



**INSTITUTE OF PEDAGOGICAL SCIENCES  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT  
POST GRADUATE PROGRAM**

***A THESIS SUBMITTED AS PARTIAL FULFILLMENT FOR DEGREE MASTER OF  
ON  
DECENTRALIZED EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT IN SOUTH EASTERN  
ZONE OF TIGRAI:-POLICY AND PRACTICE***

**By: Berhe Hailu Gebregergs -----Email; - [berheha167@gmail.com](mailto:berheha167@gmail.com)**

**Major Advisor; Dr. Haile Tareke**

**Co-advisor; G/her Gebru**

# APPROVAL SHEET

## ***TITLE: DECENTRALIZED EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT IN SOUTH EASTERN ZONE OF TIGRAI:-POLICY AND PRACTICE***

### SUBMITTED BY:

Student's Name	ID. No.	Signature	Date
<u>Berhe Hailu</u>	Ips /ps57/10	_____	_____

### APPROVED BY BORD OF EXAMINERS:

1. _____	_____	_____	_____
Department Head	Signature	Date	
2. _____	_____	_____	_____
Advisor's Name	Signature	Date	
4. _____	_____	_____	_____
Internal Examiner	Signature	Date	
5. _____	_____	_____	_____
External Examiner	Signature	Date	

## Declaration

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis entitled *Decentralized Educational Management in South Eastern Zone of Tigray:-Policy and Practice Tigray, Ethiopia*” is my original work and has not been presented for any other award, and that all sources of materials used in this thesis are duly acknowledged. This thesis was carried out under the supervision of my principal advisor **Dr. Haile Tareke** Institute of Pedagogical Sciences Mekelle University.

Name of student candidate: Berhe Hailu

Signature with date: \_\_\_\_\_

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as university advisor/co-advisor.

Name of the advisor; - Dr. Haile Tareke

Signature of the Advisor & date: \_\_\_\_\_ -

Place: Mekelle University, Mekelle, Ethiopia

Date of submission: \_\_\_\_\_

# Table of Contents

<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
Declaration.....	iii
List of tables .....	vii
ACRONYMS.....	viii
<i>ABSTRACT</i> .....	ix
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	x
CHAPTER ONE .....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY .....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	2
1.3. Basic Research Questions .....	4
1.4. Objectives of the Study.....	4
1.4.1. General Objective .....	4
1.4.2. Specific Objectives .....	4
1.5. Delimitation of the Study.....	4
1.6. Limitation of the study.....	4
1.7. Organization of the Study .....	5
CHAPTER TWO .....	6
2.1. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE .....	6
2.1. Concept of Decentralization .....	6
2.2. Decentralization .....	6
2.3. Rationale for Decentralization .....	7
2.4. Types of Education Decentralization.....	8
2.4.1. Education De-concentration.....	8
2.4.2. Education Devolution .....	8
2.4.3. Education Delegation.....	9
2.4.4. Implicit or De facto Delegation to Community Schools.....	9
2.5. Education Decentralization Framework in Ethiopia.....	9
2.6. Educational management responsibilities at different levels of the educational administration in Ethiopia .....	11
2.6.1. The federal MOE .....	11
2.6.2. The Regional Education Bureaus (REBs).....	11
2.6.3. The Zonal Education Office.....	12

2.6.4. The Woredas Education Offices (WEOs).....	12
2.6.5. The Kebele Education and Training Board (KETB) .....	13
2.7. Decentralization and Decision-Making .....	13
2.8. Level of Participation of Stakeholders in the Decentralized Education Management.....	14
CHAPTER THREE .....	16
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY .....	16
3.1. Research Design .....	16
3.3. Source of Data .....	16
3.3.1. Primary data sources .....	16
<b>3.3.2. Secondary Data Sources</b> .....	17
3.4. Population, Sampling and Sampling Techniques .....	17
3.4.1. Population and Sample Size.....	17
3.4.2. Sampling Techniques.....	17
Table 1: Sample Size and sample techniques of Respondents.....	18
3.5. Data Gathering Tools.....	18
3.5.1. Questionnaire .....	18
3.5.2. Interview .....	19
3.5.3. Documents .....	19
3.6. Procedures of Data Collection .....	19
3.7. Methods of Data Analysis.....	19
CHAPTER FOUR.....	20
DATA PRESENTATION, ANALAYSIS AND INTERPRETION .....	20
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION .....	20
4.1. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents .....	20
Table 2: Characteristics of Respondents.....	20
4.2. Practices of Delegation of Authority .....	21
Table 3: The Process through which the Respondents Obtained their Present Post.....	21
Table 4: The Practices of Delegation of Authority .....	22
4.3. Decision Making Process.....	24
Table 5: The Decision Making Process .....	25
Table 6: The Degree of Usefulness of Superiors, Colleagues, Manuals, Official Documents and Internet in the Decision Making Process of the Respondents .....	28
4.4. Level of Communication .....	30
Table 7: Staff Meetings, Evaluation and Monitoring Processes .....	30
Table 8: Level of Communication .....	32

4.5. Level of Participation of Stakeholders.....	34
Table 9 Level of Participation of WEO Personnel in Various Management Functions .....	34
Table 10: Level of Participation of PTAs and Community in Various Management Functions .....	36
4.6. Challenges of Decentralized Educational Management .....	38
Table 11. Challenges the Respondents Faced to Perform their Work Effectively and Efficiently.....	38
Table 12. Challenges the Woredas Faced to Implement Decentralized Educational Management Effectively and Efficiently.....	39
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	41
5.1. Summary of Major Findings.....	41
5.2. Conclusions.....	42
5.3. Recommendations.....	43
6. REFERENCES .....	45
APPENDICES .....	48

## List of tables

Table 1 Sample Size and sample techniques of Respondents .....	18
Table 2: Characteristics of Respondents.....	20
Table 3: The Process through which the Respondents Obtained their Present Post.....	21
Table 4: The Practices of Delegation of Authority.....	22
Table 5: The Decision Making Process .....	25
Table 6: The Degree of Usefulness of Superiors, Colleagues, Manuals, Official Documents and Internet in the Decision Making Process of the Respondents .....	28
Table 7: Staff Meetings, Evaluation and Monitoring Processes.....	30
Table 8: Level of Communication.....	32
Table 9 Level of Participation of WEO Personnel in Various Management Functions .....	34
Table 10: Level of Participation of PTAs and Community in Various Management Functions.....	36
Table 11vChallenges the Respondents Faced to Perform their Work Effectively and Efficiently .....	38
Table 12 Challenges the Woredas Faced to Implement Decentralized Educational Management Effectively and Efficiently .....	39

## ACRONYMS

ESDP-----	Education Sector Development Program
ETB-----	Education and Training Board
ETP-----	Education and Training Policy
GEQIP -----	General Education Quality Improvement Program
KETB -----	Kebele Education and Training Board
MOE -----	Ministry of Education
NGO -----	Non-Governmental Organization
PAP -----	Program Action Plan
PTA -----	Parent and Teacher Association
REB-----	Regional Education Bureau
SDPRP -----	Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Program
SSA -----	Sub Saharan Africa
TVET-----	Technical and Vocational Education and Training
UNESCO-----	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
WEO -----	Woreda Education Office

## **ABSTRACT**

*The main purpose of this study was to assess the practice of decentralized educational management in south eastern zone of Tigray and thereby identify the strengths and weaknesses so as to provide alternative recommendations to the identified problems. A descriptive survey method was employed to carry out the study. The primary sources of data were 2 Woredas education office heads, 16 Woredas education office experts, 6 secondary school principals and 48 parent teacher association members. Stratified random sampling technique was employed to select experts. Woredas education office heads, secondary school principals and parent teacher association members were selected by utilizing availability sampling. Questionnaire was the main data gathering instrument while interview and documents were also employed. The collected data were analyzed quantitatively by using descriptive statistics, and qualitatively by using narration. The study indicated that the capacity of south East of Tigray zone in implementing and managing decentralized education was weak because of challenges like lack of adequate resources, lack of coordination, lack of support (training), lack of time/ work overload, lack of familiarity of tasks and lack of knowledge and skills in their work. Based on these findings, the researcher recommends that necessary training should be given to local education stakeholders, recruit education personnel competitively, enhance the participation of stakeholders in the management of education by providing some necessary incentives to them and reducing the challenges for the management of decentralized education.*

- ✓ Key words; - Decentralizing Educational Management, participation of stake holders, quality of educational , Challenges of educational management,

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

First of all, I would like to thank the Almighty GOD who has helped me to prepare this study. Next to this, I would like to thank my major advisor **Dr. Haile Tareke** for his invaluable and constructive comments he has given me beginning from the preparation of the proposal until the completion of the study. If it had not been for his help and guidance, this research would not achieve the current status. My thanks also goes to my co-advisor Gereziher G. for his constructive advice in this study.

Finally, my appreciation extends to my family for her affection and encouragement she showed me during conducting the study.

# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

In recent years, decentralization has become a global trend and it is on the political agenda in many countries. Education is being decentralized in numerous countries as part of a larger move to reform public management systems (Bjork, 2006). The policies largely aim to reduce government size, reorganize delivery, expand private initiatives, and create new partnerships.

Many researchers suggest that education decentralization especially becomes a political decision that requires strong political will both at the central and state levels. It also becomes imperative to carefully plan the process of decentralization to ensure effective implementation. According to Bjork (2006) the challenge of balancing different aims can be enormous: first, making education more relevant to local needs; second, democratically promoting people's participation by empowering local authorities and third, improving performance accountability.

In intent, if not in practice, decentralization policies and programs that most Sub-Saharan African (SSA) countries have embarked up on in the past decade are different from previous efforts in two main respects. First, their primary objective is to empower the people as a part of efforts aimed at democratizing state institutions and initiate/support local self-governing structures and not merely the extension of state control. Second, there is a growing appreciation of the need to develop not local government as such but local governance, focusing on processes rather than structures alone. Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Program's (SDPRP) annual progress report of the year 2003 claims that woredas have been given greater economic and political power to implement development plans based on locally determined priorities, consistent with national SDPRP goals.

The guideline for organization of education management, community participation and educational finance has been implemented throughout the Country.

In the aspect of allocation of responsibilities for education, woredas are responsible for establishing and administering basic education services, including primary schools (Grade 1-8), secondary and preparatory schools (Grade 9-12), and adult education. Their responsibilities include supervising these schools, printing and distributing primary school textbooks, and establishing and administering primary boarding schools.

In the delivery of basic services, the woredas are tasked with planning and developing short and long term plans for education in their jurisdictions and ensuring that plans are implemented by both government and non-

governmental schools, according to the standards set at the regional and federal levels. This function includes planning the location of new schools in kebeles, ensuring equity in access to education, strengthening education supervisions, enhancing community participation by supporting citizen participation in education administration, and encouraging and supporting PTAs.

For implementation of decentralization of educational management at the lower levels, Woldegiyorgis, A. A. (2014) in its Program Action Plan (PAP) of the Education Sector Development Program III (ESDP), adopted the strategies such as, efficient school leadership and management will be established in schools in order to enhance the quality of instruction and their by improve learning achievements; empowerment of the community is not only a means for development but it is also an end in itself. Policies and programs to strengthen the role of the community in the management and financing of schools will be implemented. Communities shall be encouraged to mobilize their own resources to construct additional classrooms and schools; being the administrative unit closest to the communities, the role of woredas in the governance and management of education will be strengthened. The involvement of communities and partnerships with NGO and other donors at woreda level shall be enhanced.

Generally, it is obvious that the implementation of a decentralized educational management requires the development of capacity at the local levels (e.g. woredas). Hence, the study examined the practices of decentralized education management with special emphasis on education authority and responsibility delegated to the local levels, decision making process, level of participation of local stakeholders in education management, level of communication among various local stakeholders and challenges to implement decentralized education management.

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

It is obvious that decentralization becoming a genuine means of community participation requires much deeper changes in the mindset of the people who govern as well as those who are governed than simply creating local units and transfusing some powers to them (Bjork, 2006).

Vegas (2007) describe the effects of devolution of decision-making authority to schools as follows: School-based management reforms that devolve decision-making authority to the schools, for example, have had important effects on teacher performance and student learning by making schools more accountable to their communities.

Decentralization of education service delivery, it is also argued, can produce greater community pressure for transparency and accountability in school management. In Ghana, for example, education decentralization has been presented as the vehicle for strengthening management efficiency and accountability by locating critical decision-making of education matters at the district level (Chapman, 2000).

However, in several countries, sub-regional or district offices have failed to fulfill their mandates owing to lack of adequately trained personnel, essential resources, and the absence of administrative systems and controls, overwhelming multiple demands, lack of clear definition of roles (Gershberg and Winkler, 2003).

Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Program annual progress report of the year 2003 claims that Woredas have been given greater economic and political power to implement development plans based on locally determined priorities, consistent with national sustainable development and poverty reduction program goals. It further notes that district cabinets have been formed with functional representation from key public bodies organized to discharge public service delivery responsibilities.

According to IMF report (Solomon, A. 2011) implementation capacity at woreda level is not yet at the level expected to carry out their responsibilities. Woreda capacity-building programs have been initiated. Deployment of staff at regional level was undertaken as a first step in building the capacity at other levels. However, there is still a huge need for training on supervision, strategic planning and budgeting, education management information systems, etc.

Woldegiyorgis, A. (2014) in the document ESDP-III PAP shows the challenges of ESDP-II implementation by explaining that weak program management and implementation capacity has contributed to low budget utilization in civil works and procurement. High turnover of professional personnel was one of the contributing factors to the low program management capacity. In Ethiopia during the regional devolution, educational decentralization had not achieved the intended objectives because the local governments lacked the basic knowledge and experience to perform effectively (Tesfaye Tadesse, 2007). Recent studies also note acute shortage of skilled manpower as a critical challenge of the implementation of Ethiopian local governance policy (Shibeshi, A. (2009).

As shown in the above sources, Ethiopia faces constraints like trained manpower, shortage of capacity building for stakeholders, problems of insufficient administrative institutional capacity, inadequate participation of local stakeholders and financial shortage to carry out decentralization at local level. Being one of the remotest zones from it is very likely that South Eastern Zone also face these constraints. For this reason, the study examined the practices of delegating authorities and responsibilities, the level of decision making process, level of communication and participation of stakeholders in various management functions and the challenges of practicing decentralized educational management in WEOs. To make it more clear, the question “To what extent is South Eastern Zone (WEOs, secondary school managements) implementing the decentralized education management?” will be the focus of the study.

### **1.3. Basic Research Questions**

The study was intended to answer the following basic research questions:

1. To what extent do educational authorities delegate their functions among various offices?
2. To what extent do the various educational personnel practice the delegated functions in their offices?
3. What is the level of stakeholders' participation in the decentralized education management decision making process?
4. To what practicing is challenges decentralized education management in woreda education offices?

### **1.4. Objectives of the Study**

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

The general objective of the study will be to examine the performance of decentralized educational management implementation in South Eastern Zone of Tigray WEOs by concentrating on variables such as authority delegation, level of decision making process, level of communication, level of participation and challenges of practicing decentralized educational management.

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

The study focused on the following specific objectives:

1. To assess the educational authorities delegate their functions among various offices.
2. To analyze the various educational personnel practice the delegated functions in their offices.
3. To examine the level of stakeholders' participation in the decentralized education management decision making process?
4. To identify the practicing of challenges decentralized education management in Woredas education offices?

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

Decentralization can be studied in many different ways, such as its effect on quality of provision of service (e.g. education), level of authority delegated to local levels, etc. out of these, the study will be delimited to the assessment of level of delegation of authority; decision making process, participation of stakeholders and challenges of practicing decentralized education management. Furthermore, responsibility of educational management can be decentralized to a region, a province, a district, a town or an individual school or a group of schools. However, this study will be delimited to South Eastern Zone Woredas and secondary schools.

### **1.6. Limitation of the study**

Recently, most countries in the world are practicing the decentralization of educational management to local levels. Ethiopia, in its education and Training policy (ETP) of 1994 emphasized on the decentralization of service

provision. For implementing the policy, Ethiopia adopted ESDP in 1997 which is being implemented for twenty years. The program and its strategies comprise the decentralization of educational management to Woredas as well as school levels. In line with this, the findings of this study will:

- i. Provide learning lessons to educational leaders from the implementation of the system.
- ii. Help implementers identify their limitations and strengths for the betterment of future work.
- iii. Initiate future researchers to study the issue more deeply.

