

Competency and Preparedness of Educational Leaders on Managing Crisis in Public Higher Learning Institution: Haramaya University in Focus

¹Birhanu Sintayehu, ²Anwar Ahmed, ³Justin Sudhakar, ⁴Mekonnen Abdissa

¹ Lecturer, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, Haramaya University, Ethiopia

²Assistant Professor, School of Education and Behavioral Sciences, Werabe University, Ethiopia

³Assistant Professor, College of Education and Behavioral Studies, Jigjiga University, Ethiopia

⁴ Lecturer, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, Haramaya University, Ethiopia

*Correspondence to: Birhanu Sintayehu, Lecturer, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, Haramaya University, Ethiopia, email-biruhamah@gmail.com

Abstract

Ethiopia's higher education institutions have been overwhelmed by a growing array of crises at various levels caused by multiple unknown causes. As a result, it made panic inside the campus community and raised questions of whether university administrators can prepare and react to crisis occasions. Thus, this paper aims to examine the competency and preparedness of educational leaders in managing crises at Haramaya University. A survey research design was used, as well as triangulation mixed approaches. Data was gathered using a questionnaire, key informant interview, observation, and document analysis. The participants of the study were 86 leaders, 129 instructors (123 for survey & 6 interviews), 24 students' representatives, 82 peace and security officers (11 for the interview & 71 for the survey), two messengers, and two students' cafeteria service waiters with a total of 325 have participated in this study. Study subjects were selected by using purposive, simple random, and stratified sampling techniques. The researchers used descriptive statistics and inferential statistics to interpret quantitative data appropriately. Also, qualitative data analyzed thematically to substantiate quantitative data. The study results indicated that the competency and preparedness of leaders at Haramaya University are slightest and poor. The findings also showed that Haramaya university leaders are not preparing well and not vigilant for the upcoming crisis. Another outcome of the study showed no statistically substantial gap in leaders' competence and preparedness across four classes. Therefore, the leaders are inefficiently controlling and guiding the university throughout the crisis. The findings indicated that the university leaders are relatively better capable and competent in a political frame than structural, human, and symbolic leadership structures. The study further assured that the university has been interrupting the campus crisis for the last decade that led to destructions and deterred the university's teaching-learning process. Thus, the results underlined that the leaders of public higher learning institutions need to develop competencies in managing crises and improve their preparedness for the impending crisis.

Keywords: Competency; Preparedness; Higher education leaders; managing crisis; Haramaya University

Introduction

"Ethiopian institutions of higher learning have been a hotbed of dissent and opposition to political authority since the 1960's" (Hunter & de Wit, 2016). The association between universities and indeed the government was always a rather one. After four years of street demonstrations, the governing Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) voted Abiy Ahmed Ali as prime minister on 2 April 2018. For many Ethiopians, Abiy is a breath of fresh air. "So far, Abiy has launched major changes; however, huge hurdles remain, and many Ethiopians are eager for improvement" (Woldearegay & Chanimbe, 2020). A further context to the demonstrations was general discontent with the EPRDF's prolonged leadership crisis after Prime Minister Meles Zenawi's death in August 2012. "The change from Meles to his replacement, Hailemariam Desalegn, had been seamless and sufficiently valid. Under Hailemariam, the government began to employ the slogan of Meles' revolutionary, patriotic, and growth list" (Woldearegay & Chanimbe, 2020).

Ethiopian higher intuitions were not islanded from the country's political crisis. Leading higher education institutions with a diversified condition, a massive expectation of training, research and community services, insufficient financial capacity, and poor networking requires exceptional knowledge, experience, and dedication to attain the missions (Melu, 2016). Higher education establishments are dynamic centers for leading and bringing in the necessary improvements to spark much-needed transformations. This necessitates knowledgeable and effective representatives across all stages, who are often named on merit.

Due to the troubling circumstances in the area, administrators, ministers, student representatives, leaders of academic units, and even faculty of Ethiopian universities are likely to be heavily involved in

ad-hoc processes, and activities focused on security issues, particularly after 2016. (Hunter & de Wit, 2016). It is not unusual for faculty to be censored by their pupils in the school, by the government, or by their colleagues in Ethiopia's polarized political climate in public higher education. The Ethiopian higher education crisis has dealt a severe setback to the sliver of optimism that Ethiopian higher education has begun to see.

As Tola (2019) has reported, the Haramaya university students stated, "the incident happened after they began boycotting classes as of this week in protest against what they said were continued detentions of their student friends by members of the command post." More than 20 students have been arrested by the command post enforcing the new state of emergency, as per the two students who approached (Tola, 2019). The students said they were boycotting classes, but the university campus and federal security personnel stationed on campus have informed them that they would be dismissed if they do not begin studies. As of January 1, the cafeteria will be closed.

