pairote, P. (2003). Report on development of management standards for department of land development, agriculture and cooperative ministry.
- Player-Koro, C. (2012). Factors influencing teachers' use of ICT in education. *Education Inquiry*, 3(1), 93-108.
- Plüddemann, P., Braam, D., Broeder, P., Extra, G., & October, M. H. (2004). Language policy implementation and language vitality in Western Cape primary schools. PolicyProvisions [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321753588\\_Nature\\_of\\_Women\\_Empowerment\\_in\\_Ethiopia\\_Constitutional\\_and\\_Policy\\_Provisions](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321753588_Nature_of_Women_Empowerment_in_Ethiopia_Constitutional_and_Policy_Provisions) retrieved on 24, December, 2018. Pp.1-9.
- Pressman, J. L., & Wildavsky, A. (1984). *Implementation: How great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland; Or, why it's amazing that federal programs work at all, this being a saga of the Economic Development Administration as told by two sympathetic observers who seek to build morals on a foundation* (Vol. 708). Univ of California Press.
- Pressman, J. L., & Wildavsky, A. B. (1973). How great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland. *University of California: Berkeley, LA, USA*.
- Pressman, J. L., & Wildavsky, A. B. (1973). How great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland. *University of California: Berkeley, LA, USA*.

- Pülzl, H., & Treib, O. (2017). Implementing public policy. In *Handbook of public policy analysis* (pp. 115-134) Routledge.
- Richard, R. B., Williams, H., & Eckardt, R. E. (2012). Shaping education policy: the importance of clarity, commitment, and consensus building : *The Foundation Review*, 4(4), 3.
- Romane, V., & Beatriz, P. (2017). Education policy implementation: A literature review and propose framework.
- Rubin, D. B. (1977). Formalizing subjective notions about the effect of nonrespondents in sample surveys : *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 72(359), 538-543.
- Schoole, M. T. (2013). *Democratizing higher education policy: Constraints of reform in post-apartheid South Africa*. Routledge. Policy constraints
- Signé, L. (2017). Policy implementation—A synthesis of the study of policy implementation and the causes of policy failure. *OCP Policy Center*, 9-26.
- Tefera Assefa (2017). Nature of Women Empowerment in Ethiopia: Constitutional and
- Van Meter, D. S., & Van Horn, C. E. (1975). The policy implementation process: A conceptual framework. *Administration & Society*, 6(4), 445-488.
- Viennet, R., & Pont, B. (2017). Education Policy Implementation: A Literature Review and Proposed Framework. OECD Education Working Papers, No. 162. *OECD Publishing*.
- Viennet, R., & Pont, B. (2017). Education policy implementation: Literatures review a proposed framework.
- Walshaw, M., & Anthony, G. (2007). Policy implementation: integrating the personal and the social. *Mathematics Teacher Education and Development*, 8, 5-22.
- Wang, T., Olivier, D. F., & Chen, P. (2020). Creating individual and organizational readiness for change; conceptualization of system readiness for change in school education: *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 1-25.
- Yared Seid (2017). The Impact of Learning in Mother Tongue First: Evidence from a Natural Experiment in Ethiopia. *International Growth Center, LSE, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; e-mail: Y.Seid@lse.ac.uk* , May 2017, pp.1-35.

Zegeye, A. T. (2019). Article Review on the Current Education policy and curriculum issues in Ethiopia: Trends that Reveal the Problem of Practicing Policy Provisions in Institutions. *Open Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 2.

## Appendix -I



BAHIR DAR UNIVERSITY

College of Education and Behavioral Science

Department of Educational Planning and Management

**Questionnaire to be filled by School Leaders (You are as a school leader)**

**Dear Respondents**

This questionnaire is designed for the study entitled "Secondary School Leaders Policy Understanding and Implementation in East Gojam Administrative Zone secondary schools" as a requirement for my Master's degree in educational planning and management. The information collected through this questionnaire will be used purely for academic purposes. Your response will be kept confidential, and you are kindly requested to complete the questionnaire carefully. Completing the questionnaire will approximately take *30 minutes*. The study's success depends on your genuine and credible response. Thus, please read the instruction and each item in the questionnaire carefully before responding. If you want to change any of your responses, please ensure that you have canceled the undesired ones.

Thank you in advance!

