



WOLKITE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONEL PLANNING AND
MANAGEMENT**

**COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT
PROGRAM IN YABERUS SECONDARY SCHOOL OF WOLKITE TOWN
GURAGE ZONE.**

**A RESEARCH SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL
PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT FOR THE IMPARTIAL FULFILLMENT
FOR THE REQUIREMENTS OF BACHELOR OF ARTS DEGREE IN
EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT.**

BY: SALAMAWIT ABDISA

ADVISOR: - MR. AWOL NEJMU

JUNE,2023

WOLKITE, ETHIOPIA

APPROVAL SHEET

ADVISOR _____ Signature _____ Date _____

EXAMINER _____ Signature _____ Date _____

Aknowledgments

Firstly, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor Mr. Awol for his unreserved guidance, constructive comments and professional advice to realize my thesis work effectively.

Secondly, my special and warmest gratitude goes to my father Abdisa duguma and my mother Nigatuwa Alemayow for their support and moral encouragement in all my success.

I wish to thank the whole participants of the study for their great contribution in filling in the questionnaires and giving valuable idea through interviews and focus group discussions.

Finally, the contribution of Wolkite University in financial support was the remarkable of all contributors which help me to go ahead and realize my work.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine community participation of SIP in the government secondary and preparatory schools in Yaberus. For this purpose, descriptive survey design was used. Both qualitative and quantitative techniques were employed. Purposive sampling was used for schools, KETB, PTSA, SIC, Principals, Supervisor, and GEQIP expertise, random sampling for teachers and convenience sampling was used for students in focused-group discussion. Data were collected by using questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, focused group discussion and document analysis. These data were analyzed and interpreted using both qualitative and quantitative techniques. The major finding of the study indicates that low familiarity of community with SIP, lack of awareness creation training and empowerment programs, poor school-community chain (network), lack of regular communication with community and insignificant roles of school community. Thus, to alleviate the problems collaboration work of Woreda Education Office and schools in giving training, GEQIP expertise and school supervisor support for school in developing different strategies to overcome challenges, principals' active participation in differentiating problem and inviting community including teachers, KETB, and PTSA to participate in SIP were recommended.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| ABSTRACT..... | iii |
| Acronyms..... | vii |
| CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 1.1 Background to the Study..... | 1 |
| 1.2 Statement of the problem..... | 2 |
| 1.3 Basic Research Question..... | 4 |
| 1.4 Objective of the study..... | 4 |
| 1.4.1 General objective..... | 4 |
| 1.4.2 Specific objectives..... | 4 |
| 1.5 Significance of the study..... | 4 |
| 1.6 Delimitation of the study..... | 5 |
| 1.7 Definition of key terms..... | 5 |
| 1.8 Organization of the study..... | 6 |
| CHAPTER TWO..... | 7 |
| 2 Review of Related Literature..... | 7 |
| 2.1 Concept of School Improvement..... | 7 |
| 2.2 Historical development of School improvement..... | 7 |
| 2.3 Countries Experience in School Improvement Program Implementation..... | 8 |
| 2.3.1 Canada..... | 8 |
| 2.3.2 South Africa..... | 8 |
| 2.3.3 United Kingdom..... | 9 |
| 2.4 Domains of School Improvement Program..... | 9 |
| 2.4.1 The Teaching - Learning Process..... | 10 |
| 2.4.2 . School Leadership..... | 10 |
| 2.4.3 Community Participation..... | 11 |
| 2.5 Reasons for Community Participation in School Improvement Program..... | 12 |
| 2.5.1 Resource Mobilization..... | 12 |
| 2.5.2 Parents/Community Participation in their Children’s Education..... | 13 |