The aftermath of the state of emergency of 2016 had an impact on the academic calendar and scheduling, the assignment of new students to the different universities (in line with their ethnic backgrounds and the regions they would go to), the nature and extent of extracurricular activities, and the space for engagement in critical thinking and constructive dialog (Melu, 2016). Further (Tola, 2019) has stated "students of the Haramaya University said they were forced to leave campus in search of food after their cafeteria denied them providing the free meal service available in state universities in Ethiopia". Inhabitants of Haramaya town offer food and shelter to a group of students in an amateur photograph sent to (Tola, 2019). As per two students who were notified about the situation (Tola, 2019), Several students began leaving campus early noon and moving to Haramaya, a nearby place, they are about 5 kilometers from campus, in which they are cared for by locals. about 5 km from the campus, where they are being taken

care of by residents.

The education policy of the Transition Government of Ethiopia (TGE, 1994) has been the major framework for higher education reform and transformation. The policy stresses issues of quality and relevance in educational programs; quality of teaching staff and facilities; improvement of learning process towards a focus on students; improvement of management and leadership; introduction of financial diversification, including income generation and cost-sharing by students; and improvement in the system of evaluation, monitoring, autonomy, and accountability. However, higher education in Ethiopia is not well developed, and facing problems associated with managing crisis and emergencies, problems of equity, resource constraints, and inefficient resource utilization (Yizengaw, 2004). The expansion of higher education institutions in Ethiopia, particularly in the last two decades presented serious challenges of governance as it is evident that institutional crisis and complicated governance aspect of higher education institutions, and the absence of the efficient leadership and management of higher education institutions is unthinkable to bring sustainable development in the country.

Thus, the study examined competencies and preparedness of educational leaders on managing crises in public higher learning institutions of Haramaya University (HU). This study's independent variable was the leadership frames of crisis leaders. The dependent variables were crisis management leadership competency and institutional preparedness to deal with multiple crises. In light of all the above, this study aimed to examine competencies and preparedness of higher education leaders on crisis management at Haramaya University. Hence, this study will answer the following research questions:

1. To what extent do higher education leaders are competent in managing crisis at Haramaya University?
2. To what extent higher education leaders are vigilant for an upcoming crisis at Haramaya University?
3. Is there any statistically significant difference among respondents on among respondents of Haramaya university leaders' competence and preparedness towards crisis management?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive survey research design for the reason that the very purpose of the design is to describing behaviors of a given subject systematically and accurately, and gathering people's perceptions and thoughts about a current issue in education (Scott, 2009). Additionally, this design was appropriate to collect and analyze data with a limited timeline and budget. The researcher used a mixed research approach. The rationales behind using a mixed approach to corroborate, compare, and relate qualitative research findings on quantitative research findings. To make a sound to collect and analyze data, the triangulation design of mixed methods research approach was employed to simultaneously collect both quantitative and qualitative data, and to merge the findings of the study and use the results to understand a research problem in-depth and profound (Creswell, 2008). The other reason was to get the flexibility of combining theories to be accurate, credible, and scientifically rigor (Bryman, 2004; Creswell, 2008). This design allowed us for a better understanding of the quantitative result to triangulate qualitative results to the study and then reinforced our decision.

Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

The target population for this study consisted of a higher learning institution, Haramaya University. Population was divided into four starts namely; leaders, students' representatives, and campus peace

and security officers. The participants of the survey of the study comprised 90 leaders, 129 instructors, 30 students' representatives and 74 peace and security officers with the total of 323 were sampled via purposive, simple random and stratified sampling techniques from 116 leaders, 860 instructors, 198 students' representatives and 490 peace and security officers with total 1664.

Sample size determination for instructors, students' representatives and campus security officers, researchers took 15% of total population to manage the size of sample according to the suggestion of (Singh, 2006). To do so, descriptive research typically uses larger samples; it is suggested that one should select 10-20 per cent of the accessible population for the sample (Singh, 2006 P. 94)

To determine sample size from university leaders, the researchers applied Yamane (1967:886) $n = \frac{N}{1 + NE^2}$; which N =total population; n =sample size, E =error rate /margin of error (.05) provides a simplified formula to calculate sample sizes and guess: 95% confidence level $P = .05$. Thus, sample size determination was calculated as following: Sample size of the University leaders: $nh = (Nh/N) \times n^*$, $110/1 + 116 * 0.052 = 11/6 \cdot 1.29 = 90$. After determining sample size from the three strata namely top, middle and lower level managers, and researchers used proportional stratified sampling technique to select respondents from the population

Furthermore, Sample size determination for instructors, students and campus security officers, researchers took 15% of total population to manage the size of sample according to the suggestion of (Singh, 2006). To do so, descriptive research typically uses larger samples; it is suggested by (Singh, 2006) as one should select 10-20 per cent of the accessible population for the sample.