**General Directions:**

- No need to write your name.
- There is no need to consult others to fill out the questionnaires.
- In case you need any explanation, please call me using a mobile phone- 0920252611

**PART-I Background Information of the Respondents**

1. Name of your school \_\_\_\_\_
2. Your Sex: Male  Female
3. Your current position  Principal ,  Vice Principal ,  Supervisor  WEOs Heads
4. Your Qualification:  Diploma,  M A/MSc , BA/BSC
5. Your current educational background:  Teaching in subject area  Educational planning and Management,  School Leadership,  others
6. Your Experience:  1-5 years,  6-10 years,  11-15 years,  16-20 years,  above 21

**PART II: Leader’s policy Implementation**

**Table -1** Please indicate how much **you as a school leader**\_engaged in the following alternative (1= very low,2=,low,3=moderate,4=,high and 5= very high ) questions related to policy objective (clarity and relevance)

No	Items	Mark (X) one box on each line				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	School leader encouraged academic staffs to have a full understanding of the general policy frame work and its objectives					
2	School leaders supported SBM bodies to have a clear understanding of policy objectives					
3	Leader designed /cascaded strategic and operational planning in line with general policy objectives					
4	School activities/practices support the policy objectives to implement as intended					
5	School educational Practice/activities are relevant-ed in line with the policy Objectives					
6	Policy objectives are relevant to the social conditions and current problems					
7	Sufficient local staff members involved in the school policy formulation process ,like school, student, teachers code of ethics					

**Table -2** Please indicate how much you as a school leader engaged in the following alternative (1= very low,2=,low,3=moderate,4=,high and 5= very high ) questions related implementing agency ‘s capability

No	Items	Mark (X) one box on each				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Leaders continually conducted sufficient meetings among staffs related to existing school policies implementation					
2	Sufficient exchanges of information among departments in supporting one another to implement policy issues are taken placed					
3	The meetings between governmental officials , school leaders and teaching staffs under their supervision were sufficient					
4	An appropriate/relevant collaboration/cooperation among educational agencies to link the policy with the implementing strategies are practiced					
5	Leader encouraged school staff to have mutual understanding and share a common sense of school beliefs values and mission					
6	Teachers are supported to be appropriately delegated to a significant jobs					
7	Leaders used student results to evaluate teachers and school performance according the school’ s education goals					
8	Leaders took actions that teachers feel responsible for improving their teaching skills in line policy activities					
9	Over all, leader highly emphasized participation of co-workers in the schools policy related works					
11	Leader supported teachers to have positive attitude toward the school’ s policy activities					
12	School teachers are supported to willingly help any educational projects and activities					
13	Leaders supported teachers for taking a good care of their students along with school policy					
14	Overall ,staff members are highly possessed a good attitude toward being part of the school policy implementations					
15	Leaders encouraged teachers to always learn new knowledge and Skills					

16	Language teachers are encouraged to be efficient in language policy activity implementation					
----	---	--	--	--	--	--

**Table -3** Please indicate how much **you as a school leader** engaged in the following alternative (1= very low,2=,low,3=moderate,4=,high and 5= very high ) questions related to Educational Resources Availability for Policy Implementation

No	Items Statements	Mark (X) one box on each line				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	School is financially funded to implement any planned activities in line with school policies.					
2	School has a recorded financial and transaction document for monitoring the financial existences					
3	Schools has sufficient classroom for all students' learning					
4	School has sufficient teaching and non-teaching materials to support and implement any educational programs of the policy					
5	The school academic teachers are adequate in number and quality					
6	School has also sufficient non-teaching staff members for implementing policy effectively					

**Table -4 2** Please indicate how much **your school leaders** engaged in the following alternative (1= very low,2=,low,3=moderate,4=,high and 5= very high ) questions related Incentives and Safety Concerns

No	Items Statements	Mark (X) one box on each line				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Leaders supported teachers to have freedom in doing daily activities.					
2	The number of injured educational staff and others due to violence has dropped.					
3	Overall, teachers are safe in daily life					
4	Teachers with good evaluation reports have been considered for promotion in due time					



5	Special promotion has been considered for staff' members' exceptional performance					
6	Over all, the teacher' s career path is clear and due implemented					

**Part III. Major Challenges of secondary school policy implementation**

**Table -6** please put a raking order of the major factors affecting **your school leader** policy implementation from the lowest to highest marking (1<sup>st</sup> ,2<sup>nd</sup> ,3<sup>rd</sup> ,4<sup>th</sup> ,5<sup>th</sup> ,6<sup>th</sup> ,7<sup>th</sup> , -,- and 9<sup>th</sup> ) of the following question

Items	You as a school leaders	Ranking
1	Insufficient students income and Economic condition	
2	Cultural factors of parental support	
3	Turnover of staffs and students absenteeism	
4	Corruption	
5	Poor political and conducive working environment	
6	Lack of readiness , knowledge and skill related to policy	
7	Lack of Educational Technology and Facilities	
8	Lack of Funding and resources Support	
9	Non reliability of data and absences of policy related documents	
10	Lack of readiness , knowledge and skill related to policy	