## **1.7. Organization of the Study**

This thesis was organized in seven chapters. The first chapter deals with the introduction which consists of the background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions, and objective of the study, significance of the study, delimitation and limitation of the study, definition of key terms and organization of the study. A comprehensive review of the literature is presented in chapter two. It consists of the basic concepts, explanations and research findings on school improvement contributed by various authors and researchers. Chapter three consists of the research design and methodology used, source and type of data, sample size and sampling techniques, instruments of data collection as well as methods of data analysis. An analysis of the results of the data collected during this study is presented in chapter four. Chapter five provides the summary, conclusions and recommendations of the study. Finally, a list of references will be used in this study and relevant appendices will be attached.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

Under this chapter, more than eight sub topics are discussed by being supported with various related literature. First, decentralization and its concept are thoroughly discussed in detail. Second, rationale for decentralization and why countries decentralize their education system is seen in different angles. Then, four types of education decentralization are reviewed as various scholars have studied. Next to this, education decentralization framework in Ethiopia is discussed in detail. Then delegation of authority in relation to education is reviewed from different literature. Next, decentralization and decision making is deeply discussed. Level of communication among various local stakeholders is also seen under this chapter. Finally, level of participation of stakeholders in the decentralized education management is thoroughly reviewed in this chapter.

#### **2.1. Concept of Decentralization**

Decentralization is not an easily defined. Different scholars and writers define decentralization in different ways. Notwithstanding the variations in interpretations decentralization can be understood as the transfer of legal and political authority and responsibility from central government to local levels.

Decentralization is the process whereby central government assigns roles and responsibilities to lower more local levels of the system (World Bank, 2008). Decentralization involves the transfer of all or part of the decision making responsibilities and management vested in the central authority towards another regional, provincial or local authority (districts, municipalities, “communities”) or towards schools themselves. Decentralization is therefore political and financial (UNESCO, 2005)

#### **2.2. Decentralization**

In all cases, decentralization has been initiated from above, and behind this approach, there is a rational, linear and deterministic view. People are assumed to behave rationally in relation to the parameters established by the central state, by market forces or both (Gamage and Zajda, 2009), Sall (1998) shows that development theories of the 1950’s and 1960’s reflected the view that the central government alone had the capacity to provide public services and bring about development. However, the economic crisis of the 1970s, the failure of the model to generate growth and reduce poverty led more and more government to initiate experiments on democratization and decentralization.

A large number of developing countries politically, economically and ideologically diverse began decentralizing some development planning and administration in 1970’s and early 1980’s. According to Gebre-Egziabher, T., & Brhanu, K. (2007). In recent years many countries have increasingly resorted to decentralize measures as a way

to realize effective public service delivery and local self-rule. The drive is anchored in the basic principles of governance which include legitimacy representation accountability, transparency, and the rule of law.

Decentralization policies and programs that most SSA countries have embarked up on in the past decade are different from previous efforts in two main respects. First their primary objective is to empower the people as a part of efforts aimed at democratizing state institutions and initiate/support local self-governing structures and not merely the extension of state control; second, there is a growing appreciation of the need to develop not local government as such but local governance focusing on processes rather than structures alone. This implies not only the vertical transfer of responsibilities and resources from central to local government (the conventional conception of devolutionary decentralization) but also the development of horizontal networks between local government and local non state actors such as the private sectors civil society and international organs.

Litvack, Ahmed & Bird (1998) concluded that political pressure probably drives most decentralization efforts. But, whatever its origins decentralization can have significant repercussion for resource mobilization and allocations and ultimately macroeconomics stability, service delivery and equity.

### **2.3. Rationale for Decentralization**

The rationale for adopting decentralization is context specific. Nevertheless, the most frequent justifications for adopting decentralization include to improve efficiency in service delivery (Adgo Maru, 2005), enhance inter-ethnic harmony, and ensure “equality and stability” in the society (Smith,1985). To achieve efficiency, promote equity and enhance community participation in the process of local decision making are the major reasons for adopting decentralization (Smith, 1985). Ribot (2002) contended that decentralization can achieve effectiveness and efficiency by improving the implementation and allowing actor to participate in the process. It also improves coordination mechanism at lower level and enhances the relevance and sustainability of the service.

In addition, Smith (1985) argued that political decentralization enhances local accountability and improves the political skills of the local politicians and helps national integration. It brings government closer to people. It also provides better services to the client groups. Similarly, it promotes liberty, equality and welfare in the society.

In practice most basic education systems have both centralized and decentralized elements. In a partially decentralized system some powers remain in the hands of the central authority and some are exercised locally. Planners involved in a decentralizing reform must identify which components of the system are more appropriately managed at the central level and which at the local level given the countries particular circumstances and objectives of reform.

Countries decentralized their education system for a variety of reasons. In recent years’ decentralization has become a global trend and it is on the political agenda in many countries. According to Bjork (2006) education is being decentralized in numerous countries as part of a larger move to reform public management systems. The

policies largely aim to reduce government size, reorganize delivery, expand private initiatives and create new partner ships.

## **2.4. Types of Education Decentralization**

Many scholars (for example, European Commission, 2007; Gershberg and Winkler, 2003; Cole, 1996) divided educational decentralization in to the following four types. Namely: education de-concentration, education devolution, education delegation and implicit delegation to community schools.

### **2.4.1. Education De-concentration**

According to European Commission (2007), de-concentration is a process in which the agencies or ministries at the central level delegates decision making power and resources management to its branches at lower level. This form of decentralization is an extension of central government structure and it's accountable to higher tier of government.

De-concentration is the transfer of decision making from the central government MOE to either the regional/local offices of the MOE or the regional offices of the central government? This typically entails giving those offices increased autonomy both in terms of recruiting, evaluating and promoting personnel and in terms of allocating and reallocating budget. It also often includes the decentralization of payroll and other administrative matters for teacher and other school staff. It may include some degree of political decentralization too. Sometimes the election of local and/or regional political officials is introduced at the same time that decision making is de-concentrated to the MOE's regional or local offices. In this way local political may gain some influence over local administrative decision even though they have no direct authority in education (Gershberg and Winkler, 2003).

### **2.4.2. Education Devolution**

According to Gershberg and Winkler (2003), this is the transfer of decision making from the central government to popularly elected regional or local government. Key management decision including naming school principals and accosting regional/local education budgets lie with governor and legislature or the mayor and city council. In some cases, these decisions may in turn be delegated to schools or school councils.

Devolution is an arrangement or a process in public administration in which district bodies are created by law, separate from the central administration, and in which local representatives- either elected or appointed by the population – are (progressively) given powers to decide on a variable range of public matters and progressively gain access to resources which can be utilized at their discretion (European Commission, 2007).

As in decentralization, administrative and personnel functions are often inferred. Devolution can be part of political decentralization or a way for central governments to offload service responsibly.

### **2.4.3. Education Delegation**

Education delegation is the reversible assignment by the central or region government MOE or in rare cases the municipal department of education to public school principals (and/ or casually elected) school councils. The powers of these school officials vary greatly by country. In some cases, they do no more than maintain the physical plant while at the other extreme school councils may name school principals help prepare and approve school development plans and approve school spending plans (Gershberg and Winkler, 2003).

Delegation is the assignment of responsibility to someone else to complete specific tasks where the one who delegates is still held accountable for the work which he/she has delegated. As regards to this, Mullins (2007) defines delegation of authority as „the authorization to undertake activities that would otherwise be carried out by someone in a more senior position“. Moreover, Cole (1996) describes it as a process whereby a manager or a senior officer cedes or entrusts some of his authority to subordinates or team mates to perform certain tasks or duties on his behalf. They however warned that the manager or the senior officer remains accountable for those tasks or duties to his own superior officers. It has intrinsic motivation which makes employees feel that they are part of the organization through their contribution. It is a means for achieving results by giving someone else the authority to do work for which the leaders are ultimately responsible.

### **2.4.4. Implicit or De facto Delegation to Community Schools**

According to Gershberg and Winkler (2003), this is a special case of education delegation. It sometimes results from the failure of the state to provide educational opportunities in remote areas so the community takes up on itself the finance and provision of schooling. In other cases, the government actively subsidizes and supports community schools as an especial cost effective means of expanding education access or as part of strategy to improve accountability through local involvement.

## **2.5. Education Decentralization Framework in Ethiopia**

Decentralization of key decision-making at school level has been a recent development in the Ethiopian education system. This section analyses how Ethiopian education policy enables school-based management to work with stakeholders to make decisions that will improve the quality of children’s education. Ethiopian educational history indicates that the issue of school management and decision making at school level is a recent development. The modern school system was introduced into the country by missionaries during the nineteenth century. The first modern government school was built by Emperor Menilik in 1908; further schools were built by Emperor Haile Selassie and the subsequent regimes (Teshome Nekatibeb, 2012).

The rise of different governments to power in Ethiopia was accompanied by educational reforms and policy changes. From 1941–74, the imperial education system functioned on the basis of the emperor’s conviction that education held a key position in the country’s development. However, each of the two post-imperial-era

governments had well-defined reform policies of their own. For instance, the socialist regime issued a five-volume publication entitled *General Directions of Ethiopian Education* in 1980. Its aim was to cultivate a Marxist ideology, develop knowledge in science and technology and integrate education with production (Teshome Nekatibeb, 2012).

Similarly, the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia issued two policy documents entitled „Education and Training Policy“ and „Education Sector Strategy“ in 1994. Initially, policy focused on improving education access and equity. The Government then started to emphasize the importance of school governance. For example, the Education Sector Development Program (ESDP) I (MOE, 1998) defined the roles and responsibilities of school governance at the federal, regional and woreda level.

When ESDP II was designed in 2002, the Government realized the significance of management and decision-making at the woreda and school levels. This was further strengthened with ESDP III (2005) when the Government decided to decentralize critical decision-making from regions and zones to the woredas and municipalities, and further to the school level, with the objective of having education become more responsive to school situations (MOE, 2005).

The devolution of decision-making authority to the woreda level was expected to strengthen woreda-level educational institutions, to offer better local governance, to promote accountability and to improve community participation (MOE, 2005). The focus of the decentralization program at this time was to strengthen the capacity of Woreda Education Offices (WEOs) through training in educational and financial management (MOE, 2005). ESDP III also outlines the importance of community participation in school decision-making and financing. Communities were expected to raise funds for purchasing basic school equipment, hiring contract teachers, constructing schools and classrooms, building teachers“ houses, and encouraging girls to enroll in schools. Community members and parents are members of the Parent–Teacher Associations (PTAs), which were expected to participate in preparing annual action plans (MOE, 2005).

At the end of ESDP III, it was recognized that despite the increased attention given to devolving decision-making to the local level, in practice, school management and administration remained inefficient and ineffective. The WEOs were unable to implement government programs because they did not have the capacity to ensure that schools were managed and administered effectively. In addition, the system suffered from a weak relationship between regions and woredas (MOE, 2010).

ESDP IV therefore emphasized the further devolution of key decision-making to the local level, including improving the functioning of offices at all levels, promoting cluster resource centers, and improving school-level management through capacity-building programs (MOE, 2010). The General Education Quality Improvement Program (GEQIP) aims to improve quality intervention in key areas, including school management and administration (Shibeshi Ayalew, 2009). Priority areas identified included increasing effectiveness and efficiency

through decentralized educational planning and management; establishing open, transparent and productive management systems; and promoting effective horizontal and vertical communications across the education system (MOE, 2008).

## **2.6. Educational management responsibilities at different levels of the educational administration in Ethiopia**

According to MOE (2013), the Ethiopian system of educational planning and management is both a bottom-up and top-down exercise. Resource requests and plans and budget proposals come from the lower tiers, while target setting, resource allocation and the approval of proposals descend from their respective upper levels. But since the legislative line (i.e. the different levels of houses of representatives) and the executive and the technical line (i.e. the sectorial bureaus and offices) are also involved in the process of planning and resource allocation, several horizontal and vertical interactive and consultative processes are imperative.

The following sections present in more detail the roles and responsibilities played in educational planning and management by the federal MOE, the Regional Education Bureaus (REBs), the Zonal Education Office, the Woreda Education Offices and the *Kebele* Education and Training Boards (KETBs).

### **2.6.1. The federal MOE**

With regard to the planning and management of education, the federal MOE is responsible for: formulating national education policy; setting education and training standards at all levels of education; monitoring implementation and ensuring that standards are respected and formulating the general framework of curricula of education and training. In this context, the MOE Planning Unit monitors the implementation of policy interventions and ensures that the REBs and WEOs have the capacity to plan and manage education at their levels. This requires that this unit has the requisite skills to capacitate the REBs and WEOs (MOE, 2010).

### **2.6.2. The Regional Education Bureaus (REBs)**

The Regional Education Bureau (REB) is the Ministry of Education's equivalent for the regional state. The bureau is staffed with key professionals to plan, manage and assess the delivery of education within the region. According to MOE (2002), the REBs plan and provide for access to formal education, organize teacher training programs and develop curricula at the primary level. The REBs also prepare strategic plans for the region at the federal level, within the approved framework. The organizational structure of the REBs generally encompasses two major departments, namely general education and TVET. The general education department is further subdivided into units such as the curriculum unit and the supervision unit. In addition to those major departments, several smaller units' form part of the organizational structure, such as planning, legal services, public relations and finance. The REB answers to two agencies – the regional council (on policy, planning, management and financial matters) and

to the sector ministry (on policy and standard matters). More precisely, the REB has the following major responsibilities as jot down by MOE (2002): to plan, administer and direct education from the pre-school to junior college level in line with the country's education policy; to provide basic education to all in the region; to monitor the implementation of education policy in the region; to adapt the national curricular framework, particularly that of primary and pre-primary education, to the region's specific needs and culture; to build, rehabilitate, maintain and repair educational establishments (secondary schools, TVET and teacher training schools) in the region; to train, employ, manage and dismiss teachers and other educational staff; to supply educational materials and equipment, and issue certificates; to license the establishment of private institutions of education (primary, secondary and middle-level TVETs); to initiate and enhance the participation of the community.

### **2.6.3. The Zonal Education Office**

In some regions, particularly the larger ones such as South Eastern Tigray zones were created as an intermediary level between the REB and WEO levels. "The zone is another tier of governance situated between the region and the woreda with a limited administrative role, with much coordination and without legislative power" (Ministry of Education, 2006).

### **2.6.4. The Woredas Education Offices (WEOs)**

According to MOE (2002), Woredas Education Offices (WEOs) are the primary educational authorities responsible for the establishment and implementation of all educational activities – primary, secondary and TVET at the district level. They monitor the delivery of instruction in schools and mobilize resources for the operation of schools. The sub-city education administrations are the equivalent of Woredas education offices in city administration.

The WEO is administratively subordinated to the Woredas Council, and also professionally and technically answerable to the REB. Its specific mandates are the following: planning education for the Woredas up to secondary level; ensuring standards and the accreditation of institutions; implementing and evaluating projects; administering primary and secondary schools; monitoring and supervising programs; enhancing community participation by establishing administrative boards, PTAs and other committees; developing interschool integration and coordination; allocating budgets to schools; building the capacities of educational personnel in the woredas.

WEOs are supposed to undertake preliminary analysis of the data they collect and provide feedback to the schools before they forward it to the REB. They also have the responsibility of training kebele education officers, recruiting, training and deploying teachers and head teachers, as well as supporting kebele offices.

### **2.6.5. The Kebele Education and Training Board (KETB)**

The KETBs have fewer responsibilities in educational planning, but play an important role in the actual implementation of policies at the pre-primary and primary levels of education. Their staff comprises two to five people usually recruited among primary school teachers.

They are responsible for (MOE, 2002): collecting educational data up to the primary level and forwarding it to the WEOs; monitoring the operations of the school in the kebele; participating in the evaluation of teachers' performance; organizing and facilitating community participation and support; paying attention to the disciplinary affairs of teachers and students.

### **2.7. Decentralization and Decision-Making**

Within the last two decades there has been a big push by international development agencies to make decentralized governance a key part of reforms to improve education service delivery in developing countries (Naidoo, 2002; De Grauwe et al., 2005). This increasing policy shift is usually based on the assumption that decentralized systems are leaner and therefore better at responding to local needs (Rondinelli, 1981). Within the local community context, shared educational concerns, such as persistent dropout, high pupil absenteeism, and utilization of school fees are expected to galvanize community and local government action (Chapman, 2000).

Decentralization of education service delivery, it is also argued, can produce greater community pressure for transparency and accountability in school management (Chapman, 2000). In Ghana, for example, education decentralization has been presented as the vehicle for strengthening management efficiency and accountability by locating critical decision-making of education matters at the district level.

Decentralization will be the major driving force in strengthening efficiency and accountability of resources and results. Basic education will be made accountable to local level authorities with development and operational responsibilities transferred from central government to the districts. Self-regulation mechanisms through school communities at grass roots will be introduced (Government of Ghana, 2000).

These studies show „elements of hope“ for decentralization policy in poor countries. For example, in these countries it had more or less motivated parents to show greater interest in their children's education, to the extent that in some places the functioning of local education offices was financed. Although, De Grauwe et al. (2005), agree it might not be a sustainable policy, and that its „impact on equity is probably negative, it nevertheless shows a commitment to education, which is an indispensable building block for any decentralization policy“.