Table1. Summary of Sampling Frame

	Participants	Population	Sample size	Sampling techniques
strata	Leaders	116	90	Stratified
	Instructors	860	129	Simple
	Students'	198	30	Simple
	Campus Peace and security Officers	490	74	Simple random
Overall Groups		1,664	323	

Source: from the university's statistics.

Furthermore, In addition to survey questions, 11 peace and security officers, 6 instructors, 2 messengers, and 2 students' cafeteria waiters have participated in interview key informant groups. In short, 304 participants were involved in survey questionnaires and 15 participants were involved in the interview as a key informant for this study with the overall subject of the study (325).

Data Gathering Instruments

I. Questionnaire

Leadership Orientations Instrument (LOI) which was developed by (Bolman & Deal, 2003) was modified and used to gather data on leadership frames, leadership competency, and preparedness of crisis leaders from sampled respondents. The survey questionnaire was distributed and data collected from university leaders, instructors, students' representatives, and peace and security officers. The first section of the questionnaire consists of three variables that focused on biographical information about the participants. The second part of the survey on leader competency for the independent variable for this study: the leadership frames of higher education leaders. It was employed by using a five-point Likert scale (1 = never & 5 = always) of 32 items, and each corresponded to one of the leadership frames (

Bolman & Deal, 2003). The construct of section 2 is displayed in Table 2.

Table 2. A Summary of What of a Leader and Leadership Process According to (Bolman & Deal, 2003)

Leadership Frames	A Leader is:	Leadership process is:
1 Structural	analyst, architect	analysis, design
2 Human Resource	catalyst, servant	support, empowerment
3 Political	advocate, negotiator	advocacy, coalition building
4 Symbolic	prophet, poet inspiration,	leadership experience

Sources: Adapted from (Bolman & Deal, 2003)

The third section a bite modified to make suit to secure data on crisis preparedness of university leaders. This section asked participants how university leaders prepared as they believed their institution would be to manage through the fourteen likely campus crisis situations posited by Mitroff et al. (2006). It employed by using a five point likert scale (1= not prepared at all & 5= very well prepared). This information related to the dependent variable of crisis preparedness.

Table 3. The Survey Instrument Mapped to the Study's Variables.

Section	Construct	Variable
I	Background Information	N/A
II	Leadership Frame/competency	Independent
III	Crisis Preparedness	Dependent

The survey was structured to generate responses to inform this study's independent and dependent variables. LOI survey has already been validated by being used over one thousand times and their website provides resultant test score statistics, internal consistency data, and item reliability statistics (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

II. Key Informant Interview

Semi-structured interview was conducted with some illiterate respondents who are working in different positions like 11 security office, 6 instructors, 2 messengers, and 2 cafeteria services to gather data regarding their leaders' competence and preparedness to manage the forthcoming crisis. Interviewees were coded as SS, I, M, and CS respectively to refer to security service, messengers and cafeteria service.

III. Observation

To enrich data collected through questionnaire and interview, observations of various buildings, the way higher education leaders manage crisis, decision making procedures on crisis and classroom situations were employed.

IV. Document Analysis

Documents like annual academic calendar of the university, time table of various departments/schools, attendance sheet prepared by instructors, exam schedule and the like were analyzed to see how much teaching learning process were either implemented as per plan or interrupted. Moreover, these documents were used to assess the preparedness of leaders in taking immediate actions to solve crisis situations when happened.

Methods of Data Analysis

To interpret data sound, the researchers used both descriptive (frequency count, percentage, mean score and standard deviation) and www.psychologyandeducation.

inferential statistics (One way ANOVA and multiple regressions). Percent and frequency count were used to analyze data regarding background information of respondents. Besides, mean was used to analyze data collected through close-ended questionnaire concerning the competence of higher education leaders, their preparedness to control the imminent crisis at the university. Moreover, One-way ANOVA was employed to see if there were significant mean differences among the four groups of respondents (leaders, students, instructors, and security officers) regarding leaders' competence and alertness to control the forthcoming crisis at the University level. The qualitative data, which were collected through key informant interview, observation, document analysis, and open-ended questionnaire, were analyzed thematically

FINDINGS

Background information of the respondents

Table 4: Background Information of the Participants

N ₀	Demographic characteristics	n	%
1. Participants	Leaders	86	28.3
	Instructors	123	40.5
	Students' representatives	24	7.9
	Peace and security officers	71	23.3
2. Sex	Male	206	67.8
	Female	98	32.2
3. Educational qualification/ Academic rank	Illiterates	13	4.3
	Students	24	7.9
	Certificates	17	5.6
	Diploma	17	5.6
	Bachelor degree	43	14.1
	Masters degree	133	43.8
	Assistant professor & above	57	18.7

Table 4 shows the questionnaire was initially distributed to 90 leaders, 129 instructors, 30 students' representatives, and the remaining 74 peace and security officers with a total of (n =323). Of the total number of the questionnaire distributed to the four groups, 86(28.3%) leaders, 123(40.5%) instructors, 24 (7.9 %) students' representatives and the remaining 71(23.3%) peace and security officers were appropriately filled and returned with a total of 304 (94 %) return rate.