**VI Write your opinion /suggestion for the following open-ended questions**

1. In your opinion, what do you understand education policy as a general and school policy as particular? ---  
-----

2. What are the factors affecting the successful implementation of educational projects for the schools? -----  
-----
3. From the mentioned factors, please name three that are critical to implementation success. -----  
-----  
-----

Thank You for your Cooperation

## Appendix -II



BAHIR DAR UNIVERSITY

College of Education and Behavioral Science

Department of Educational Planning and Management

### Questionnaire to be filled by School Department Head Teachers

#### Dear Respondents

This questionnaire is designed for the study entitled "Secondary School Leaders Policy Understanding and Implementation in East Gojam Administrative Zone secondary schools" as a requirement for my Master's degree in educational planning and management. The information collected through this questionnaire will be used purely for academic purposes. Your response will be kept confidential, and you are kindly requested to complete the questionnaire carefully. Completing the questionnaire will approximately take *30 minutes*. The study's success depends on your genuine and credible response. Thus, please read the instruction and each item in the questionnaire carefully before responding. If you want to change any of your responses, please ensure that you have canceled the undesired ones.

Thank you in advance!

#### General Directions:

- No need to write your name.
- There is no need to consult others to fill out the questionnaires.
- In case you need any explanation, please call me using a mobile phone- 0920252611

#### PART-I Background Information of the Respondents

7. Name of your school \_\_\_\_\_
8. Your Sex:  Male  Female
9. Your current position  Principal ,  Vice Principal ,  Supervisor  WEOs Heads
10. Your Qualification:  Diploma,  M A/MSc , BA/BSC
11. Your current educational background:  Teaching in subject area  Educational planning and Management,  School Leadership,  others
12. Your Experience:  1-5 years,  6-10 years,  11-15 years,  16-20 years,  above 21

**PART II: Leader’s policy Implementation**

**Table -1** Please indicate how much your school leaders engaged in the following alternative (1= very low,2=,low,3=moderate,4=,high and 5= very high ) questions related to policy objective (clarity and relevance)

No	Items	Mark (X) one box on each line				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	School leader encouraged academic staffs to have a full understanding of the general policy frame work and its objectives					
2	School leaders supported SBM bodies to have a clear understanding of policy objectives					
3	Leader designed /cascaded strategic and operational planning in line with general policy objectives					
4	School activities/practices support the policy objectives to implement as intended					
5	School educational Practice/activities are relevant-ed in line with the policy Objectives					
6	Policy objectives are relevant to the social conditions and current problems					
7	Sufficient local staff members involved in the school policy formulation process ,like school, student, teachers code of ethics					

**Table -2 Please indicate how much your school leaders engaged in the following alternative (1= very low,2=,low,3=moderate,4=,high and 5= very high ) questions related implementing agency ‘s capability**

No	Items	Mark (X) one box on each				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Leaders continually conducted sufficient meetings among staffs related to existing school policies implementation					
2	Sufficient exchanges of information among departments in supporting one another to implement policy issues are taken placed					
3	The meetings between governmental officials , school leaders and teaching staffs under their supervision were sufficient					
4	An appropriate/relevant collaboration/cooperation among educational agencies to link the policy with the implementing strategies are practiced					
5	Leader encouraged school staff to have mutual understanding and share a common sense of school beliefs values and mission					
6	Teachers are supported to be appropriately delegated to a significant jobs					
7	Leaders used student results to evaluate teachers and school performance according the school’ s education goals					
8	Leaders took actions that teachers feel responsible for improving their teaching skills in line policy activities					
9	Over all, leader highly emphasized participation of co-workers in the schools policy related works					
11	Leader supported teachers to have positive attitude toward the school’ s policy activities					
12	School teachers are supported to willingly help any educational projects and activities					
13	Leaders supported teachers for taking a good care of their students along with school policy					
14	Overall ,staff members are highly possessed a good attitude toward being part of the school policy implementations					
15	Leaders encouraged teachers to always learn new knowledge and Skills					
16	Language teachers are encouraged to be efficient in language policy activity implementation					

**Table -3 Please indicate how much your school leaders engaged in the following alternative (1= very low,2=,low,3=moderate,4=,high and 5= very high ) questions related to Educational Resources Availability for Policy Implementation**

No	Items Statements	Mark (X) one box on each line				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	School is financially funded to implement any planned activities in line with school policies.					
2	School has a recorded financial and transaction document for monitoring the financial existences					
3	Schools has sufficient classroom for all students' learning					
4	School has sufficient teaching and non-teaching materials to support and implement any educational programs of the policy					
5	The school academic teachers are adequate in number and quality					
6	School has also sufficient non-teaching staff members for implementing policy effectively					