Furthermore, it is an indication of demand for education that could serve better purposes than the usual purpose of resource mobilization. To illustrate this point, they describe a specific situation where in one school PTA members contacted parents of children absent from school for a considerable length of time and made efforts to convince these parents to send their children back to school. In another example, increased awareness of the role of the

community in school development had encouraged one older woman in the community to take up the responsibility of caring for pupils with minor health problems, thus making the „school a more child-friendly one“. Thus, despite the considerable evidence of lack of effectiveness in decentralization policy, the process in many countries has raised awareness and commitment among local players to take more active role in addressing problems of education.

If the new challenge for local government is to provide leadership that energizes local communities, head teachers and teachers into action to improve access then what is needed is better understanding of how hierarchical power relations undermine local agency.

In general, the literature reveals very little celebration of the positive impact of decentralization policy in terms of shifting responsibility for critical decision-making to lower levels of government, institutions and local people. The most optimistic outcome of decentralization policy in developing countries appears to be creation of awareness and increase in local concern and action to address problems of education at the local level (De Grauwe et al., 2005).

## **2.8. Level of Participation of Stakeholders in the Decentralized Education Management**

One of the advantages of involving communities in school decision-making is that it creates a greater sense of ownership, morale and commitment among the stakeholders. Decisions that are made at local level are arguably more responsive to specific issues related to school contexts (Dunne et al., 2007). An important achievement has been observed in South Africa in this regard, since school-based governance is often integrated with participatory decision-making (Naidoo, 2005).

Decentralization motivates parents to show greater interest in their children’s education. In some cases, the functioning of local education offices was financed by communities (Dunne et al., 2007). According to De Grauwe et al. (2011), the involvement of parents, teachers, local councilors and education officials in school management can help to promote decision-making at school level, which improves the quality of schooling and students’ achievement.

However, the implementation of decision-making through the full participation of parents and communities’ entails challenges. When compared with teachers and head teachers, community groups do not focus on education matters and this often creates conflict (Naidoo, 2005).

To conclude, MOE (2007) indicated that the Government of Ethiopia has recently focused on improving school-based management through the devolution of education decision-making to school level. To achieve this objective, it has promoted the roles of various education stakeholders in decision-making. Specifically,

- It has tried to strengthen the relationship between the WEOs and the schools through monitoring and capacity-building schemes.

- The recent education programs such as ESDP IV, GEQIP and SIP give more power to head teachers and administrators to coordinate the roles of communities, parents and local administration in school decision-making.
- The policy emphasizes the importance of the participation of communities, parents and teachers (through PTAs) for the improvement of critical decision-making at school level.
- As a key local administration unit working closely with the community, kebele administration is considered as one of the key stakeholders for enhancing school based management.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY**

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

To carry out an in-depth assessment of the implementation of decentralized educational management: its constraints, problems, challenge and performances in South Eastern Zone, a descriptive survey method was employed in this study on the ground that it was found to be one of the methods that helps to obtain reliable and relevant information from a variety of group on the actual practices of the issues under the study. In relation to this Kaul, (2006). Stated that descriptive method helps to have general understanding of the Problem by studying the current status, nature of prevailing condition, practices and trends through relevant and precise information. Strengthening this assumption, Sharma, (2000) states a descriptive research method allows objectives description of the status of a phenomenon at a particular time without value judgment. Moreover, with descriptive survey research it is possible to describe what the data show to indicate how the intended variables are being implemented to contribute to current practice of decentralized educational management in South Eastern Zone. In this connection Seyoum and Ayalew (1989) express that the descriptive survey methods of the research is more appropriate to gather different kinds for data of such broad size. This justification made the descriptive survey methods more appropriate.

In order to attain the objective of the study the researcher was used both quantitative, qualitative and mixed method approach. The data was collected using questionnaire, interview and documents. In using these questionnaires different questions was used in different forms which tolerate the quantitative basis and the qualitative basis. However, it appears that choosing one research approach over another severely limits the scope of the study as (Creswell 2011) observed, one approach alone cannot answer all the questions that might emerge in the course of researching a topic. In order to facilitate a more comprehensive study, the researcher was used to all available research tools.

#### **3.3. Source of Data**

The data for the study was obtained from both primary and secondary sources.

##### **3.3.1. Primary data sources**

Primary data was collected from WEOs heads and experts; secondary school principals and PTSA members through questionnaires and interviews.

### **3.3.2. Secondary Data Sources**

The secondary data sources were relevant books and legal documents such as educational directives, planning documents and training manuals.

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

### **3.4.1. Population and Sample Size**

There are four Woredas in South Eastern Zone. It would be the pleasure of the researcher if it possible to include all these Woredas in the study. However, due to financial, time and other constraints, the study was focused on only two Woredas. These were Hintalo-Wejerat and Enderta, in conducting this research with some possible audiences in mind; the target groups for this study was WEO personnel, secondary school principals and PTA members. Once the study area was selected, it is rational to specify the study population, because improper specification of the population may affect the decision was make on the type of sample and resources was used. In connection to this, Mannion, A. M. (1995). Suggest, it is logical to determine the population and the sample size depending on the purpose and nature of the study groups. The population of the study consisted of 2(100%) WEO heads, 16 (58%) WEO experts, 6(47%) principals and 48 (41%) PTSA members. This accounts to a sum of 72(62%) respondents (Kumar, 2006).

### **3.4.2. Sampling Techniques**

Purposive sampling technique was employed to select sample Woredas. With this sampling technique, the researcher selected two of the four Woredas as the sources of information based on their geographical location and level of infrastructure facilities. Accordingly, HintaloWejerat and Enderta was selected being close to the main transportation line to the North part of the country; which have relatively better infrastructure facilities as compared to the other two sample Woredas: HintaloWejerat and Enderta which are located in the rural part of the zone. The total population in the study area was listed in the table.

## Sample Size and sampling techniques of Respondents

**Table 1: Sample Size and sample techniques of Respondents**

Woreda	Secondary school	WEO heads			WEO Experts			Principals			PTA Members		
		Population	Sample	%	Population	Sample	%	Population	Sample	%	Population	Sample	%
H/wejerat	Esra adi	1	1	100	13	8	62	7	3	43	63	36	57
	M/weyane												
	Adigudom												
Enderta	Meremieti	1	1	100	15	8	53	6	3	50	54	36	67
	Aragure												
	Maymekden												
Total		2	2	100	28	16	58	13	6	47	117	72	62
Sampling technique		Availability			Random Sampling technique			Random Sampling technique			Random Sampling technique		

So, from the above the total number of population the researcher also where selected only 72 respondents and was used availability sampling technique to select 2(100%) leaders of the education offices from all selected Woredas and 16(57%) WEO experts was selected by random sampling technique. In order to carry out the later one he divided all WEO experts of the sample Woredas in to four groups based on their units in the office. Namely, planning, teacher's development program, curriculum and supervision units. Then, 16(57%) experts was selected randomly from the four groups of the sample Woredas. In addition, to make the study more reliable, 6(47 %) secondary school principals and 48(41%) PTA members in the selected Woredas was also be selected by random sampling technique.

### 3.5. Data Gathering Tools

The primary data for the study were collected from personnel of the selected Woredas Education Offices and Secondary Schools through questionnaires and interview based on the basic questions of the research and secondary data was collected from related documents.

#### 3.5.1. Questionnaire

To collect the primary data, the researcher administered questionnaires. Separate questionnaires were distributed to WEO personnel and secondary school leaders (principals and PTA members). To make the questionnaires more manageable, both open and closed ended questions was prepared in Tigrigna language for PTA members and in English language for WEO personnel and principals. The questionnaire was incorporated both close-ended and open-ended items. The close -ended items again where included multiple choice items and Pilot test was conducted at Hintalo-Wejerat and Enderta Weredas on sixteen WEO experts, twenty-four PTA members and six principals. This was made to identify the reliability of the items and to get some comments and make necessary correction for

the successful accomplishment of the final administration of the questionnaire. In such way, the responses of the respondents were put in to SPSS16 to test the reliability. Having taken all the possible suggestions and comments into account, the researcher was made readjustment to the questionnaire and finally, administered it to the sample.

### **3.5.2. Interview**

To validate the information from the questionnaires, semi-structured interviews were administered to WEO heads and secondary school principals to collect qualitative data. Interview was made with the above respondents in order to get relevant data according to the present practice of decentralized educational management. The checklist and notes were used as a control mechanism during interviews. The interviews were made by the researcher himself.

### **3.5.3. Documents**

In order to find the facts in the study area, the researcher reviewed different documents of the sample WEO and secondary schools' documents such as minutes, and reports (monthly, quarterly and annual). This helped the researcher to make a crosscheck against the collected data.

## **3.6. Procedures of Data Collection**

In order to administer the readymade questionnaire, the researcher first attempted to contact the Woreda Education personnel to create a conducive environment for the successful accomplishment of the study. Next to this, school principals and PTA members were informed about the purpose of the study in detail and then they were given the required information about the questionnaires. Following this, the respondents were provided with a chance to ask questions about the issue which was not clear for them. Then, the researcher was giving a brief explanation about each point in the discussion and answered all the questions that were raised.

To this effect, the respondents were told to reply the questionnaires based on the facts and their personal feelings. After the respondents have filled the questionnaires, they returned these data back to the researcher for further analysis. An interview was also conducted through disclosing the purpose of the study based on the permission and willingness of respondents by the researcher. Besides, document investigation was also made by the researcher himself. Then, the researcher collected all the data from the respondents and analyzed them by using different methods of data analysis. Finally, some possible recommendations were forwarded.

## **3.7. Methods of Data Analysis**

The analysis and interpretation of the study was based on the data collected through the data collecting instruments. Quantitative data was coded and entered in SPSS16, tabulated and analyzed using descriptive statistics methods such as frequencies and percentage. Qualitative data were analyzed, described and interpreted through explanation and conceptualization by using narrative analysis to supplement the quantitative data.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETION

#### 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter deals with presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data collected from respondents of 2 woreda education office heads, 16 experts, 6 principals and 48 parent teacher association members through questionnaires; 4 principals and 2 Woredas education office heads through interview and document analysis. The data were presented in tables and analyzed using appropriate statistical tools such as, percentages and frequencies. Moreover, the most important points were discussed qualitatively through descriptive statements. The researcher dispatched 75 questionnaires for the respondents among these the rate of return was 72 (96%).

##### 4.1. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

In the questionnaire, respondents were requested to provide a limited amount of information related to their personal and professional demographic characteristics. Accordingly, the following variables about the respondents were summarized and described in the subsequent table. These variables include: sex, age, education qualification and experience of the respondents in their present post.

**Table 2: Characteristics of Respondents**

Total number of respondents		WEO head		Experts		Principals		PTAs		Total	
		f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%
		2	100	16	100	6	100	48	100	72	97.2
Sex	Male	2	100	16	100	6	100	30	63	54	75
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	37	18	25
Age	20-24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	25—29	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	30-34	-	-	6	37.5	2	33	8	16.7	16	22.2
	35-39	1	50	4	25	2	33	14	29.2	23	29.2
	>40-45	1	50	3	18.75	1	17	18	37.5	22	32
	>45	-	-	3	18.75	1	17	8	16.7	25	16.7
Education qualification	12 complete	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Certificate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Diploma	-	-	4	25	-	-	-	-	4	5.6
	Bachelor degree	2	100	12	75	-	-	-	-	24	33.3
	Masters and above	-	-	-	-	6	100	-	-	6	8.33
Experience in their present post	Less than 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	25	35	25	34.7
	4-6	-	-	-	-	-	-	23	48	23	32
	7-9			6	38	2	33	-	-	8	11.1
	10 and above	2	100	10	62	4	67	-	-	16	22.2

Representation: f= Frequency

According to the information from table 2 above, about 75% of the respondents were male, which shows the inadequate involvement of females in educational management. Regarding the age of the respondents, the largest group (32%) was in the age of 40-45 followed by 29.2% in the age of 35-39 which shows that young graduates are almost not involved in educational management. As to education qualification of the respondents, 33.3% were bachelor degree holders while 8.3% were master holders. Most of WEO heads said: “Many of our experts and all of our secondary school principals are diploma and degree holders respectively. This is inadequate education qualification as the minimum qualification required is bachelor of degree for all experts and masters for secondary school principals. But, our (heads of WEO) qualification does not matter as we are politically nominated.” This shows that WEO heads are politically nominated without any technical criteria and professional experience.

According to MOE (2007), the minimum education qualification required for secondary school principals is masters in EdPM while WEO experts are required to have BA degree in the fields related to education. However, this document does not say anything about education qualification of WEO heads except simply mentioning that they are nominated. Concerning the experience in their present post, the largest (34.7%) of the respondents has less than three years of experience which shows that they are not well experienced in their present post.

#### 4.2. Practices of Delegation of Authority

Table 3; below, the respondents were asked through which process they obtained their present post.

**Table 3: The Process through which the Respondents Obtained their Present Post**

1. Through which process did you obtain your post?	WEO head		Experts		Principals		PTAs		Total	
	f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%
Promotion	-	-	8	50	1	16.7	-	-	9	12.5
Internal competitive recruitment	-	-	4	25	4	66.6	-	-	8	11.11
external competitive recruitment	-	-	-	-	1	16.6	-	-	1	1.4
Nomination	2	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2.8
Transfer	-	-	4	25	-	-	-	-	4	5.6
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	48	100	48	66.6

According to table 3 above, 2(100%) of Woredas education office heads obtained their post through nomination; 50% of experts obtained their post through promotion while 25% of them obtained their post through transfer; 66.6% of principals obtained their post through internal competitive recruitment; and 48 (100%) PTA members obtained their post through other process (selection). The responses show that most of WEO experts are not placed in their post through competitive recruitment process. Regarding this, most of the WEO heads said: “We simply promote best performing teachers from schools and transfer experts from one post to the other without asking the necessary criteria because of shortage of budget to recruit new workers for the posts.” This may have impact on the quality of teaching learning process as effective teachers are promoted to WEOs.

**Table 4: The Practices of Delegation of Authority**

Note: f= Frequency, SA= Strongly Agree; A= Agree; PA= Partially Agree; D= Disagree; SD= Strongly Disagree

Items		WEO head		Experts		Principals		PTAs		Total	
		f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%
2. Education administrative authority is delegated to me	SA	1	50	4	25	2	33	19	39.6	26	36.11
	A	1	50	7	44	4	67	15	31.3	27	37.5
	PA	-	-	5	31	-	-	10	20.8	15	20.83
	DA	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	8.3	4	5.6
3. Financial authority is delegated to me	SA	-	-	-	-	3	50	18	37.5	21	29.2
	A	2	100	3	19	2	33	8	16.7	15	20.83
	PA	-	-	9	56	1	17	14	29.2	24	33.33
	D	-	-	4	25	-	-	8	16.7	12	16.7
4. Nature and scope of my task is clearly defined	SA	2	100	1	6	-	-	6	12.5	9	12.5
	A	-	-	3	19	3	50	21	43.8	27	37.5
	PA	-	-	10	62	3	50	17	35.4	30	41.7
	D	-	-	2	13	-	-	4	8.3	6	8.33
5. I've authority which is proportionate to my tasks	SA	2	100	5	31	1	17	8	16.7	16	22.22
	A		-	7	44	3	50	26	54.2	36	50
	PA		-	4	25	2	33	14	21.2	20	27.8
	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. I clearly know the limits of my authority	SA	1	50	2	13	1	17	17	35.4	21	29.2
	A	1	50	5	31	3	50	14	29.2	23	32
	PA	-	-	9	56	2	33	11	23	22	30.6
	D	-	-	-		-	-	6	12.5	6	8.33
7. I've incentives in my present post	SA		-	3	19	-	-	10	20.8	13	18.1
	A	2	100	8	50	2	33	25	52.1	37	51.4
	PA	-	-	5	31	3	50	13	27.1	21	29.2
	D	--	-	-	-	1		-	-	1	1.4
8. I've received training which enables me perform my duties	SA	2	100	2	12	1	17	11	22.9	16	8.33
	A	-	-	4	25	2	33	19	39.6	25	34.7
	PA	-	-	6	38	3	50	17	35.4	26	36.11
	D	-	-	4	25	-	-	1	2.1	5	6.94
9. I've enough freedom to perform my work	SA	1	50	2	12	1	17	27	56.3	31	43.1
	A	1	50	6	38	2	33	12	25	19	29.2
	PA	-	-	4	25	2	33	9	18.8	15	20.83
	D	-	-	4	25	1	17	-	-	5	6.94

As shown in table 4 above, item 2, the respondents were asked to rate to what extent the education administrative authority is delegated to them. Accordingly, 50% of WEO heads, 44% of experts, 67% of principals and 39.6% of PTA reflected their agreement by saying that the necessary authority to administer education is decentralized to lower levels together with decentralized educational management.