This indicates that the data was collected from the diversified source of respondents who are working in various positions and levels of the university which intern enables them to have detailed information about the issue under study.

Interims of sex, 206 (67.8%) were males and 98 (32.2%) were females. Regarding the academic rank of respondents, 13(4.3%) were illiterates, 24 (7.9%) students, 17(5.6%) certificates, and 17(5.6%) diploma holders. Moreover, respondents with the rank of the first degree, master's degree and assistant professor & above accounted for 43(14.1%), 133(43.8%), and 57(18.7%) respectively. This indicates that the data was collected from stakeholders that have an opportunity and experience to understand the issue under study.

Furthermore, in addition to survey questions, 11 illiterate peace and security officers, 2 messengers, and 2 students' cafeteria waiters have participated in interview key informant groups. In short, 304 participants were involved in survey questionnaires and 15 participants were involved in the interview as a key informant for this study with the overall subject of the study (319).

In line with the objectives of the research and basic research questions framed, the data is presented as follows;

Objective One: To identify the higher education leaders' 6545

competences in managing crisis at Haramaya University

To achieve the above objective, data was collected by using likert scale having 5-point scales (1: never, 2-Occasionally, 3-Sometimes, 4-Often, and 5-Always) from leaders, instructors, students' class representatives and peace & security officers of HU. Hence, the data is analyzed by using mean scores between 1-1.5 as never, 1.5-2.5 as occasionally; 2.5-3.5 as sometimes; 3.5-4.5 as often; and 4.5 – 5 as almost always according to Anderson 2003 (as cited in Abera, Kedir, & Beyabeyin, 2017). The summary is indicated in Table 5 below.

Table 5: Leaders Competence in Managing Crisis at HU

Ite. N _g	Description of leaders competence at HU	N _g	Mi n.	Ma x.	Me an	SD
1.	Thinks very clearly and logically	304	1	5	2.66	1.05
2.	Shows high levels of support and concern for others	304	1	5	2.68	1.18
3.	Shows exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done	304	1	5	2.71	1.14
4.	Inspires others to do their best	304	1	5	2.71	1.11
5.	Emphasizes careful planning and clear time lines	304	1	5	2.45	1.03
6.	Builds trust through open and collaborative relationships	304	1	5	2.61	1.06
7.	Acts as a skillful and shrewd negotiator	304	1	5	2.66	1.09
8.	Acts in a charismatic manner	304	1	5	2.66	1.07
9.	Approaches problems through logical analysis and careful thinking	304	1	5	2.54	1.06
10.	Shows sensitivity and concern for others' needs and feelings	304	1	5	2.71	1.10
11.	Acts in a persuasive and influential manner	304	1	5	2.89	1.20
12.	Inspires others	304	1	5	2.39	.94
13.	Develops and implements clear, logical policies and procedures	304	1	5	2.36	.79
14.	Fosters high levels of participation and involvement in decisions	304	1	5	2.29	.87
15.	Anticipates and deals adroitly with organizational conflict	304	1	5	2.32	.90
16.	Leads in imaginative and creative ways	304	1	5	2.44	.91
17.	Approaches problems with facts and logic	304	1	5	2.25	.89
18.	Responds to inquiries and offers help	304	1	5	2.23	.90
19.	Uses influence and power to lead the institution	304	1	5	2.31	.92
20.	Communicates a strong and challenging vision and sense of mission	304	1	5	2.35	.92
21.	Sets specific, measurable goals and holds people accountable for results	304	1	5	2.30	.918
22.	Listens well and is unusually receptive to other people's ideas and input	304	1	5	2.33	.938
23.	Responds skillfully and carefully to political matters	304	1	5	2.32	.958
24.	Shows attention to detail	304	1	5	2.28	.978
25.	Sees beyond current realities to create exciting new opportunities	304	1	5	2.24	.918
26.	Gives personal recognition for work well done	304	1	5	2.24	.947
27.	Develops alliances to build a strong base of support	304	1	5	2.52	1.099
28.	Generates loyalty and enthusiasm	304	1	5	2.43	1.097
29.	Believes in clear structure and a chain of command	304	1	5	2.43	.983
30.	Encourages participation from the team	304	1	5	2.44	.983
31.	Succeeds in the face of conflict and opposition	304	1	5	2.49	.988
32.	Serves as an influential model of	304	1	5	2.40	.960

organizational aspirations and values

Overall mean **2.46**

Scales of interpretation <1.49-almost never; 1.5-2.49-occasionally; 2.5-3.49-sometimes; 3.5-4.49-often; >4.5-almost always