**Table -4 2 Please indicate how much your school leaders engaged in the following alternative (1= very low,2=,low,3=moderate,4=,high and 5= very high ) questions related Incentives and Safety Concerns**

No	Items Statements	Mark (X) one box on each line				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Leaders supported teachers to have freedom in doing daily activities.					
2	The number of injured educational staff and others due to violence has dropped.					
3	Overall, teachers are safe in daily life					
4	Teachers with good evaluation reports have been considered for promotion in due time					
5	Special promotion has been considered for staff' members' exceptional performance					
6	Over all, the teacher' s career path is clear and due implemented					

**Part III. Major Challenges of secondary school policy implementation**

**Table -6 please put a raking order of the major factors affecting your school leader policy implementation from the highest to lowest by marking (1<sup>st</sup> ,2<sup>nd</sup> ,3<sup>rd</sup> ,4<sup>th</sup> ,5<sup>th</sup> ,6<sup>th</sup> ,7<sup>th</sup> , -,- and 9<sup>th</sup> ) of the following question**

No	The most difficult challenges	Ranking
1	Insufficient students income and Economic condition	
2	Cultural factors of parental support	
3	Turnover of staffs and students absenteeism	
4	Corruption	
5	Poor political and conducive working environment	
6	Lack of readiness , knowledge and skill related to policy	
7	Lack of Educational Technology and Facilities	
8	Lack of Funding and resources Support	
9	Non reliability of data and absences of policy related documents	
10	Lack of readiness , knowledge and skill related to policy	

**VI Write your opinion /suggestion for the following open-ended questions**

4. In your opinion, what do you understand education policy as a general and school policy as particular? ---  
-----
5. What are the factors affecting the successful implementation of educational projects for the schools? -----  
-----
6. From the mentioned factors, please name three that are critical to implementation success. -----  
-----  
-----

Thank You for your Cooperation

## Appendix III



### BAHIR DAR UNIVERSITY

#### College of Education and Behavioral Science

#### Department of Educational Planning and Management

#### **Guiding interview Questions for principals, vice principals and supervisors**

1. Please share with me some of your background information regarding educational background(qualification, the department you came from),professional experience (in teaching and leading schools) and age
2. How much your Educational background and experience help you to conceptualize and lead school policy?
3. How much you know the education and school policy as a school/WEOs leader?
  - a. Can you explain by listing the general and specific objectives and the strategies of the ETP?
  - b. Can you remember the common and mandatory school policies helping as a guide line for day to day activities? List and explain all that you used them.
4. How much you are involved in different policy related training that helps to improve your policy understanding? List any term/kind of training that you have taken in this academic year and before.
5. How much you are familiar with the relevance policy related documents /materials to govern the day today policy related activities?

Thank You for your Cooperation,

## Appendix IV



### BAHIR DAR UNIVERSITY

College of Education and Behavioral Science

Department of Educational Planning and Management

#### Document Investigating Checklists Items

No	Items	Present	Not present
1	School Planning and related documents		
2	The three Years Strategic Planning		
3	The yearly operational planning		
4	Performance-based evaluation checklists		
5	Different monitoring and evaluation feedback		
6	Academic and professional supervision documents `		
7	Federal/Regional constitution		
8	General Education Curriculum Framework, Syllabus & Teachers guide		
9	Especial and Inclusive Education Program strategies		
10	General Education and Training Policy with different ESDPs		



	documents		
11	General Education Quality Assurance Packages and School block grant guideline		
12	School Based Management and community participation and financial administration guideline(KETB,PTA)		
13	Nation female education strategies Blueprint		
14	Teacher development program(TDP), School improvement program (SIP) framework & Blueprint		
15	Co-curriculum activities organization and management guideline		

Appendix V.

**Samples of Interviewees and Code**

Interviews			
No	Profession	Code	School
1	Principals	SP1	Sedy secondary
2	V principals	SVP1	Sedy secondary
3	V principal	SVP2	Sedy secondary
4	principal	SP2	D /markos
5	V principal	SVP3	D /markos
6	principal	SP3	Libanos
7	V principal	SVP4	Libanos
8	principal	SP4	Belayzeleke
9	V principal	SVP	Belayzeleke
10	Supervisor	ICSP1	2gu
11	Supervisor	ICSP2	Keranio
12	Supervisor	ICSP3	D /markos
13	Supervisor	ICSP4	Gojjame Bere
14	Supervisor	ICSP5	Enebsie
15	Supervisor	ICSP6	Gozamen
16	Supervisor	ICSP7	Mota
17	Supervisor	ICSP8	Enemay
	Total		