In item 3 of table 4, the respondents were asked to what extent the financial authority is delegated to them. Accordingly, 100% of WEO heads partially agreed, 56% of experts' partial greed, 50% of principals agreed and 37.5% of PTA members strongly agreed with the statement. This indicates that financial authority is decentralized

to lower levels, especially to the school level as the largest number of WEO heads (100%) agreed with the statement. In addition to this most of WEO heads confirmed: “Education administration and financial authority are normally delegated to the lower levels of education management. For instance, WEO and secondary schools have the authority to administer their own budgets. However, sometimes there might be limitations in implementing this on the part of education leaders.”

As Pont et al. (2009) indicated decentralization has disadvantages as well as benefits. For example, school-level control over devolved budgets creates opportunities for school leaders to allocate resources to priority development areas, but it increases the burden of financial administration, leaving less time to focus on teaching and learning. In item number 4 of table 4, the respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement on the clarity of the nature and scope of their task. The majority of the respondents: 2(100%) of WEO heads agreed, 10(62%) of experts are partial agreed and 13(50%) of PTA members partially agreed while 21(43.8%) of agreed with the idea. This shows that the nature and scope of the principals’ task is more or less clearly defined while for the other respondents, it is somewhat clearly defined. Regarding this most of WEO heads confirmed: “The nature and scope of each and every position’s (WEO heads, experts, principals and PTAs) task is clearly defined in MOE’s guidelines which was written in 2002.”

According to Salinas-Maningo (2005), when delegating authority leaders must explain exactly what they want the employee to do and they should not forget to describe the background and overall scope of the task.

The respondents were asked to show their agreement on whether they have authority which is proportionate to their tasks in item 5 of table 4. 2 (100 %) of WEO heads are strong agreed, while 7 (44%) of experts, 3 (50%) of principals and 26 (54.2%) of PTA members agreed, with the statement. This shows that enough authority which is proportionate to their tasks is not delegated.

Autonomy and accountability at local authority and school levels is not a simple and straightforward matter. What happens or fails to happen on the ground reflects the difficulties of shifting traditions and long-standing practices. As De Grauwe et al. (2005) have pointed out the situation can be described as paradoxical: “where autonomy is needed it is lacking because of a rigid control which, however, is inefficient and counterproductive.

In item 6 of table 4 the respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement on whether they clearly know the limits of their authority. Most of the respondents 1 (50%) of WEO heads, strong agreed 9 (56%) of experts, partial agreed 3(50%) of principals are agreed and 17 (35.4%) of PTA members] strongly agreed with the statement.

Every individual, from the president of the company down to the floor sweepers, must know the limits and scope of the authority of his or her position. These limitations - this scope - must never be circumvented. When an individual circumvents the authority of any other, he effectively relieves that individual of all responsibility and accountability for an unspecified length of time (MOE, 2007).

In item number 7 of table 4, the respondents were asked to show their level of agreement with the statement “I have incentive in my present post.” The majority of the respondents (33.3% of WEO heads partially agreed, 52.2% of experts disagreed, 72.7% of principals agreed and 57.1% of PTA members disagreed with the statement). This shows that there was not enough incentive for experts and PTA members. Regarding this, one of WEO heads said in an interview: “Although education authority is delegated to the local levels through decentralization, there is not enough incentive for the local level actors (especially: experts, PTA members and so on) which is very important to implement decentralized education management.”

According to Salinas-Maningo (2005), rewarding delegates is an important point of consider. One way could be thanking the employees while they are working on the project and after the task is completed. It is also good to reward them as appropriate for their hard work.

In item 8, table 4, the respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement on whether they received training which enables them perform their duties. While 2 (100%) of WEO heads are strongly agreed, 6 (38%) of experts and 3 (50%) of principals partially agreed with the statement, 19 (39.6%) of PTA members agreed.

Major justifications for decentralization include enhancing local planning capacity, community participation and enabling other actors to contribute in the process of improving the efficiency of service delivery (Ribot, 2002).

In item number 9 of table 4, the respondents were asked to show their level of agreement with the statement: “I have enough freedom to perform my work.” Accordingly, 1 (500%) of WEO heads, 6 (38%) of experts, 2 (33%) of principals are agreed while 27 (56.3%) of PTA members strongly agreed with the statement. Most of secondary school principals supported this idea by saying: “However roles and responsibilities of each and every body is clearly defined in MOE’s guideline, sometimes some superiors interfere in the works of their subordinates. For instance, WEO heads and experts interfere in the tasks of principals, and principals interfere in the tasks of PTAs which hinders subordinates to perform their works with freedom.”

According to Nathan (2000), careful planning is the source of effective delegation. Nathan further suggests that defining clearly and precisely areas of responsibility to be delegated are the first task. The second one is the authority to do the job; that is signing letters, using office, taking decisions without referring back to the principal. Thirdly, the delegated staff members need to be clear on how the performance will be judged. Finally, effective communication is a critical aspect of effective delegation that helps a leader.

### **4.3. Decision Making Process**

In table 5 below, respondents were required to indicate their level of agreement with the statements concerning educational decision making process in their woreda and responses were measured on five point Likert scale with Strongly Agree, Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree.

**Table 5: The Decision Making Process**

Items		WEO head		Experts		Principals		PTAs		Total	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
10. I've enough autonomy to make decisions	SA	2	100	-	-	3	50	10	20.8	15	20.8
	A	-	-	5	31	3	50	25	52.1	33	45.8
	PA	-	-	6	38	-	-	13	27.1	19	26.4
	DA	-	-	5	31	-	-	-	-	5	6.9
	SD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11. there is clear decision making process in our office	SA	1	50	3	19	2	33	5	10.4	11	15.3
	A	1	50	4	25	1	17	11	22.9	17	23.6
	PA	-	-	6	37	3	50	17	35.4	26	36.1
	DA	-	-	3	19	-	-	10	20.8	13	18.1
	SD	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	5	10.4	6.9
12. roles & responsibilities of every employee in our office is clearly defined	SA	-	-	2	13	1	17	4	22	8.33	9.7
	A	2	100	8	50	4	66	22	31	5.83	36.1
	PA	-	-	6	37	1	17	17	24	35.4	33.3
	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	15	10.4	6.9
	SD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13. Employees make decisions according to their assigned roles and responsibilities	SA	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	16.7	8	11.1
	A	1	50	7	44	3	50	27	56.3	38	52.8
	PA	1	50	6	38	2	33	7	14.6	14	22.2
	D	-	-	3	18	1	17	6	12.5	10	13.9
	SD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14. I've all the skills I need to make decisions well	SA	1	50	4	25	2	33	9	18.8	16	22.2
	A	1	50	5	31	3	50	19	39.6	28	38.9
	PA	-	-	6	38	1	17	13	27.1	20	27.8
	D	-	-	1	6	-	-	7	14.6	8	11.1
	SD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15. My superior do not interfere in my decision making process	SA	-	-	1	6	1	17	7	14.6	9	12.5
	A	1	50	3	19	2	33	28	58.3	34	47.2
	PA	1	50	4	25	2	33	10	20.8	17	23.6
	DA	-	-	7	44	1	17	3	6.3	11	15.3
	SD	-	-	1	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
16. Important DM responsibilities are decentralized-zed to the lower levels according to directives	SA	1	50	-	-	1	17	13	27.1	15	20.8
	A	1	50	9	56	3	50	24	50	27	37.5
	PA	-	-	7	44	2	33	11	22.9	20	27.8
	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
17. Decentralized decision making responsibilities are being practically implemented	SA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	A	1	50	2	12	1	17	13	27.1	17	23.6
	PA	1	50	7	44	2	33	15	31.3	21	29.2
	D	-	-	3	19	2	33	15	31.3	20	27.8
	SD	-	-	4	25	1	17	5	10.4	14	19.4

Representation: f= Frequency

In table 5 above, item 10, the respondents were asked to show their agreement on whether they have enough autonomy to make decisions. The majority of the respondents 2(100% of WEO heads, are strong agreed and 38% of expert's partial agreed and 50% of strong agreed, 52.1% of PTA 57 members agreed with the statement) which shows that the respondents have some autonomy to make decisions as 45.5% of principals also agreed with the statement except experts of which 26.1% of them disagreed with the statement. One of the WEO heads also confirmed: "Our woreda's educational personnel have sufficient autonomy to make decisions except in some cases in which some superiors interfere in the decision making of their subordinates."

Pont et al. (2009) indicated that school leaders can only have an impact on student outcomes if they have sufficient autonomy to make important decisions about the curriculum and teacher recruitment and development and if their major areas of responsibility are focused on improving student learning.

In item 11 of table 5, the respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement asking "if there is clear decision making process in their office". 26 (36.1%) of the respondents partially agreed while 17(23.6%) of them part agreed with the statement. It can be deduced from the responses that the decision making process is not clear enough.

According to MOE (2013), the process of decision making needs to follow a series of logical steps which starts with recognizing a problem as a problem and going through considering alternative solutions, selecting the best one(s) and finally accepting an action. With this regard, it can be said that decision making is not easy task, but difficult even to highly trained and people experienced.

In item number 12 of table 5, the respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement on the level to which roles and responsibilities of every employee in their office are clearly defined. Accordingly, 100% of WEO heads and 50% of PTA members and 66% are agreed with the statement while 37% experts and 24% PTA are partially agreed with the statement. As most of WEO heads and principal members agreed with the statement it is possible to conclude that roles and responsibilities of them are clearly defined. On the other hand, the majority of experts and principals partially agreed with the idea which shows that their roles and responsibilities are somehow clearly defined. One of the principals said: "Roles and responsibilities of every employee in education are clearly defined in MOE's manual.

However, most of them do not know their roles and responsibilities well because they do not usually read it."

In relationships between local education authorities and schools, there is some ambiguity over who is responsible to whom and for what (De Grauwe et al., 2005).

Item 13 of table 5 required the respondents to indicate their level of agreement on the extent to which employees make decisions according to their assigned roles and responsibilities. 50% of heads 38%, 44% and 50% of experts, principals and PTA members respectively agreed with the statement. Their responses indicate that employees do make decisions according to their assigned roles and responsibilities except for WEO heads who make decisions somewhat according to the assigned roles and responsibilities. Most of the WEO heads indicated: "The problem in decision making is that most of the time most superiors interfere in the decision making process of their subordinates that makes employees not to make decisions according to their assigned roles and responsibilities."

While decentralization may be a goal of many education reforms, research from many developing countries indicates that decentralization policy does not necessarily produce the expected outcomes. The fact that decentralization has not devolved power and control over education management, financial administration and teacher management to the school level can be one of the challenges (De Grauwe et al., 2011).

In item number 14 of table 5, the respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement “I have all the skills I need to make decisions well”. 50% of WEO heads agreed, 38% of experts, partially agreed and 50% of principals 39.6% of PTA members agreed with the statement. According to the responses it can be deduced that many of the respondents have not got all the skills they needed to make decisions well.

According to MOE (2013), decision making process is a consultative affair done by a committee of professionals to drive better functioning of any organization. Thereby, it is a continuous and dynamic activity that pervades all other activities pertaining to the organization. Since it is an ongoing activity, decision making process plays vital importance in the functioning of an organization. Since intellectual minds are involved in the process of decision making, it requires solid scientific knowledge coupled with skills and experience in addition to mental maturity. In item 15 of table 5 above, the respondents were requested to indicate their level of agreement with the statement: “my superior does not interfere in my decision making process”. The majority of WEO heads (50%) agreed and expert (44%) disagreed with the statement while the majority of principals (33%) and PTA members (58.3) partially agreed with the statement. It can be concluded from this data that most of WEO heads” and experts” superiors interfere in the decision making process of their workers while most of principals” and PTA members” superiors somewhat interfere in their decision making process.

Item 16 in table 5 requested the respondents to show their level of agreement with the statement: “important DM responsibilities are decentralized to the lower levels according to directives”. The respondents: WEO heads, experts, principals, and PTA members (50%), (50%), (50%) and (50%) respectively agreed with the statement. The responses show that most of the important decision making responsibilities are decentralized to the milder levels of the woredas.

Decision-making at the woreda and school levels. This was further strengthened with ESDP III (2005) when the government decided to decentralize critical decision-making from regions and zones to the woredas and municipalities, and further to the school level, with the objective of having education become more responsive to school situations (MOE, 2005).

The respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement: “decentralized responsibilities are being practically implemented” in item 17 of table 5. The majority of the respondents: 1 (50%) of WEO heads, 25 (44%) of experts, 17 (33%) of principals and 15 (31.3%) of PTA members partially agreed with the idea. From these responses, it can be concluded that decentralized responsibilities to the lower levels of the Woredas are being practically implemented.

According to Dunne et al. (2007), in many developing countries, the shift to decentralization as a way of improving service delivery has been initiated because of pressure from international organizations. It is not an internally driven force that will bring realistic outcomes in the system. Moreover, problems such as poverty, difficult socio-political situations and limited economic opportunities have prevented decentralization from bringing about the desired outcomes in local contexts.

In table 6 below, respondents were asked to show how useful the support they received from their superior, colleagues, manuals/guidelines, official documents and internet.

Table 6: The Degree of Usefulness of Superiors, Colleagues, Manuals, Official Documents and Internet in the Decision Making Process of the Respondents

18. Indicate the level of usefulness of the following sources in your decision making process

Items		WEO head		Experts		Principals		PTAs		Total	
		f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%
18.1. my superior	Very useful	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	18.8	9	12.5
	Useful	1	50	4	25	1	16.7	18	37.5	24	33.3
	Somehow useful	1	50	6	35.5	3	50	14	29.2	24	33.3
	Not useful	-	-	6	35.5	2	33.3	7	14.6	15	20.8
18.2. my colleagues	very useful	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	12.5	6	8.33
	Useful	1	50	10	62.5	3	50	15	31.3	29	40.3
	somehow useful	1	50	6	37.5	3	50	25	52.1	35	48.6
	not useful	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	4.2	2	2.8
18.3. Manuals/guidelines	Very useful	-	-	-	-	1	16.7	19	39.6	20	27.8
	Useful	2	100	7	43.8	3	50	21	43.8	33	45.8
	Somehow useful	-	-	4	25	2	33.3	8	12.5	14	19.4
	Not useful	-	-	5	-	-	-	5	6.9	-	-
18.4. Official documents	Very useful	2	100	7	43.8	3	50	19	39.6	31	43.1
	Useful	-	-	6	37.5	3	50	25	52.1	34	47.2
	Somehow useful	-	-	3	18.7	-	-	4	8.33	7	9.7
	Not useful	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
18.5 Internet	Very useful	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Useful	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Somehow useful	-	-	-	-	2	33.3	19	39.6	21	29.2
	Not useful	2	100	16	100	4	66.4	29	60.4	51	70.8

In table 6 above item 18.1, the respondents were asked to show the level of usefulness of their superiors in their decision making process. Accordingly, the majority of the respondents: 50% of heads and 45.7% useful 35.5% experts 50% of principals responded that the support they receive from their superior is somehow useful while and

37.5% of PTA members responded that the support they receive from their superior is useful in their decision making process. This indicates that superiors are giving adequate support in the decision making process of their subordinates except for principals“. In item 18.2 of table 6, the respondents were asked how useful the support they receive from their colleagues is in their decision making process. While the majority of WEO heads (50%), experts (62.5%) and principals (50%) confirmed that the support they receive from their colleagues is useful; the majority of PTA members (52.1%) responded that it is somehow useful. This shows that most of the respondents receive fair support from their colleagues in their decision making process. One of WEO heads confirmed: “Most colleagues know the situation in their work place. Hence, they have the opportunity to help one another in the decision making process.”

In item 18.3 of table 6 above, the respondents were asked to indicate how useful manuals/ guidelines are in their decision making process. Accordingly, the majority of the respondents: 2 (100%) of WEO heads, 7 (43.8%) of experts, 3 (50%) of principals and 21 (43.8%) of PTA members confirmed that manuals/ guidelines are useful for their decision making process. Regarding this, most of the principals also said: “Since we have MOE’s manuals and guidelines in our office, whenever a case arises we can simply use it in decision makings. Hence, manuals and guidelines are very useful in our decision making processes.”

In item 18.4 of table 6 the respondents were asked to show how useful official documents are in their decision making process. The majority of the respondents: 2 (100%) of WEO heads, 10 (43.8%) of experts, 3 (50%) of principals very useful while 25 (52.1%) of PTA members responded that official documents are useful for their decision making process.