As indicated in Table 5 above, the overall mean score of all the items is 2.46 which indicate leaders of the study area are 24.6% competent to perform the activities listed in the table according to Leadership Orientations Instrument which was developed by (Bolman & Deal, 2003) with 32 items summarized in to four leadership frames summarized in Table 6 below;

Table 6: Summary of Leader Behavior in HU

Descriptive statistics						
N _g	Leadership Frames	Items	N _g	Min.	Max	SD
1.	Structural	1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29	304	9	31	2.40
2.	Human resources	2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, 30	304	9	30	2.44
3.	Political	3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, 31	304	10	32	2.53
4.	Symbolic	4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32	304	10	29	2.46

Scales of interpretation <1.49-almost never; 1.5-2.49-occasionally; 2.5-3.49-sometimes 3.5-4.49-often; >4.5-almost always

As presented in Table 6 above, the mean score of leaders in HU is 2.4 for structural component, 2.44 for Human, 2.53 for political, and 2.46 for symbolic components of leadership frame. This indicates that the leaders of HU have relatively better competence in a political frame (mean=2.53) than structural, human, and symbolic frames. Additionally, the mean score of the three leadership frames (structural, human, and symbolic) is below 2.5 which the intern shows that leaders of the study area are occasionally performing activities in items that correspond to these frames. However, the mean score of leaders in a political frame is 2.53 which indicates that the leaders of the study area have relatively better competence in performing activities related to the political frame like acting as a skillful & shrewd negotiator, acting in a persuasive & influential manner, dealing adroitly with organizational conflict, using influence & power to lead the institution, responding skillfully & carefully to political matters and developing alliances to build a strong base of support.

More specifically, the mean score of items number 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 27 is between 2.5 and 3.5. This indicates that leaders are sometimes performing their roles indicated in these items which further indicate leaders in the study area are 25% to 35% competent to perform the list of activities indicated in these items ((Bolman & Deal, 2003). Meaning, activities like leaders; thinks very clearly and logically, shows high levels of support & concern for others, shows exceptional ability to mobilize people & resources to get things done, inspires others to do their best, builds trust through open & collaborative relationships were done sometimes.

Moreover, the mean score of item number 5, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, and 32 is between 1.5 and 2.5. This indicates that the leaders of HU are occasionally performing their roles indicated in these items which further indicate; leaders are 15% to 25% competent to perform these activities ((Bolman & Deal, 2003).

Furthermore, from 32 questions which were developed by (Bolman & Deal, 2003) the mean score of 21 items is between 1.5 and 2.5 that indicates 65.6% of the activities mentioned in Table 6 above are

occasionally (below average) performed while the remaining 34.4% of the activities (11 items) are sometimes (averagely) performed as their mean score is between 2.5 and 3.49. In support of this, data collected through an open-ended questionnaire regarding their leaders' confidence and competence to deal with multiple crises indicated that respondents are minimally confident in their leaders' ability to react with crises. Moreover, respondents were asked to rate the overall effectiveness of their leaders. Surprisingly, the mean score of the respondents was found to be 1.48 in 5 point Likert scales which is below average. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that leaders' competence in HU is low (minimal). Overall, this intern indicates that leaders of HU are at least level of competence to shoulder their tasks presented in Table 6 above.

Moreover, one way ANOVA test was conducted to test whether there is a significant difference among the four groups (leaders, instructors, students, and security officers) of respondents concerning leaders' competence in managing crises. As indicated in Table 7 below, there is no significant mean difference among the four groups of respondents regarding the competence of HU leaders in managing crisis, $F(3, 300) = 2.3, p < 0.05$. Therefore, the null hypothesis that states there is no significant mean difference among respondents was accepted and the alternatively.

Table 7: Summary of ANOVA test on Leaders' Competence

Groups	ANOVA Summary					
	SV	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Leaders	Between Groups	1028.333	3	342.778	2.32	.075
Instructors	Within Groups	44259.29	300	147.531		
Students' representative	Total	45287.63	303			
Security officers		2				

Objective Two: To examine the preparedness and alertness of leaders for upcoming crisis at Haramaya University

Likert scale having 5 point scales (1-not prepared, 2-minimally prepared, 3- averagely or moderately prepared, 4 highly prepared, and 5- extremely prepared) were used to collect the data. Hence, 3 is considered as the average mean score and cut point to indicate the whether the level of leaders' preparedness in managing crisis at HU is low or high. Table 8 below shows the summary of it.

Table 8: Level of Leaders' Preparedness and Alertness in managing upcoming Crisis at HU

Ite. No	Leaders' preparedness and alertness in managing upcoming crisis at HU	No	M in.	Max	Mean	SD
1.	Serious outbreaks of illness	304	1	5	2.32	.98
2.	Major food tampering	304	1	5	2.63	1.11
3.	Employee sabotage	304	1	5	2.60	1.18
4.	Fires, explosions, and chemical spills	304	1	5	2.53	1.26
5.	Environmental disasters	304	1	5	2.53	1.28
6.	Significant drops in revenues	304	1	5	2.72	1.22
7.	Natural disasters	304	1	5	2.65	1.18
8.	Loss of confidential/sensitive information or records	304	1	5	2.69	1.18
9.	Major lawsuits	304	1	5	2.83	1.31
10.	Terrorist attacks	304	1	5	2.90	1.28
11.	Damage to institutional reputation	304	1	5	3.14	1.36
12.	Ethical breaches by administrators, faculty, and trustees	304	1	5	2.50	1.09
13.	Major crimes	304	1	5	2.33	1.02

14.	Athletic scandals	304	1	5	2.44	1.07
Overall mean score					2.63	

As indicated in Table 8 above, the mean score of all the items except for item number 11 is below 3 (the cut point). In addition to this, the overall mean score of all the items (2.63) is below the cut point. These indicate that leaders' preparedness and alertness in managing crisis at Haramaya University is low. Particularly, the preparedness and alertness of leaders in a managing crisis like a serious outbreak of illness (mean=2.32), major crimes (mean=2.33) and athletic scandals (mean=2.44).

However, the alertness and preparedness of leaders in a managing crisis like damage to institutional reputation (mean=3.14), terrorist attacks (mean=2.9), major lawsuits (mean=2.83), significant drops in revenues (mean=2.72), and loss of confidential information (mean=2.69) are relatively higher as their corresponding mean score is above the average score of all items (2.63). In support of these, one of the interviewees reported;

Unfortunately, our university has a bad history in relation to the terrorist attack in 2013/14. Due to this, our leaders are strongly working on managing terrorist attack. Again they are also strong in keeping institutional reputations. For instance, the leaders facilitated the plantation of surveillance cameras in different locations of the main campus that help to protect the university from external attaches as well as a deconstruction of university reputations like glasses available in different buildings, direction indicators that indicate sub institutional units like colleges, departments, classrooms, offices and the like [SS4, May 2020].

Supporting the above idea, the other interviewee confirmed:

I think our leaders are good at keeping the campus from external attaches. However, they are not good at keeping peace on campus particularly related to the safety of students. In the last two years, our campus was unsafe and the most horrible for students particularly for few ethnic groups because of political views. Crimes were also committed upon students. Some students left the campus forever while few students are forced to withdraw because of leaders' inability to pass decisions in taking measures upon students who violated the legislation of the university [instructor 2, April 2020].

In line with the above discussion, the other interviewee repeated:

Yes, most leaders are routine focused that emphasize on keeping records or files regarding their office. I mean, they try to keep a small fraction of their office tasks particularly well done in a file rather than planning for more tasks and implementing their plans as per their due date. They are also sensitive in controlling their office meets as they hesitated employees under them will make sabotage on the office. However, most leaders are weak and laissez-faire in ethical breaches by their administrators (higher position holders) as they fear they will lose their present position.

Moreover, one way ANOVA test was conducted to test whether there is a significant difference among the four groups of respondents with regard to leaders' preparedness and alertness in managing crises. As indicated in Table 9 below, there was no significant mean difference among the respondents $F(3, 300) = 0.78, p > 0.05$. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis which state there is a significant mean difference among respondents was rejected and the null hypothesis was accepted. Here is the summary of the ANOVA test:

Table 9: Summary of ANOVA Test on Leaders' Preparedness and Alertness to Manage Crisis

Groups	ANOVA Summary					
	SV	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.

Leaders	Between Groups	97.427	3	32.476	.779	.507
Instructors	Within Groups	12511.507	300	41.705		
Students' representatives	Total	12608.934	303			
Security officers						

Discussions

The main purpose of this study was to examine the competency and preparedness of educational leaders in managing crises in public higher learning institution of Haramaya University. Three research questions guide the study. #1. To what extent do higher education leaders are competent in managing crisis at Haramaya University? #2. To what extent higher education leaders are vigilant for an upcoming crisis at Haramaya University? #3. Is there any statistically significant difference among respondents on the competence and preparedness of Haramaya university leaders towards crisis management?