In item 18.5 of table 6, the respondents were asked how useful internet is in their decision making process. Almost all the respondents: 2 (100%) of WEO heads, 16 (95.7%) of experts, 6 (100%) of principals and 29 (60.4%) of PTA members responded that internet is useful for their decision making process. Moreover, almost all WEO heads and secondary school principals in the interview confirmed that educational leaders in Woredas levels are not accustomed to use internet in their decision making process. Regarding this, most of the WEO heads said: “Our main reason for not using internet in educational decision making is lack of access to the internet in woreda level.” These problems are related to the level of connection to the Internet within the country, and in particular at the woreda level, where it is very low (5 per cent). For the time being, the cost of a permanent connection for setting up a reliable and efficient system that would allow remote sites to access a centralized database is not affordable (Watson, 2005).

#### 4.4. Level of Communication

**Table 7: Staff Meetings, Evaluation and Monitoring Processes**

Items		WEO head		Experts		Principals		PTAs		Total	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
19. How often staff meetings are held in your office?	Once a week	1	50	6	37.5	2	33.3	-	-	9	9.4
	once a month	1	50	10	62.5	4	66.7	-	-	15	15.6
	Twice a month	-	-	-	-	-	-	16	33.3	16	22.2
	once in 3 month	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	66.7	32	44.4
	Others	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20. During the past three months, how many times you participated in staff meetings?	1-2	1	50	7	43.8	3	50	48	100	59	81.9
	3-4	1	50	9	56.2	3	50	-	-	13	18.1
	5-6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Not	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
21. How do you rate the usefulness of these meetings for your performance?	very useful	1	50	8	50	3	30	27	56.3	39	54.2
	Useful	1	50	8	50	3	30	22	48.3	34	47.2
	Not useful	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
22. adequacy of these meetings	Adequate	2	100	12	75	5	83.3	35	72.9	54	75
	inadequate	-	-	4	25	1	16.7	13	27.1	18	25
23. Have you been evaluated during the past 2 years?	Yes	2	100	14	87.5	6	100	30	62.5	52	72.2
	No	-	-	2	12.5	-	-	18	37.5	20	27.8
24. if yes, was it useful	Very useful	1	50	10	62.5	4	66.7	28	58.3	43	59.7
	Useful	1	50	6	37.5	2	33.3	2	4.2	11	15.3
	Some what	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	37.5	18	25
	not useful	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
25. if yes was it adequate	Yes	2	100	11	68.8	5	83.3	38	79.2	56	77.8
	No	-	-	5	31.2	1	16.7	10	20.8	16	22.2
26. WEO monitors the performance of PTAs	Yes	2	100	16	100	4	66.7	35	72.9	57	79.2
	No	-	-	-	-	2	33.3	13	27.1	15	20.8

Representation: f= Frequency

In item 19 of table 7 above, the respondents were asked to tell how often staff meetings are held in their respective working places. The majority of WEO heads (50%), experts (62.5%) and principals (66.7%) responded that meetings are held once a month. while the majority of and PTA members (80.0%) held once in 3 months selected the option “other” which they mentioned that staff meetings are held when needs arise. This indicates that WEOs hold staff meetings once a month while schools have fixed time to hold staff meetings. Regarding this, one of secondary school principal confirmed: “In principle, we need to arrange regular fixed time to meet with our PTA members. However, in practice most of us call for meetings of PTAs only when needs such as disciplinary problems of students and teachers, discussion on school budgets and so on arise.”

In item 20 of table 7, the respondents were asked to show how many times they participated in staff meetings in the past three months. Accordingly, the majority of the respondents: (50%) of WEO heads and (56.2%) of experts responded (50%) of principals and (100%) of PTA members responded that they participated 1-2 times respectively participated at all. One of the principals in an interview indicated: “Although we had a meeting with

our PTA on an issue during the past three months, most of the members did not attend the meeting. This situation happens in most of our meetings.” What can be deduced from this data is that most of the respondents especially, PTA members do not participate in the meetings.

Weekend (2005) recommends in order to reach parents and get those attending meetings, principals should address them in the language they understand and organize meetings at appropriate times in consultation with the employer (DoE) and also request the employer to provide transport for the parents and teachers who work far from their homes.

In item 21 of table 7 above, the respondents were asked to rate the usefulness of the meetings if they ever participated. The majority of WEO heads (50%) and experts (50%) responded that the meetings were very useful. However, in item 22 where they were asked if the meetings were adequate, the majority of them: 2 (100%) of WEO heads and 12 (75%) of experts, 5 (83.3%) principals, and PTAs responded that the meetings were adequate. Regarding this, one of the WEO heads in an interview also said: “However the participation of our experts is adequate, meetings are always useful to enhance the performance of each and every of them.”

In item 23 of table 7 above, the respondents were asked if they have been evaluated during the past two years. Accordingly, the majority of WEO heads (100%) and principals (687.5%) experts (100%) and PTA members (62.5%) responded that they had been evaluated during the previous two years. This indicates that the required formal evaluation is being conducted for experts and PTAs while heads and principals are evaluated to some extent. According to MOE (2013), evaluation is a selective exercise that attempts to systematically and objectively assess progress towards the achievement of an outcome. Evaluation is not a one-time event, but an exercise involving assessments of differing scope and depth carried out at several points in time in response to evolving needs for evaluative knowledge and learning during the effort to achieve an outcome.

In item 24 of table 7, the respondents were asked how very useful the evaluation was if they were evaluated the majority of WEO heads 1(50%), experts 10(62.5%), principals 4(66.7%) and PTA members (58.3%) responded that they very useful.

In item 25 of table 7, the respondents, who were evaluated, were also asked if the evaluation was adequate and the majority of WEO heads 2(100%), experts 11(68.8%), principals 5(83.3%) and PTA members 38(79.2%) responded adequate evaluation in the Woredas.

In item 26 of table 7 above, the respondents were majority of WEO heads 2(100%), experts 16(100%), principals 4(66.7%) and PTA members 35(72.9%) yes responded. Concerning this, almost all WEO heads and principals in the interview confirmed that WEO does monitor the performance of PTAs while a principal in particular said: “Most of the time WEO does monitor the performance of PTAs. Instead of this WEO only asks the principals whether PTAs are performing well.”

**Table 8: Level of Communication**

Items		WEO head		Experts		Principals		PTAs		Total	
		f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%
27. I am properly oriented about our organization's practices	SA	1	50	2	12.5	2	33.3	9	18.8	14	19.4
	A	1	50	8	50	3	50	25	52.1	37	51.4
	PA	-	-	6	37.5	1	16.7	14	29.2	21	29.2
	DA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
28. I know my job's relationship with others"	SA	1	50	7	44	3	50	26	54.2	27	51.4
	A	1	50	6	38	2	33	8	16.7	17	23.6
	PA			3	18	1	17	16	33.3	20	27.8
	DA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
29. Goals of our organization are communicated to society & stakeholders	SA	1	50	4	25	2	33	9	18.8	16	22.2
	A	1	50	5	31	3	50	19	39.6	28	38.9
	PA	-	-	6	38	1	17	13	27.1	20	27.8
	DA	-	-	1	6	-	-	7	14.6	8	11.1
30. There is proper coordination among units in our office	SA	2	100	1	6	-	-	6	12.5	9	12.5
	A	-	-	3	19	3	50	21	43.8	27	37.5
	PA	-	-	10	62	3	50	18	37.5	31	43.1
	DA	-	-	2	13	-	-	3	6.3	5	6.9
31. I receive proper support from my superior	SA	2	100	5	31	1	17	8	16.7	16	22.2
	A		-	7	44	3	50	26	54.2	36	50
	PA		-	4	25	2	33	14	21.2	20	27.8
	DA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
32. WEO trains PTAs	SA	1	50	2	13	1	17	17	35.4	21	29.2
	A	1	50	5	31	3	50	14	29.2	23	32
	PA	-	-	9	56	2	33	11	23	22	30.6
	DA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Representation: f = Frequency

In item 27 of table 8 above, the respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement: "I am properly oriented about our organization's structure, policies and practices." Accordingly, the majority of the respondents: 1(50%) of WEO heads 3 (50%) experts, 8 (50%) principals and 25 (52.1%) PTA members agreed with the statement. This indicates that they were oriented and given necessary training before and after they were posted to their current positions. Hence, this has contributed to the high level of participation of PTAs and community in the school management system. Regarding this, one of the principals said: "Most of the time educational personnel in our Woredas are properly oriented about the organization's structure, policies and practices when they are first recruited. Instead they simply start their work." If members of the team do abide by their organizational values, morals, and principles, their organization is in well. In this respect, members of the SGB were trapped in an ethical and had to take the right direction as depicted by the guidelines (Covey, 1992).

In item 28 table 8, the respondents were asked to show their level of agreement with the extent to which they know their job's relationship with others" jobs in the organization. Accordingly, the majority of them: 1 (50%) of WEO heads, 7 (44%) of experts, 3 (50%) of principals and 26 (54.2%) of PTA members strongly agreed with the

statement which indicates that they know their job's relationship with others" jobs only to some extent. One of the WEO heads in an interview also confirmed: "Some of our experts and principals and most of PTA members do know the relationship between their jobs and other education personnel's jobs which means they do know to whom they should report and who their close superior is".

Chapman (2000) examined trends in educational administration in East Asia which showed that what the network of provincial, regional and district education offices largely did was to duplicate the structure of the central ministry, and that there was very little communication either between levels of ministry or across units at the same level. To address such challenges, others recommend a gradual transfer of autonomy to the local level – that is, allow lower levels of government to earn their autonomy by demonstrating their capability before allowing them to graduate to higher levels of responsibility and discretion within acceptable levels of risk (UNESCO, 2005).

In item 29 of table 8 above, the respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement: "goals, activities and accomplishments of our organization are communicated to society and stakeholders". The majority: 1 (50%) of WEO heads, 3 (50%) of principals and 19 (39.6%) of PTA members agreed while 6 (38%) of experts, partially agreed with the statement. Moreover, one of WEO heads in an interview added: "Goals, activities and accomplishments of our organization are communicated to society and all stakeholders as required." The school leadership should consider training parents and learners, not only to involve them in SGBs or RCLs, but also in general school activities. This will be achieved when school principals improve communication with parents as well as work towards bridging the distance between teachers and learners, which has been caused by societal traditions (Weekend, 2005).

In item 30 in table 8, the respondents were asked to show their level of agreement with the statement: "There is proper coordination among units in our office". The majority of the respondents: 2 (100%) of WEO heads strong agreed, and 10(68%) of experts, 3(50%) of principals partially agreed while 21 (43.8%) of PTA members agreed with the statement. This indicates that there is no proper coordination among units in their offices.

The relationship between elected local authorities and education offices was usually characterized by conflict rather than collaboration. Crucially, their different legitimacies are in confrontation: "education officials refer to their professional legitimacy, while local authorities emphasize their political legitimacy" (Dunne et al., 2007).

In item 31 of table 8, the respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement: "I receive proper support and guidance from my superior". The majority: 100% of WEO strong agreed while 44% of principals, 50% of experts and 54.2% of PTA members agreed with the statement. However, there are some committed superiors who help their subordinates by giving proper support and guidance." In Ghana, circuit supervisors who visited schools rarely went beyond checking staffing numbers and enrolments for the purpose of addressing problems of teacher absenteeism or low enrolment instead of giving proper support and guidance (World Bank, 2004).

In item 32 of table 8 above, the respondents were asked to show their level of agreement with the statement: “WEO trains and orients PTAs”. Accordingly, the majority of the respondents: 1 (50%) of WEO heads, 5 (51%) of experts, 3 (50%) of principals agreed. while 17 (35.4%) of PTA members strongly agreed with the statement. This indicates that WEOs do train and orient PTAs. “WEO does train and orient PTAs except giving them some manuals and guidelines.”

Weekend (2005) recommends workshops or some type of thorough and intensive training is essential in order to equip parents who serve in the SGBs with necessary skills. Parents need to possess relevant knowledge, especially regarding educational policy and current educational affairs. The school principals should therefore come in after training provided by the DoE and organize internal frequent workshops, targeting parents, learners, teachers and SMTs.

#### 4.5. Level of Participation of Stakeholders

**Table 9 Level of Participation of WEO Personnel in Various Management Functions**

33. Indicate the level of participation of WEO personnel in the following management functions		WEO head		Experts		Principal s		PTAs		Total	
		f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%
33.1. planning	very high	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	High	2	100	9	56.3	4	66.7	13	27.1	28	38.9
	Average	-	-	6	37.5	2	33.3	15	31.3	23	31.9
	Low	-	-	1	6.5	-	-	20	41.6	21	29.2
33.2. organizing	very high	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	High	2	100	8	50	3	50	9	18.8	22	30.6
	Average	-	-	6	37.5	3	50	24	50	33	45.8
	Low	-	-	2	12.5	-	-	15	31.2	17	23.6
33.3. directing	very high	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	High	1	50	7	43.8	5	83.3	10	20.8	23	31.9
	Average	1	50	8	50	1	16.7	20	41.7	30	41.7
	Low	-	-	1	6.3	-	-	18	37.5	19	26.4
33.4. controlling and monitoring	very high	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	High	1	50	5	31.3	3	50	18	37.5	27	37.5
	average	1	50	11	68.7	3	50	21	43.8	36	50
	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	18.7	9	12.5
33.5. important decision makings	very high	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	High	2	100	12	75	4	66.7	14	29.2	32	44.4
	average	-	-	4	25	2	33.3	23	47.9	29	40.3
	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	22.9	11	15.3

In item 33 of table 9 above, the respondents were asked to indicate the level of participation of WEO heads and experts in various management functions. Accordingly, in 33.1, they were asked to show the level of their participation in planning. The majority of the respondents: 100% of WEO heads, 56.3% of experts, 66.7% of

principals re high participation while 41.6% of PTA members responded low participation. In this process of planning all our experts participate in the planning and give information about their units.

Regarding this, Walker (1994) also states that much planning should be carried out in teams, at the management level and among staff in their areas of interest and expertise. In item 33.2 of table 9, the respondents were asked to show the participation of WEO heads and experts in organizing. 100% of heads, 56.3% of experts, 66.7% of principals and 50% of PTA members (which is the majority) responded that the participation of WEO heads and experts in organizing is high participation.

The National Department of Education stipulated the need for democratic governance in schools. This means active involvement of stakeholders in decision-making, policy formulations and other aspects. The DoE, however, has not yet practiced what it is preaching in terms of democratic values and consultation. Decisions are imposed on schools even if they are hard to implement. This means that this issue should be thoroughly reviewed (Weekend 2005).

In 33.3 of table 9, the respondents were asked to indicate the level of participation of WEO heads and experts in directing. Accordingly, the majority of them: 50% of WEO heads and 83.3% of principals re high participate. While 43.8% of experts, and 41.7% of PTA members responded that t heads“ participation in directing is average. Regarding this, one of the secondary school principals in an interview said: “Most of the time most of our WEO heads and experts except our supervisor that sometimes comes and direct us, do participate in directing us and our teachers.”

In 33.4 of table 9 above, the respondents were asked to show the level of participation of WEO heads and experts in controlling and monitoring functions. Accordingly, the majority: 50% of WEO heads, 68.7% of experts, 50% of principals and 43.8% of PTA members responded that the participation of WEO heads and experts in controlling and monitoring is average.

In 33.5 of table 9, the respondents were asked the level of participation of WEO heads and experts in important decision makings. Accordingly, 100% of WEO heads, 75% of experts, 66.7% of principals and 47.9% of PTA members (which is the majority) said that the participation of WEO heads and experts in important decision makings is high.

The fact that you involved as many people as possible, who you may call them expert in their respective discipline of decision-making, carry the potential that the decision taken will be supported, defended and ultimately carried out by everyone, even those that appear to be negative or defensive of decisions taken by the majority (Mungunda, 2003).

**Table 10: Level of Participation of PTAs and Community in Various Management Functions**

34. Indicate the level of participation of PTAs in the following management functions		WEO head		Experts		Principals		PTAs		Total	
		f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%
33.1. planning	very high	1	50	4	25	2	33	9	18.8	16	22.22
	High	1	50	6	37.5	3	50	19	39.6	29	40.3
	Average	-	-	5	31.3	1	17	13	27.1	19	26.4
	Low	-	-	1	6	-	-	7	14.6	8	11.11
34.2. organizing	very high	2	100	5	31	1	17	8	16.7	16	22.22
	High		-	7	44	3	50	26	54.2	36	50
	Average		-	4	25	2	33	14	21.2	20	27.8
	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
34.3. directing	very high	-	-	2	12.5	1	16.7	17	35.4	20	27.8
	High	1	50	5	31.3	-	-	2	4.2	8	11.1
	average	-	-	-	-	2	33	11	23	22	30.6
	Low	1	50	9	56.3	3	50	18	37.5	27	37.5
34.4. controlling and monitoring	very high	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	High	1	50	7	43.8	1	16.7	10	20.8	19	26.4
	average	1	50	8	50	5	83.3	20	41.7	34	47.2
	Low	-	-	1	6.3	-	-	18	37.5	19	26.4
34.5. important decision makings	very high	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	High	1	50	5	31.3	3	50	18	37.5	27	37.5
	Average	1	50	11	68.7	3	50	21	43.8	36	50
	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	18.7	9	12.5
34.6. Participation of community in education management	very high	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	High	2	100	9	56.3	4	66.7	13	27.1	28	38.9
	Average	-	-	6	37.5	2	33.3	15	31.3	23	31.9
	Low	-	-	1	6.5	-	-	20	41.6	21	29.2

In table 10 above, the respondents were asked to indicate the level of participation of PTAs and community in various management functions. Accordingly, in item 34.1 they were asked the level of participation of PTAs in planning. 50% of WEO heads, 37.5% of experts, 50% of principals and 39.6% of PTA members (which is the majority) responded that the participation of PTAs in planning is high. Concerning this, one of the principals said: “Although MOE’s manuals focus on the participation of PTAs in educational (school) plans, most of our PTA members do participate in school plans.”