The first key finding was that the competence of HU leaders is low with the overall mean score of 2.46. In support of this, data collected from side to side via open-ended questionnaires on leaders' confidence and competence indicated that respondents are minimally confident in their leaders' ability to react with crisis situations. Moreover, respondents were asked to rate the overall effectiveness of their leaders. Surprisingly, the mean score of the respondents was found to be 1.48 in 5 point Likert scales which are below average. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that leaders' competence in HU is least. To support this McCarty (2012) found that "in large measure, educational leaders reported that their competency in a crisis derived from personal experiences. Yet, they do not have a vast number of experiences, the specialized preparation, nor the supervision to learn all they need to know experientially". However, as (Smith & Riley, 2012) confirmed that "strong leadership generally is about positioning the school for the future, and about supporting and empowering staff and students in the pursuit of teaching and learning excellence".

The second key finding revealed that higher education leaders at Haramaya University are stumpy vigilant for an upcoming crisis with an overall mean score of 2.63. interview result further revealed that leaders are good in keeping the campus from external attack, institutional reputations, most leaders are routine focused that emphasize on keeping records or files. They are also sensitive in controlling their office meets and employees' needs. However, they are not good in keeping peace in campus particularly related with safety of students particularly for few ethnic groups because of political views, some students left the campus for a good while few students are forced to withdraw because of leaders' inability to pass decisions in taking measure upon students who violated the legislation of the university, most leaders are poor in implementing their plans as per their due date, weak and laissez-faire in ethical breaches by their administrators as they fear they will lose their present position. Ironically, the result of a study conducted by Smith and Riley (2012) underlined that leadership in times of crisis is about dealing with events, emotions, and consequences in the immediate present in ways that minimize personal and organizational harm to the campus and school community".

The last major finding of one-way ANOVA test indicated that there is no significant mean difference among four groups [Leaders,

instructors, class students' representatives, and peace and security officers] of respondents with regard to leaders' competence [F (3, 300) = 0.78, p>0.05] and their preparedness [F (3, 300) = 0.78, p>0.05]. Therefore, all groups of respondents agreed that leaders are not as competent enough to manage as they expected. As the reason for this McCarty (2012) realized that "given the number of crises university has dealt with throughout our recent history, it is shocking that so little attention has been given to how we prepare those who protect our children during a school's darkest hours".

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the result and discussions above, the researcher drew the following conclusions:

The first findings of the study revealed that higher education leaders at HU are not competent, not effective, and efficient, and they do not have ample experiences to lead the campus. Thus, it is possible to conclude that administrative leaders of HU are not competent and capable enough to lead the university as they expected to lead. Thus, it is recommended that the Haramaya university board, Ministry of science and higher education (MoSHE) should collaboratively work on to skill up leaders, their talents and proficiencies via on the job training and off the job training.

The second foremost findings revealed that Haramaya University leaders are not as vigilant for the upcoming crisis of the campus. Thus, it is possible to conclude that higher education leaders of HU are not preparing well and alert for an upcoming crisis. Thus, they are short-sighted, they are not visionaries, and they cannot predict and forecast the future. It is possible to generalize that the assigned leaders of the university are not really true leaders. The fact that managing and leading higher education requires both science and an art, however, many of our country politicians deny this reality and appoint higher education officials without any educational background which place of position derives and invites. Thus, it is possible to recommend that government officials particularly MoSHE and Haramaya University itself should appoint the right person at the right position during the right time for rational persuasion, consultation, collaboration, and inspirational appeals.

The third foremost finding revealed that there was no statistically significant difference among four groups [Leaders, instructors, class students' representatives, and peace and security officers] of respondents with regard to leaders' competence and their preparedness. Therefore, it is suggested that university management and leadership should create awareness and provide short term training for all stakeholders to learn more about how to manage and lead university during times of crisis. In addition, higher education officials and policymakers at the Ministry of Education (MoE), Ministry of Science, Higher Education (MoSHE), and Haramaya University should take into account staff seniority and appoint leaders from educational leadership background.

In brief, higher education is training ground for all institutions, equipping, and preparing and building floor of the young generation for the future. As Wagaw (1979) stated "the fate and destiny of our country depend on what we do for the young. Our world is a horrible spectacle of undeveloped and misapplied possibilities...How many mute and glorious Miltons have died in silence, how many potential Newtons never learned to read?" Thus, if education goes wrong particularly higher education leadership, absolutely true that nothing goes right.