Effective education service delivery requires the involvement of all local actors operating in the district. Decentralization enhances coordination of other actors and contribution of the beneficiaries as it gives the opportunity to involve in the process of delivering (Ribot, 2002).

In item 34.2 of table 10, the respondents were asked to indicate the level of participation of PTAs in organizing function. The majority of them: 50% of WEO heads re very high, while 44% of experts, 50% of principals and 54.2% of PTA members indicated that the participation of PTAs in organizing is high. Relationships between the

school heads and the PTA chair tended to be strong. Teachers and PTA members were often poorly informed about key decisions. The composition of PTAs („many are illiterates ... chosen because of their usefulness, for example, mechanics or plumbers“) was such that they lacked the power to hold the head teacher to account. Crucially, many PTAs did not constitute a true representation of parents and the community (Dunne et al., 2007).

In item 34.3 of table 10, the respondents were asked to show the level of participation of PTAs in directing function. Accordingly, the majority of them: 50% of WEO heads, 56.3% of experts, 50% of principals and 37.5% of PTA members indicated that the participation of PTAs in directing is low. Moreover, regarding the above two items, one of the WEO heads in an interview indicated: “Most of the times PTAs are not seen when they are participating in organizing and directing schools as principals are also not seen when involving them in such matters.”

One of the purposes of decentralizing education services is to widen the participation of non-education professionals at local community level in the running and management of schools (Grauwe et al., 2005).

In item 34.4 of table 10, the respondents were asked to indicate the level of participation of PTAs in controlling and monitoring. The majority of them: 50% of WEO heads, 50% of experts, 83.3% of principals and 41.7% of PTA members indicated that it is average. One of the principals also indicated: “While our education system requires PTAs to strongly control and monitor our all-round performances, they are not doing this as required.”

Some researchers argue that the participation of communities and students in the day-to-day activities of the schools (for example, in supervision, monitoring and evaluation) is part of the decentralization of school management (Naidoo, 2005).

In item 34.5 of table 10 above, the respondents were asked to indicate the level of participation of PTAs in important decision makings. Accordingly, 50% of WEO heads, 68.7% of experts, 50% of principals and 43.8% of PTA members indicated that the participation of PTAs in important decision makings is average. One of the principals said: “Our PTA members are participating only in decision makings of punishment for disciplinary problems of students and teachers and our school’s budget matter.”

In item 34.6 of table 10 above, the respondents were asked to indicate the level of participation of community in education management. The majority of 100% of WEO heads, 56.3% of experts, 66.7% of principals are high in the statement while 41.6% of PTA members indicated that the participation of community in education management is low.

Parents and communities are expected to become further involved in schooling in a variety of ways but generally in ways determined by the school, laid down by central and/or regional or local government and driven by international policy agendas (World Bank, 2004). Policy literature on community involvement continues to emphasize the need for capacity building within the community to enable them to participate in these ways without questioning what it is they are being asked to be involved in (Heystek, 2003).

## 4.6. Challenges of Decentralized Educational Management

**Table 11. Challenges the Respondents Faced to Perform their Work Effectively and Efficiently**

35. The most difficult challenges you face to perform your work effectively and efficiently		WEO head		Experts		Principals		PTAs		Total	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Lack of coordination	very high	-	-	1	6	-	-	7	14.6	8	11.1
	High	1	50	4	25	2	33	9	18.8	16	22.2
	average	1	50	6	37.5	3	50	19	39.6	29	40.3
	Low	-	-	5	31.3	1	17	13	27.1	19	26.4
Lack of guidelines	very high	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	High	-	-	4	25	2	33	14	21.2	20	27.8
	average	-	-	7	44	3	50	26	54.2	36	50
	Low	2	100	5	31	1	17	8	16.7	16	22.2
Lack of reliable data	very high	-	-	2	12.5	1	16.7	17	35.4	20	27.8
	High	1	50	5	31.3	-	-	2	4.2	8	11.1
	average	-	-	-	-	2	33	11	23	22	30.6
	Low	1	50	9	56.3	3	50	18	37.5	27	37.5
Lack of knowledge and skills in my work	very high	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	High			1	6.3	-	-	18	37.5	19	26.4
	average	1	50	7	43.8	1	16.7	10	20.8	19	26.4
	Low	1	50	8	50	5	83.3	20	41.7	34	47.2
Lack of familiarity of tasks	very high	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	High	1	50	5	31.3	3	50	18	37.5	27	37.5
	average	1	50	11	68.7	3	50	21	43.8	36	50
	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	18.7	9	12.5
Lack of adequate resources (computers, paper, etc.)	very high	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	High	2	100	9	56.3	4	66.7	13	27.1	28	38.9
	average	-	-	7	43.8	2	33.3	15	31.3	24	33.3
	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	41.6	21	29.2
Lack of support	very high	1	50	4	25	2	33.3	18	37.5	25	34.7
	High	1	50	8	50	2	33.3	20	41.6	31	43.1
	average	-	-	3	18.8	2	33.3	6	12.5	11	15.3
	Low	-	-	1	6.3	-	-	4	8.3	5	6.9
Lack of job security	very high	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	High	1	50	6	37.5	3	50	25	52.1	35	48.6
	average	1	50	3	18.8	3	50	19	39.6	26	36.1
	Low	-	-	7	43.8	-	-	4	8.3	11	15.3
Lack of time (work overload)	very high	1	50	5	31.3	2	33.3	15	31.3	23	31.9
	High	-	-	6	37.5	1	16.7	21	43.8	28	38.9
	average	1	50	5	31.3	3	50	10	20.8	19	26.4
	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	4.2	2	2.8

In item 35 of table 11, the respondents were asked through open-ended item to indicate the most difficult challenges they face to perform their works effectively and efficiently. Accordingly, the majority of them indicated that: Lack of coordination (40.3%) Lack of guidelines (50%) Lack of reliable data (37.5%) Lack of knowledge and skills in

my work (47.2%), Lack of familiarity of tasks (50%), Lack of adequate resources (computers, paper, etc.) (38.9%) Lack of support (43.1%), Lack of job security (48.6%) and Lack of time (work overload) (38.9%) are the most difficult challenges they face to perform their works effectively and efficiently.

According to Workneh Abebe (2012), though the policy gives full power to head teachers to manage and control the overall activities of the school, in practice various factors have constrained the head teachers ‘ability to implement policies and regulations properly. These include head teachers’ limited management capacity, lack of transparency in their appointment, shortages of human, material and financial resources, lack of adequate support from the WEO, and a low level of awareness among communities.

Moreover, at the end of Ethiopia’s ESDP III, it was recognized that despite the increased attention given to devolving decision-making to the local level, in practice, school management and administration remained inefficient and ineffective. The WEOs were unable to implement government programs because they did not have the capacity to ensure that schools were managed and administered effectively. In addition, the system suffered from a weak relationship between regions and woredas (MOE, 2010).

**Table 12. Challenges the Woredas Faced to Implement Decentralized Educational Management Effectively and Efficiently**

36. The most difficult challenges your Woredas faces to implement decentralized educational management effectively and efficiently		WEO head		Experts		Principals		PTAs		Total	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Shortage of skilled man power	very high	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	8.33	4	5.5
	High	2	100	10	62.5	3	50	30	62.5	45	62.5
	average	-	-	6	37.5	3	50	14	29.2	23	32
	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lack of coordination among various stake holders	very high	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	High	1	50	7	44	3	50	14	29.2	25	34.7
	average	1	50	9	56	3	50	34	70.8	47	65.3
	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lack of clear accountability relationship	very high	1	50	5	31	3	50	19	39.6	28	38.9
	High	1	50	4	25	2	33	9	18.8	16	22.2
	average	-	-	7	44	1	17	13	27.1	20	27.8
	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	14.6	8	11.1
Lack of clearly defined decision making process	very high	2	100	1	6	-	-	6	12.5	9	12.5
	High	-	-	3	19	3	50	21	43.8	27	37.5
	average	-	-	10	62	3	50	18	37.5	31	43.1
	Low	-	-	2	13	-	-	3	6.3	5	6.9
Lack of training for the stake holders	very high	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	High	2	100	5	31	1	17	8	16.7	16	22.2
	Average	-	-	7	44	3	50	26	54.2	36	50
	Low	-	-	4	25	2	33	14	21.2	20	27.8
Shortage of budget for education	very high	1	50	2	13	1	17	17	35.4	21	29.2
	High	1	50	5	31	3	50	14	29.2	23	32
	Average	-	-	9	56	2	33	11	23	22	30.6

	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Inadequate participation of stake holders	very high	1	50	4	25	1	17	20	41.7	26	36.1
	High	-	-	6	37.5	3	50	18	37.5	27	37.5
	Average	1	50	6	37.5	2	33	4	8.3	13	18.1
	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	16.7	8	11.1

In item 36 of table 12, the respondents were asked to indicate the most difficult challenges their woredas face to implement decentralized educational management effectively and efficiently. Accordingly, the majority of the respondents indicated that Shortage of skilled man power (62.5%), Lack of coordination among various stake holders (65.3%), Lack of clear accountability relationship (38.9%) Lack of clearly defined decision making process (43.1%) Lack of training for the stake holders (50%), Shortage of budget for education (32%) and inadequate participation of stake holders (37.5%) are the most difficult challenges their Woredas face to implement decentralized educational management. Lack of clear accountability relationship, inadequate participation of stakeholders and lack of clearly defined decision making process are also indicated as challenges. One of the WEO heads in an interview also indicated: “Shortage of skilled man power, shortage of training for education stake holders, inadequate community participation and inadequate budget for our sector are the major factors that hinder the implementation of decentralized education management in our Woredas.”

Local government systems lacking in human resource capacity, usually have restrictions placed on their responsibilities under decentralized regimes (e.g. Malawi). But, instead of seeing local governments as inefficient and lacking capacity for responsive decision-making, we would argue that it is better to look for potential and opportunities within these systems that can boost their institutional capacity and sensitize them into adapting their operations to meet the challenges of improving access and quality in schooling (Akyeampong, 2004)

## CHAPTER FIVE

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 5.1. Summary of Major Findings

The main purpose of this study was to look into the practices of decentralized educational management in south east Tigray Zone of WEOs and point out the prevailing problems and to suggest alternative solutions. This study used a descriptive survey research design. In order to achieve its purpose, the study attempted to answer the following basic questions:

1. What are the practices of delegating the authorities in the woreda education offices of south east Tigray Zone?
2. What is the level of decision making process at various hierarchical levels in the concerned woreda education offices?
3. What is level of communication in the concerned Woredas education offices?
4. What is level of participation of stakeholders in various functions of management in Woredas education offices?
5. What are the challenges of practicing decentralized education management in Woredas education offices?

The study was conducted in two WEOs namely H/wejerat and Enderta WEOs of south east Tigray Zone. These Woredas were selected using purposive sampling technique. The data for the study were collected from WEO heads, experts, principals and PTA members with the help of questionnaires. Besides, interview was carried out with sample school principals and WEO heads. Finally, document analysis was also made.

A total of 75 questionnaires were distributed to WEO heads, experts, principals and PTA members and among these the returned questionnaires were 72 (96%). The collected data were analyzed with the help of statistical tools such as percentage and frequency.

The following are the major findings drawn from the analysis:

- ☞ With regard to the process through which WEO heads obtained their post, all the respondents indicated that they obtained their post through nomination. This indicates that they are not competitively recruited while education is a profession which requires competitively recruited professionals. Moreover, the majority of WEO experts confirmed that they obtained their present post through promotion and transfer.
- ☞ Concerning the degree to which authority is delegated to the lower levels, a significant number of respondents confirmed that the necessary authority which is proportionate to their tasks is not delegated to them. Most of them also agreed that they do not receive the necessary training and incentive in relation to their work.
- ☞ The decision making autonomy of WEO heads, experts and principals was found low. Their superiors interfere in most of their decision makings.

- ☞ The study reveals that decentralized decision making responsibilities are not being practically implemented and employees do not make decisions according to their assigned roles and responsibilities.
- ☞ Another finding from the study indicates that the level of usefulness of superior in the decision making process is found to be very low.
- ☞ The majority of respondents indicated that WEOs do not evaluate and monitor the performances of schools regularly and when they do, it is not constructive.
- ☞ A significant number of respondents asserted that they are not properly oriented about their organization's structure, policies and practices; and they do not know their job's relationship with others".
- ☞ The majority of the respondents confirmed that neither there is proper coordination among units in their offices nor they receive proper support and guidance from their superiors.
- ☞ The largest number of respondents reflected that the level of participation of WEO personnel and PTAs in organizing, directing, controlling and monitoring and important decision makings of the management functions is low.
- ☞ Concerning the level of participation of community in education management the majority of respondents indicated that community participation in education management is low.
- ☞ Regarding the challenges of decentralized educational management, a significant number of respondents confirmed that lack of coordination, lack of familiarity of tasks, lack of adequate resources (computers, paper, etc.), lack of support and lack of time (work overload) are the most difficult challenges they face to perform their work effectively and efficiently and lack of training for the stake holders, shortage of budget for education, lack of coordination among various stake holders, shortage of skilled man power, some are lack of clear accountability relationship, inadequate participation of stake holders and lack of clearly defined decision making process are the most difficult challenges their woredas face to implement decentralized educational management effectively and efficiently.

## **5.2. Conclusions**

Relying on the findings presented above, the following conclusions were drawn.

- ☞ The study indicated that the necessary authority which is proportionate to their tasks is delegated to the lower levels as indicated in the education directives.
- ☞ The findings indicated that decentralized decision making roles and responsibilities were not being practically implemented and employees do not make decisions according to their assigned roles and responsibilities. Decision making autonomy of WEO heads, experts and principals was found low as their superiors interfere in most of their decision makings. Moreover, the level of usefulness of superiors in the decision making process was found to be very low.
- ☞ The study indicated that WEO heads, experts, principals and PTA members were not properly oriented about their organization's structure, policies and practices; and they do not know their job's relationship with others".

There were neither proper coordinations among units in the zone's WEOs nor do principals and PTA members receive proper support and guidance from their superiors. WEOs do not evaluate and monitor the performances of schools regularly and when they do, it is not constructive. Moreover, no regular meetings were held by PTA members of secondary schools.

- ☞ The study has shown that the level of participation of WEO personnel and PTAs in the management functions was low. Their participation in organizing, directing, controlling and monitoring, important decision makings and staff meetings was found to be low. The participation of Community in education management was also low.
- ☞ Finally, regarding the challenges of decentralized educational management, lack of coordination, lack of familiarity of tasks, lack of adequate resources (computers, paper, etc.), lack of support and lack of time (work overload) are the most difficult challenges WEO heads, experts, principals and PTA members faced to perform their work and lack of training for the stake holders, shortage of budget for education, lack of coordination among various stake holders, shortage of skilled man power, lack of clear accountability relationship, inadequate participation of stake holders and lack of clearly defined decision making process were among the most difficult challenges the Woredas face to implement decentralized educational management effectively and efficiently. Coordination of educational personnel, assigning the right person in the right place, provision of adequate resources, the provision of training, adequate participation of stake holders, addressing clear roles and responsibilities, and creating conducive environment were some of the major ones.

However, the success of these measures strongly relies on the collaborative efforts of all educational personnel beginning from school to regional levels.

### **5.3. Recommendations**

Based on the preceding findings and conclusions of the practices of decentralized educational management in the Woredas, the following recommendations were forwarded.

- ☞ Competitively recruiting educational personnel and delegating them the necessary authority: - since education is a profession which requires competitively recruited professionals, Woredas had better competitively recruit WEO heads, experts and school principals than simply nominating, promoting and transferring them. The necessary authority which is proportionate to their tasks (as indicated in the education directives) must also be delegated to them.
- ☞ Implementing decentralized decision making roles and responsibilities practically: - decentralized decision making roles and responsibilities are indicated in the Directive for Educational Management, Organization, Public Participation, and Finance which was published in 2002 by ministry of education. This directive need to be practically implemented and every education personnel are required to make decisions according to their assigned roles and responsibilities with their full autonomy.

- ☞ Creating smooth communication among units in the WEOs and between WEOs and schools and PTAs: - WEO heads, experts, principals and PTA members should be properly oriented about their organization“ structure, policies and practices; and about their job’s relationship with others“. Proper co-ordinations among units in the WEOs should be created; and principals and PTA members should receive proper support and guidance from their superiors. Generally, it is necessary to create a better communication system among units in the WEOs and between WEOs and schools and PTAs.
- ☞ Enhancing the participation of stake holders in the management of education: - in the preceding findings of this study, it has been mentioned that the level of participation of WEO personnel, PTA members and community in education management was low. Therefore, community participation has to be facilitated by providing sustainable training to PTA and KETB members in organizing, directing, controlling and monitoring, important decision makings and etc. Such programs should be organized at school level by the principals and teachers, supervisors and Woredas Education Experts.
- ☞ Providing incentives to PTA and KETB members: - Woredas Education Office and school principals need to assess the overall activities of PTA and KETB members and provide rewards to those members who performed well in their respective positions. This kind of reward can motivate the PTA and KETB members to participate much harder in education management.
- ☞ Reducing the challenges of decentralized educational management: - Improving the coordination of educational personnel, assigning the right person in the right place, provision of adequate resources, the provision of training, adequate participation of stake holders, addressing clear roles and responsibilities, and creating conducive environment are some of the major ones which should be practiced to reduce the challenges of decentralized educational management. Most of these could be done by the Woredas while others should be done by the concerned educational stake holders.
- ☞ Select self- motivated and willing people for PTA and KETB membership: - school principals and the concerned bodies need to select individuals who are committed, interested and willing to shoulder responsibilities of the society for PTA and KETB members. That means the nominated people should exercise only the school and their private works. As far as these people have adequate time, they can be functional in the works of schools. By doing so, the community participation can easily be improved and become meaningful.

## 6. REFERENCES

- Adgo Maru, 2005. Decentralization of Health Service Delivery in Ethiopia: MA Thesis. Institute of Social Studies. The Hague.
- Akyeampong, A. 2004. „Aid for Self-Help Effort? A sustainable alternative route to basic education in Northern Ghana.“ *Journal of International Cooperation in Education*,
- Bjork, C. (2006). Education in the asia-pacific region: issues, concerns and prospects. *Educational Decentralization: Asian Experiences and Conceptual Contributions Ed. Springer*.
- Chapman, D. W. (2000). Trends in educational administration in developing Asia. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(2), 283-308.
- Cole, G. A. (1996). Management Theory and practice. London, DP publication. Council for Higher Education Accreditation (2005): The best in the world, inside Accreditation with the president of CHSA, 1 (2).
- Covey, S.R. 1992. Principle-centred Leadership. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Creswell, J. D. (2011). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. Sage publications.
- De Grauwe, A. and Lugaz, C. 2011. Strengthening Local Actors: The Path to Decentralizing Education, Kenya, Uganda, and Lesotho, Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning and UNESCO.
- De Grauwe, A., Lugaz, C., Baldé, D., Diakhaté, C., Dougnon, D. Moustapha, M. and Odushina, D. 2005. „Does decentralization lead to school improvement? Findings and lessons from research in West Africa,“ *Journal of Education for International Development*, 1(1) Available from <[www.equip123.net/JEID/articles/1/1-1.pdf](http://www.equip123.net/JEID/articles/1/1-1.pdf)> [Accessed on 1 August
- Dunne, M., Akyeampong, K., & Humphreys, S. (2007). *School Processes, Local Governance and Community Participation: Understanding Access. Create Pathways to Access. Research Monograph No. 6*.
- European Commission. 2007. Supporting Decentralization and Local Governance in Third Countries. Tools and Methods Series. Reference Document No 2.<http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid>.
- Gebre-Egziabher, T., & Berhanu, K. (2007). A literature review of decentralization in Ethiopia. *Decentralization in Ethiopia*, 9-68.
- Gershberg, I. and Winky, D. (2003). Education Decentralization in Africa: A Review of Recent Policy and Practice. Ingrid, R. and Mercedes, P. (2008). School-Based Management: Promoting Special Education Programs in Local Schools. *Education Quarterly* - did not match any articles.
- Government of Ghana (GOG). (2000). Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy. Accra: Ghana.
- Heystek, J. 2003. „Parents as governors and partners in schools,“ *Education and Urban Society*, 35(3): 328-51.

- Kaul, S. (2006). Higher education in India: Seizing the opportunity (No. 179). Working paper.
- Kumar, P. R. (2006). Scaling laws for ad hoc wireless networks: an information theoretic approach. *Foundations and Trends® in Networking*, 1(2), 145-270.
- Litvack, J., Ahmad, J., & Bird, R. (1998). *Rethinking decentralization in developing countries*. The World Bank.
- Mannion, A. M. (1995). *Agriculture and environmental change: temporal and spatial dimensions*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Ministry of Education. (1998). Education Sector Development Program I (ESDP-I): Action Plan, Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. (2002a). Directive for Educational Management, Organization, Public Participation, and Finance. Addis Ababa.
- Ministry of Education. (2002b). Education sector Development program II, III (ESDP-II and ESDP-III), Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Ministry of Education. (2007a). General Education Quality Improvement Program (GEQIP), Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. (2007b). School Improvement Program (SIP) Manual, Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. (2010b). Education Statistics Annual Abstract 2008/09, Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. 2005. Education Sector Development program III (ESDP-III) program Action plan (PAP) Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Ministry of Education. 2006a. Decentralized management of education in Ethiopia: a reference manual. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Ministry of Education. 2010a. Education Sector Development Program IV (ESDP IV), Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.
- MoE. (Ministry of Education) Ethiopia 2013 the new school planning document was set. 2005. Education sector Development program-III. 2005/2006-2010/2011. Program Action plan. Addis Ababa: Berhanena Selam printing Enterprise
- Mullins, L. J. (2007). *Management and organisational behaviour*. Pearson education.
- Mungunda, C. 2003. An Investigation into School Principal's Experience and Perceptions of Participative Management. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis. Grahamstown: Rhodes University.
- Naidoo, J. P. (2002). Education Decentralization in Sub-Saharan Africa--Espoused Theories and Theories in Use.
- Naidoo, J. P. (2005). Educational Decentralization and School Governance in South Africa: From Policy to Practice. International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) UNESCO.
- Ribot, J. C. (2002). *African decentralization: local actors, powers and accountability*. Geneva: UNRISD.
- Rondinelli, D. A. (1981). Government decentralization in comparative perspective: theory and practice in developing countries. *International review of administrative sciences*, 47(2), 133-145.

- Seyoum. T. and Ayalew. S. (1989). *Fundamental of Educational Research* A.A. AAU printing press
- Shibeshi, A. (2009). Overview of education research in Ethiopian studies. *Journal of Ethiopian Studies*, 42(1/2), 141-174.
- Shrama R.A. (2000) *fundamentals of educational Research*. Meerut: New Agrawal offset printing press.
- Smith, B. C. (1985). *Decentralization: the territorial dimension of the state*. Taylor & Francis.
- Solomon, A. (2011). *An Investigation into the Factors Affecting the Implementation of Agricultural Extension Program in Hintalo-Wajirat Wereda, South-Eastern Tigray, Ethiopia* (Doctoral dissertation, Addis Ababa University).
- Tesfaye. T. 2007. Decentralization and education service delivery: The case of MoretennaJirru and BerehAleltuWeredas in North Shoa. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Teshome, N. (2012). Classroom Participation and Pupil Performance: A Study of Active Learning Practices in Ethiopian Primary Education'paper presented at the Young Lives Ethiopia School Survey Workshop. *Addis Ababa, 25*.
- Vegas, E. (2007). Teacher labor markets in developing countries. *The future of children*, 219-232.
- Winkler, D. R., & Gershberg, A. I. (2003). Education decentralization in Africa: A review of recent policy and practice. *Draft (used by permission of the author)*.
- Woldegiyorgis, A. A. (2014). Adapting to global trends: why and how is the Ethiopian higher education changing? *The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education*, 4(3), 23-29.
- World Bank. 2004. *Books, Buildings and Learning Outcomes: An Impact Evaluation of World Bank Support to Basic Education in Ghana*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank. 2008. *Governance, Management and Accountability in Secondary Education in Sub-Saharan Africa*. WB Publications, Washington, D.C, USA.
- Zajda, J. I., & Gamage, D. T. (2009). *Decentralization, school-based management, and quality* (Vol. 8). Dordrecht: Springer.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix I:

Sample Questionnaires for WEO Personnel Mekelle University  
 Department of educational planning and management Post graduate program  
 Department of Educational Planning & Management  
 Questionnaire to be filled by Woreda Education Offices Personnel of south eastern Tigray

Dear -----

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information on the decentralized educational management in south eastern zone of Tigray:-policy and practice. Since the success of this study entirely depends up on your genuine response, the researcher would like to express his appreciation for your frankness and sincerity. The information obtained will undoubtedly be used only for academic purposes. Your response will be kept confidential.

Please read the instruction of each item carefully to provide your response correctly. If you feel that you should change your responses, make sure that you have cancelled the previous ones. Please try to respond to all questions in all pages. No need to write your name.

Thank you in advance for your time and concern!

Sincerely yours.

### General instruction

Please complete the following questions by putting “√” in the box against your answer; and for the items that require written answers, use the blank space to write your answers corresponding to the questions.

#### i. Practices of delegation of authority

1. What is the exact title of your post? \_\_\_\_\_
2. Through which process did you obtain this post? Promotion  Nomination   
 Internal competitive recruitment Transfer  External competitive recruitment   
 Other process: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Is there any official document (e.g. job description) which identifies the tasks you are expected to perform?  
 Yes  No  I don't know
4. If so, what type of document is it? \_\_\_\_\_
5. Do you find that this document clearly describes the tasks you have to perform? Yes  No
6. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:  
 Key: strong agree (SA) agree (A) partially agree (A) dis-agree (DA) strongly disagree (SA)

Items:	strong agree	agree	partially agree	dis-agree	strongly disagree
Educational administrative authority is delegated to me					
Political authority is delegated to me					
Financial authority is delegated to me					
The nature and scope of my task is clearly defined					
I have authority which is proportionate to my tasks					
I clearly know the limits of my authority					
I have some positive incentives in my present post					
I have received training which enables me perform my duties properly					
I have enough freedom to perform my work					
I know to whom I am accountable					

**ii. Level of decision making process**

7. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

Items:	strong agree	agree	parity agree	dis-agree	S/dis agree
I have enough autonomy to make decisions					
There is clear decision making process in our office					
Roles and responsibilities of every employee in our office is clearly defined					
Employees in our office make decisions according to their assigned roles and responsibilities					
I have all the skills I need to make decisions well					
My superior do not interfere in my decision making process					
Important decision making responsibilities are decentralized to the lower levels(schools, PTAs) according to the directives/guidelines					
The decentralized responsibilities are being practically implemented					

8. When you encounter a technical or professional problem for making a decision, how useful the help you receive from the following sources?

Sources:	Very useful	useful	Somehow useful	Not useful
My superior				
My colleagues				
Manuals/guidelines				
Official documents				
Internet				
Others(specify)				

**iii. Level of communication**

9. How often staff meetings are held in your office? Once a week  once a month

Two wise a month  once in three months  Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

10. Have you been evaluated during the past two years? Yes  No

11. If yes, will it useful? Not useful  somewhat useful  Useful  Very useful

12. If yes, was it adequate? Yes  No

13. Does the worda education office monitor the performance of parent teacher associations? Yes  No

14. If yes, how often in time? \_\_\_\_\_

15. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

Key: strong agree (SA) agree (A) partially agree (A) dis-agree (DA) strongly disagree (SA)

Items:	strongy agree	agree	partaiy agree	dis-agree	strongly disagree
I am properly oriented about the practices of the office					
I know my job's relationship with others" and its importance for the overall operation					
The goals of our office are communicated to the society and stakeholders					
There is proper coordination among varies units in our office					
I receive proper support from my superior					
The worda education office trains parent teacher association members about their roles and responsibilities					

**iv. Level of participation of stake holders in various management functions**

16. During the past three months, how many times have you participated in staff meetings in your woreda education office?

17. How do you rate the usefulness of these meetings for the performance of your job?

Not useful  Useful  Very useful

18. How do you rate the adequacy of these meetings for the performance of your job?

Adequate  Inadequate

19. Please mark “√” in the box that you think is appropriate regarding the level of participation of woreda education office personnel in the following management functions:

Management functions:	Very high	High	Aver- age	Low	Very low
Planning					
Organizing					
Directing					
Controlling and monitoring					
Important decision makings					

20. Please mark “√” in the box that you think is appropriate regarding the level participation of parent teacher associations in the following school management functions:

Management functions:	Very high	High	Aver- age	Low	Very low
Planning of the schools					
Organizing of the schools					
Directing the schools					
Controlling and monitoring schools					
Important decision makings of schools					

21. How do you rate the level of participation of community in the management of schools?

Very good  Good  Fair  Poor  Very poor

22. If poor or very poor, why? \_\_\_\_\_

**v. Challenges of decentralized educational management**

23. Please indicate the most difficult challenges you face to perform your work effectively and efficiently (more than one answer is possible):

- Lack of coordination
- Lack of guidelines
- Lack of reliable data
- Lack of knowledge and skills in my work
- Lack of familiarity of tasks
- Lack of adequate resources (computers, paper, etc.)
- Lack of support
- Lack of job security
- Lack of time (work overload)

Others: \_\_\_\_\_

24. Please indicate the most difficult challenges your woreda faces to implement decentralized educational management effectively and efficiently (more than one answer is possible):

- Shortage of budget for education
- Lack of coordination among various stake holders
- Lack of clear accountability relationship
- Lack of clearly defined decision making process
- Lack of training for the stake holders
- Inadequate participation of stake holders

Others (specify) \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

25. Do you have any ideas to improve the performance of decentralized educational management in your woreda? If so, please explain.

### General information

Name of the woreda \_\_\_\_\_

Personal Data:

26. Gender Male  Female

27. Age 20 – 24  25 – 29  30 – 34  35 - 39  40 - 45  46 & above

28. What is your academic qualification?

12 complete  Certificate  Bachelor's degree  Master's degree  PhD  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

29. In which field/academic discipline did you obtain this qualification? \_\_\_\_\_

30. How many years of work experience do you have in the education sector?

Less than 5  5 - 10  11 - 15  16 - 20  21 - 25  More than 25

31. How many years of professional experience do you have in the area of educational planning and management?

Less than 5  5 - 10  11 - 15  More than 15

32. For how long (in years) have you been occupying your present post?

Less than 3  years 4 – 6  7 - 9  10 and above

33. For how long have you ever been a school teacher?

1 - 2 years  3 - 4 years  5 - 6 years  7 - 8 years  9 - 10 years  Above 10 years

Thank you for your participation!

Mekelle University School of Graduate Studies Department of educational planning and management  
 Post graduate program Department of Educational Planning & Management  
 Questionnaire to be filled by Woreda Education Offices experts of south eastern Tigray  
 Dear -----

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information on the decentralized educational management in south eastern zone of Tigray:-policy and practice. Since the success of this study entirely depends up on your genuine response, the researcher would like to express his appreciation for your frankness and sincerity. The information obtained will undoubtedly be used only for academic purposes. Your response will be kept confidential. Please read the instruction of each item carefully to provide your response correctly. If you feel that you should change your responses, make sure that you have cancelled the previous ones. Please try to respond to all questions in all pages. No need to write your name.

Thank you in advance for your time and concern!  
 Sincerely yours.

**General instruction**

Please complete the following questions by putting “√” in the box against your answer; and for the items that require written answers, use the blank space to write your answers corresponding to the questions.

**i. Practices of delegation of authority**

1. What is the exact title of your post? \_\_\_\_\_
2. Through which process did you obtain this post? Promotion  Nomination   
 Internal competitive recruitment Transfer  External competitive recruitment   
 Other process: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Is there any official document (e.g. job description) which identifies the tasks you are expected to perform?  
 Yes  No  I don't know
4. If so, what type of document is it? \_\_\_\_\_
5. Do you find that this document clearly describes the tasks you have to perform? Yes  No
6. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

Items:	strongly agree	agree	partially agree	dis-agree	strongly disagree
Educational administrative authority is delegated to me					
Political authority is delegated to me					
Financial authority is delegated to me					
The nature and scope of my task is clearly defined					
I have authority which is proportionate to my tasks					
I clearly know the limits of my authority					
I have some positive incentives in my present post					
I have received training which enables me perform my duties properly					
I have enough freedom to perform my work					
I know to whom I am accountable					

**ii. Level of decision making process**

7. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

Items:	strong agree	agree	parity agree	dis-agree	strongly disagree
I have enough autonomy to make decisions					
There is clear decision making process in our office					
Roles and responsibilities of every employee in our office is clearly defined					
Employees in our office make decisions according to their assigned roles and responsibilities					
I have all the skills I need to make decisions well					
My superior do not interfere in my decision making process					
Important decision making responsibilities are decentralized to the lower levels(schools, PTAs) according to the directives/guidelines					
The decentralized responsibilities are being practically implemented					

8. When you encounter a technical or professional problem for making a decision, how useful the help you receive from the following sources?