References

1. Abera, G., Kedir, M., & Beyabeyin, M. (2017). The Implementations and Challenges of Continuous Assessment in Public Universities of Eastern Ethiopia. *International Journal of Instruction*, 10(4), 109–128. <https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2017.1047a>

2. Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. <https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Reframing+Organizations:+Artistry,+Choice,+and+Leadership,+6th+Edition-p-9781119281818>
3. Booker Jr, L. (2014). Crisis Management: Changing Times for Colleges. *Journal of College Admission*, 222(8), 16-23. <http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/97394361/crisis-management-changing-times-colleges>
4. Bryman, M. A. H. A. (2004). *Handbook of data analysis*. Sage. <https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=tr22eC0AAAAJ&hl=en&oi=sra>
5. Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Mapping the field of mixed methods research*. Sage Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1558689808330883>
6. Dane, E., & Pratt, M. G. (2007). Exploring intuition and its role in managerial decision making. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(1), 33–54. <https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/amr.2007.23463682>
7. TGE, Transitional Government of Ethiopia (1994). *Education and training policy*. EMPDA AddisAbaba. https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Ethiopian+Education+and+training+policy+1994&btnG=
8. Hunter, F., & de Wit, H. (2016). Brexit and the European shape of things to come. *International Higher Education*, 87, 2–3. <https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2016.87.9492>
9. McCarty, S. (2012). *K-12 School Leaders and School Crisis: an Exploration of Principals' school Crisis Competencies and Preparedness*. PhD Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh. [http://d-scholarship.pitt.edu/12030/McConnell, A., & Drennan, L. \(2006\). Mission impossible? Planning and preparing for crisis 1. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 14\(2\), 59–70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5973.2006.00482.x>](http://d-scholarship.pitt.edu/12030/McConnell, A., & Drennan, L. (2006). Mission impossible? Planning and preparing for crisis 1. Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management, 14(2), 59–70. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5973.2006.00482.x)
10. Melu, A. (2016). Brief assessment of higher education governance in Ethiopia: Reflection on the leap of the decade. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa/Revue de l'enseignement Supérieur En Afrique*, 14(2), 107–126. https://www.jstor.org/stable/90015349?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
11. Mitroff, I. I., Diamond, M. A., & Alpaslan, M. C. (2006). How prepared are America's colleges and universities for major crises? *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 38(1), 61–67.
12. Ringwalt, C., Vincus, A. A., Hanley, S., Ennett, S. T., Bowling, J. M., & Haws, S. (2011). The prevalence of evidence-based drug use prevention curricula in US middle schools in 2008. *Prevention Science*, 12(1), 63–69.
13. Sapiel, C. (2003). Effective crisis management: Tools and best practice for the new millennium. *Journal of Communication Management*, 7(4), 348–355.
14. Singh, Y. K. (2006). *Fundamental of research methodology and statistics*. New Age International.
15. Slater, M. D. (2017). *Crisis Management by Higher Education Leaders*. Edgewood College.
16. Smith, L., & Riley, D. (2012). School leadership in times of crisis. *School Leadership & Management*, 32(1), 57–71.
17. Telila, L. (2010). Review of some recent literature: Identifying factors that affect Ethiopia's education crisis. *Ethiopian E-Journal for Research and Innovation Foresight*, 2(2), 56–68.
18. Tola, M. D. (2019). *Qeerroo Fi Qarree': The Engine of Current Transition in Ethiopia Politics*. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 9(5), 2250–3153 <http://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.9.05.2019.p8964>. www.ijsrp.org
19. Wagaw, T. G. (1979). *Education in Ethiopia: Prospect and retrospect*. Ann Arbor : University of Michigan Press. <https://www.worldcat.org/title/education-in-ethiopia-prospect-and-retrospect/oclc/4591289/editions?referer=di&editionsView=true>
20. Woldearegay, T., & Chanimbe, T. (2020). The Dynamics of Ethiopia's Unsettling Political Crisis: The Genesis, Dimensions of Stakeholders' Inclusiveness and Remedies. *Journal of Politics & Governance*, 8(4), 18-31. <http://jpg.net.in/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Tewodros-Woldearegay-and-Timothy-Chanimbe.pdf>
21. Wooten, L. (2007). Leadership in a crisis situation: An opportunity for framing to learn. *Human Factor*, 2(1), 76-80. <https://www.simmons.edu/about/university-leadership/president/about-president/books-and-publications>
22. Yizengaw, T. (2004). The status and challenges of Ethiopian higher education system and its contribution to development. *The Ethiopian Journal of Higher Education*, 1(1), 1–19. <http://ejol.aau.edu.et/index.php/EJHE/article/view/245>
23. Zdziarski, E. L. I. (2002). *Institutional preparedness to respond to campus crises as perceived by student affairs administrators in selected NASPA member institutions*. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62: 3714, UMI No. 3033906. <https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=urYIf-0AAAAJ&hl=en>