Sources:	Very useful	useful	Somehow useful	Not useful
My superior				
My colleagues				
Manuals/guidelines				
Official documents				
Internet				
Others(specify				

### iii. Level of communication

9. How often staff meetings are held in your office?

Once a week  once a month

Two wise a month  once in three months  Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

10. Have you been evaluated during the past two years?

Yes  No

11. If yes, will it useful?

Not useful  somewhat useful  Useful  Very useful

12. If yes, was it adequate? Yes  No

13. Does the woreda education office monitor the performance of parent teacher associations?

Yes  No

14. If yes, how often in time? \_\_\_\_\_

1

5. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

Items:	strongly agree	agree	partiy agree	dis-agree	strongly disagree
I am properly oriented about the practices of the office					
I know my job's relationship with others" and its importance for the overall operation					
The goals of our office are communicated to the society and stakeholders					
There is proper coordination among varies units in our office					
I receive proper support from my superior					
The woreda education office trains parent teacher association members about their roles and responsibilities					

**iv. Level of participation of stake holders in various management functions**

16. During the past three months, how many times have you participated in staff meetings in your woreda education office?

17. How do you rate the usefulness of these meetings for the performance of your job?

Not useful  Useful  Very useful

18. How do you rate the adequacy of these meetings for the performance of your job?

Adequate  Inadequate

19. Please mark "√" in the box that you think is appropriate regarding the level of participation of woreda education office personnel in the following management functions:

Management functions:	Very high	High	Aver- age	Low	Very low
Planning					
Organizing					
Directing					
Controlling and monitoring					
Important decision makings					

20. Please mark "√" in the box that you think is appropriate regarding the level participation of parent teacher associations in the following school management functions:

Management functions:	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low
Planning of the schools					
Organizing of the schools					
Directing the schools					
Controlling and monitoring schools					
Important decision makings of schools					

21. How do you rate the level of participation of community in the management of schools?

Very good  Good  Fair  Poor  Very poor

22. If poor or very poor, why? \_\_\_\_\_

**v. Challenges of decentralized educational management**

23. Please indicate the most difficult challenges you face to perform your work effectively and efficiently (more than one answer is possible):

Lack of coordination

- Lack of guidelines
- Lack of reliable data
- Lack of knowledge and skills in my work
- Lack of familiarity of tasks
- Lack of adequate resources (computers, paper, etc.)
- Lack of support
- Lack of job security
- Lack of time (work overload)

Others: \_\_\_\_\_

24. Please indicate the most difficult challenges your woreda faces to implement decentralized educational management effectively and efficiently (more than one answer is possible):

- Shortage of budget for education
- Lack of coordination among various stake holders
- Lack of clear accountability relationship
- Lack of clearly defined decision making process
- Lack of training for the stake holders
- Inadequate participation of stake holders

Others (specify) \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

25. Do you have any ideas to improve the performance of decentralized educational management in your woreda? If so, please explain.

**General information**

Name of the woreda \_\_\_\_\_

Personal Data:

26. Gender Male  Female

27. Age 20 – 24  25 – 29  30 – 34  35 - 39  40 - 45  46 & above

28. What is your academic qualification?

12 complete  Certificate  Bachelor’s degree  Master’s degree  PhD  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

29. In which field/academic discipline did you obtain this qualification? \_\_\_\_\_

30. How many years of work experience do you have in the education sector?

Less than 5  5 - 10  11 - 15  16 - 20  21 - 25  More than 25

31. How many years of professional experience do you have in the area of educational planning and management?

Less than 5  5 - 10  11 - 15  More than 15

32. For how long (in years) have you been occupying your present post?

Less than 3  years 4 – 6  7 - 9  10 and above

33. For how long have you ever been a school teacher?

1 - 2 years  3 - 4 years  5 - 6 years  7 - 8 years  9 - 10 years  Above 10 years

Thank you for your participation!

**7.3. Appendix III. Sample Questionnaires for secondary school principals**

**Mekelle University** Department of educational planning and management Post graduate program Department of Educational Planning & Management

Questionnaire to be filled by secondary school principals of south eastern Tigray

Dear -----

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information on the decentralized educational management in south eastern zone of Tigray:-policy and practice. Since the success of this study entirely depends up on your genuine response, the researcher would like to express his appreciation for your frankness and sincerity. The information obtained will undoubtedly be used only for academic purposes. Your response will be kept confidential.

Please read the instruction of each item carefully to provide your response correctly. If you feel that you should change your responses, make sure that you have cancelled the previous ones. Please try to respond to all questions in all pages. No need to write your name.

Thank you in advance for your time and concern!

Sincerely yours.

**General instruction**

Please complete the following questions by putting “√” in the box against your answer; and for the items that require written answers, use the blank space to write your answers corresponding to the questions.

**i. Practices of delegation of authority**

1. What is the exact title of your post? \_\_\_\_\_

2. Through which process did you obtain this post? Promotion  Nomination

Internal competitive recruitment Transfer  External competitive recruitment

Other process: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Is there any official document (e.g. job description) which identifies the tasks you are expected to perform?

Yes  No  I don't know

4. If so, what type of document is it? \_\_\_\_\_

5. Do you find that this document clearly describes the tasks you have to perform? Yes  No

6. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

Key: strong agree (SA) agree (A) partially agree (A) dis-agree (DA) strongly disagree (SA)

Items:	strongy agree	agree	partiall y agree	dis-agree	strongly disagree
Educational administrative authority is delegated to me					
Political authority is delegated to me					
Financial authority is delegated to me					
The nature and scope of my task is clearly defined					
I have authority which is proportionate to my tasks					
I clearly know the limits of my authority					
I have some positive incentives in my present post					
I have received training which enables me perform my duties properly					
I have enough freedom to perform my work					
I know to whom I am accountable					

**ii. Level of decision making process**

7. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

Items:	strong agree	agree	parity agree	dis-agree	strongly disagree
I have enough autonomy to make decisions					
There is clear decision making process in our office					
Roles and responsibilities of every employee in our office is clearly defined					
Employees in our office make decisions according to their assigned roles and responsibilities					
I have all the skills I need to make decisions well					
My superior do not interfere in my decision making process					
Important decision making responsibilities are decentralized to the lower levels(schools, PTAs) according to the directives/guidelines					
The decentralized responsibilities are being practically implemented					

8. When you encounter a technical or professional problem for making a decision, how useful the help you receive from the following sources?

Sources:	Very useful	useful	Somehow useful	Not useful
My superior				
My colleagues				
Manuals/guidelines				
Official documents				
Internet				
Others(specify				

### iii. Level of communication

9. How often staff meetings are held in your office?

Once a week  once a month

Two wise a month  once in three months  other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

10. Have you been evaluated during the past two years?

Yes  No

11. If yes, will it useful?

Not useful  somewhat useful  Useful  Very useful

12. If yes, was it adequate? Yes  No

13. Does the woreda education office monitor the performance of parent teacher associations?

Yes  No

14. If yes, how often in time? \_\_\_\_\_

15. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

Items:	strongly agree	agree	partiy agree	dis-agree	strongly disagree
I am properly oriented about the practices of the office					
I know my job's relationship with others" and its importance for the overall operation					
The goals of our office are communicated to the society and stakeholders					
There is proper coordination among varies units in our office					
I receive proper support from my superior					
The worda education office trains parent teacher association members about their roles and responsibilities					

**iv. Level of participation of stake holders in various management functions**

16. During the past three months, how many times have you participated in staff meetings in your worda education office?

17. How do you rate the usefulness of these meetings for the performance of your job?

Not useful  Useful  Very useful

18. How do you rate the adequacy of these meetings for the performance of your job?

Adequate  Inadequate

19. Please mark "√" in the box that you think is appropriate regarding the level of participation of worda education office personnel in the following management functions:

Management functions:	Very high	High	Aver- age	Low	Very low
Planning					
Organizing					
Directing					
Controlling and monitoring					
Important decision makings					

20. Please mark "√" in the box that you think is appropriate regarding the level participation of parent teacher associations in the following school management functions:

Management functions:	Very high	High	Aver- age	Low	Very low
Planning of the schools					
Organizing of the schools					
Directing the schools					
Controlling and monitoring schools					
Important decision makings of schools					

21. How do you rate the level of participation of community in the management of schools?

Very good  Good  Fair  Poor  Very poor

22. If poor or very poor, why? \_\_\_\_\_

**v. Challenges of decentralized educational management**

23. Please indicate the most difficult challenges you face to perform your work effectively and efficiently (more than one answer is possible):

- Lack of coordination
- Lack of guidelines
- Lack of reliable data
- Lack of knowledge and skills in my work
- Lack of familiarity of tasks
- Lack of adequate resources (computers, paper, etc.)
- Lack of support
- Lack of job security
- Lack of time (work overload)

Others: \_\_\_\_\_

24. Please indicate the most difficult challenges your woreda faces to implement decentralized educational management effectively and efficiently (more than one answer is possible):

- Shortage of budget for education
- Lack of coordination among various stake holders
- Lack of clear accountability relationship
- Lack of clearly defined decision making process
- Lack of training for the stake holders
- Inadequate participation of stake holders

Others (specify) \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

25. Do you have any ideas to improve the performance of decentralized educational management in your woreda? If so, please explain.

### General information

Name of the woreda \_\_\_\_\_

Personal Data:

26. Gender Male  Female

27. Age 20 – 24  25 – 29  30 – 34  35 - 39  40 - 45  46 & above

28. What is your academic qualification?

12 complete  Certificate  Bachelor's degree  Master's degree  PhD  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

29. In which field/academic discipline did you obtain this qualification? \_\_\_\_\_

30. How many years of work experience do you have in the education sector?

Less than 5  5 - 10  11 - 15  16 - 20  21 - 25  More than 25

31. How many years of professional experience do you have in the area of educational planning and management?

Less than 5  5 - 10  11 - 15  More than 15

32. For how long (in years) have you been occupying your present post?

Less than 3  years 4 – 6  7 - 9  10 and above

33. For how long have you ever been a school teacher?

1 - 2 years  3 - 4 years  5 - 6 years  7 - 8 years  9 - 10 years  Above 10 years

Thank you for your participation!

**Appendix IV.** Sample Questionnaires for secondary school PTSA members

Mekelle University

School of Graduate Studies

Department of educational planning and management

Post graduate program

Department of Educational Planning & Management

Questionnaire to be filled by secondary school PTSA members of south eastern Tigray

Dear -----

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information on the decentralized educational management in south eastern zone of Tigray:-policy and practice. Since the success of this study entirely depends up on your genuine response, the researcher would like to express his appreciation for your frankness and sincerity. The information obtained will undoubtedly be used only for academic purposes. Your response will be kept confidential. Please read the instruction of each item carefully to provide your response correctly. If you feel that you should change your responses, make sure that you have cancelled the previous ones. Please try to respond to all questions in all pages. No need to write your name.

Thank you in advance for your time and concern!

Sincerely yours.

**General instruction**

Please complete the following questions by putting “√” in the box against your answer; and for the items that require written answers, use the blank space to write your answers corresponding to the questions.

**i. Practices of delegation of authority**

1. What is the exact title of your post? \_\_\_\_\_

2. Through which process did you obtain this post?

Promotion  Nomination

Internal competitive recruitment Transfer  External competitive recruitment

Other process: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Is there any official document (e.g. job description) which identifies the tasks you are expected to perform?

Yes  No  I don't know

4. If so, what type of document is it? \_\_\_\_\_

5. Do you find that this document clearly describes the tasks you have to perform? Yes  No

6. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

Key: strong agree (SA) agree (A) partially agree (A) dis-agree (DA) strongly disagree (SA)

Items:	strongly agree	agree	partially agree	dis-agree	strongly disagree
Educational administrative authority is delegated to me					
Political authority is delegated to me					
Financial authority is delegated to me					

The nature and scope of my task is clearly defined					
I have authority which is proportionate to my tasks					
I clearly know the limits of my authority					
I have some positive incentives in my present post					
I have received training which enables me perform my duties properly					
I have enough freedom to perform my work					
I know to whom I am accountable					

**ii. Level of decision making process**

7. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

Items:	strong agree	agree	parity agree	dis-agree	strongly disagree
I have enough autonomy to make decisions					
There is clear decision making process in our office					
Roles and responsibilities of every employee in our office is clearly defined					
Employees in our office make decisions according to their assigned roles and responsibilities					
I have all the skills I need to make decisions well					
My superior do not interfere in my decision making process					
Important decision making responsibilities are decentralized to the lower levels(schools, PTAs) according to the directives/guidelines					
The decentralized responsibilities are being practically implemented					

8. When you encounter a technical or professional problem for making a decision, how useful the help you receive from the following sources?

Sources:	Very useful	useful	Somehow useful	Not useful
My superior				
My colleagues				
Manuals/guidelines				
Official documents				
Internet				
Others(specify				

**iii. Level of communication**

9. How often staff meetings are held in your office? Once a week  once a month

Two wise a month  once in three months  other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

10. Have you been evaluated during the past two years? Yes  No

11. If yes, will it useful? Not useful  somewhat useful  Useful  Very useful

12. If yes, was it adequate? Yes  No

13. Does the woreda education office monitor the performance of parent teacher associations?

Yes  No

14. If yes, how often in time? \_\_\_\_\_

15. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

Items:	strongly agree	agree	partiy agree	dis-agree	strongly disagree
I am properly oriented about the practices of the office					
I know my job's relationship with others" and its importance for the overall operation					
The goals of our office are communicated to the society and stakeholders					
There is proper coordination among varies units in our office					
I receive proper support from my superior					
The worda education office trains parent teacher association members about their roles and responsibilities					

**iv. Level of participation of stake holders in various management functions**

16. During the past three months, how many times have you participated in staff meetings in your worda education office? \_\_\_\_\_

17. How do you rate the usefulness of these meetings for the performance of your job?

Not useful  Useful  Very useful

18. How do you rate the adequacy of these meetings for the performance of your job?

Adequate  Inadequate

19. Please mark "√" in the box that you think is appropriate regarding the level of participation of worda education office personnel in the following management functions:

Management functions:	Very high	High	Aver- age	Low	Very low
Planning					
Organizing					
Directing					
Controlling and monitoring					
Important decision makings					

20. Please mark "√" in the box that you think is appropriate regarding the level participation of parent teacher associations in the following school management functions:

Management functions:	Very high	High	Aver- age	Low	Very low
Planning of the schools					
Organizing of the schools					
Directing the schools					
Controlling and monitoring schools					
Important decision makings of schools					

21. How do you rate the level of participation of community in the management of schools?

Very good  Good  Fair  Poor  Very poor

22. If poor or very poor, why? \_\_\_\_\_

**v. Challenges of decentralized educational management**

23. Please indicate the most difficult challenges you face to perform your work effectively and efficiently (more than one answer is possible):

- Lack of coordination
- Lack of guidelines
- Lack of reliable data
- Lack of knowledge and skills in my work
- Lack of familiarity of tasks
- Lack of adequate resources (computers, paper, etc.)
- Lack of support
- Lack of job security
- Lack of time (work overload)

Others: \_\_\_\_\_

24. Please indicate the most difficult challenges your woreda faces to implement decentralized educational management effectively and efficiently (more than one answer is possible):

- Shortage of budget for education
- Lack of coordination among various stake holders
- Lack of clear accountability relationship
- Lack of clearly defined decision making process
- Lack of training for the stake holders
- Inadequate participation of stake holders

Others (specify) \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

25. Do you have any ideas to improve the performance of decentralized educational management in your woreda? If so, please explain.

**General information**

Name of the woreda \_\_\_\_\_

Personal Data:

26. Gender Male  Female

27. Age 20 – 24  25 – 29  30 – 34  35 - 39  40 - 45  46 & above

28. What is your academic qualification?

12 complete  Certificate  Bachelor’s degree  Master’s degree  PhD  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

29. In which field/academic discipline did you obtain this qualification? \_\_\_\_\_

30. How many years of work experience do you have in the education sector?

Less than 5  5 - 10  11 - 15  16 - 20  21 - 25  More than 25

31. How many years of professional experience do you have in the area of educational planning and management?

Less than 5  5 - 10  11 - 15  More than 15

32. For how long (in years) have you been occupying your present post?

Less than 3  years 4 – 6  7 - 9  10 and above

33. For how long have you ever been a school teacher?

1 - 2 years  3 - 4 years  5 - 6 years  7 - 8 years  9 - 10 years  Above 10 years

Thank you for your participation!