| | | |
|---------------------|---|----|
| 2.6 | Community Participation Empowerment in Implementation of SIP | 13 |
| 2.7 | Stakeholder Responsibilities in Supporting Community Participation in SIP | 14 |
| CHAPTER THREE | | 15 |
| 3 | Research Design and Methodology | 15 |
| 3.1 | Research Design..... | 15 |
| 3.2 | Research method..... | 15 |
| 3.3 | Source of Data..... | 15 |
| 3.3.1 | Primary Source of Data..... | 15 |
| 3.3.2 | Secondary Source of Data..... | 15 |
| 3.4 | Population, Samples size and Sampling Techniques | 15 |
| 3.5 | Instruments of Data Collection | 17 |
| 3.6 | Questionnaire | 18 |
| 3.6.1 | Interview | 18 |
| 3.6.2 | Document Analysis..... | 18 |
| 3.6.3 | Focused group discussion | 19 |
| 3.7 | Data Collecting Procedure | 19 |
| 3.8 | Method of Data Analysis and Interpretation..... | 19 |
| 3.9 | ethical consideration | 20 |
| 4.1. | Characteristics of the Respondents. | 21 |
| 4.2. | Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of Data..... | 24 |
| CHAPTER FIVE | | 32 |
| 5. | Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations | 32 |
| 5.1. | Summary | 32 |
| REFERENCES | | 36 |
| Appendix A..... | | 38 |
| Appendix B..... | | 42 |
| Appendix C..... | | 46 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1. population, Sample size and sampling techniques..... | 17 |
| Table 2: General background of the respondents in terms of gender, age and educational level. | 21 |
| Table: 3 Area of specialization, service year and additional responsibilities of Teachers, KETB, PTSA and SI | 23 |
| Table 4: Opportunities available for SIP in community Participation..... | 26 |
| Table 5: Challenges that hindering the implementation of school improvement program in community participation | 28 |

Acronyms

| | |
|-------|---|
| ESDP | Education Sector Development Program |
| FGD | Focus Group Discussions |
| GEQIP | General Education Quality Improvement Package |
| IQEA | Improvement of Quality Education for All |
| MOE | Ministry of Education |
| PTSA | Parent Teacher and Students Association |
| SBM | School Based Management |
| SIC | School Improvement Committee |
| SIP | School Improvement Program |
| TDP | Teacher Development Program |

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Education has a vital role to play in the life of an individual as well as the society. It is considered to have the potential to effect change in the system of social structure. Educated people can have the power of controlling the skills necessary for sustainable economic growth and for a better and quality life. Anderson (1992: 6-7) says, “a child who has gained quality education will have a better chance of leading a healthy and secured life”. It is not only the child who benefits from being educated but also the nation, because education and economic performance go together. School improvement helps to create a learning environment that welcomes all learners. It enables teachers to be responsive to the diverse learning needs of students in their teaching learning approaches. School Improvement; moreover, is essential to enhance the involvement of parents and the community in school activities and to improve the effectiveness of the school management. Shaffer (1994) in (World Bank, 1999) claims that education on a program that takes place at school level is most likely to be more relevant, more supported, successful and sustainable to the extent that it involves the communities in planning, implementation and evaluation. Thus, this research attempts to assess community participation in the implementation of SIP and factors that hindering community participation of Wolkite town. In other words, Community Participation in the implementation of School Improvement Programs in yaberus secondary schools .

The high cost of education requires that funds be utilized in the best possible way and thus intellectual development of the child calls for parent-teacher Corporation. In agreement with the views of Shaffer (1994), Gallagher and Donald (2005) point out that there must be a structured systematic and active participation of the people of a community in the planning, policy making, problem solving and evaluation activities of the SIP. Therefore, to improve the quality of education and student’s achievements, community participation is a vital component. After the downfall of military regime in 1991, Ethiopia has embarked on a new education and training policy which was issued by the transitional government of Ethiopia. (TGE) (MOE, 2008).

However, at the early time before 1994, the majority of Ethiopia society had no access to education. According to Ethiopian Education and Training Policy of 1994, the gross participation rate of secondary education in 1994 was below 22%, ETP (1994).

When we generalize school improvement program in Ethiopian context, the Ministry of Education has been engaged in formulation and implementation of different policies and programs, one of the land marks to this effect is putting the 1994 Education and Training Policy along with the Education Sector Strategy and Education Sector Development Program (ESDP I - III) in place. Another program recently developed and currently under implementation is the general education improvement package (GEQIP) which has six important pillars. Those are the following: teachers development program (TDP), School improvement program (SIP), civic and ethical education (CEE), information and communication technology (ICT), and curriculum improvement program (CIP) and management and leader ship.

Due to poor quality of education, student's achievement for most subjects is below average. This is the main reason for the promulgation of GEQIP in Ethiopia. In relation to this, MOE (2008) respond to the deep-rooted problems related to secondary and higher educational by introducing General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP). It is suggested that putting in to practice to design a General Educational Quality Improving Package (GEQIP) that contains six main programs such as; Teachers Development Program (TDP), School Improvement Program (SIP), Information Communication Technology Program (ICTP), Education Leadership and Management Improvement Program (ELMP), Civic and Ethical Education Program and Curriculum Improvement Program began all over the country. In line with this, in Ethiopia as indicated in MOE (2007), SIP addresses four major domains to improve schools. The domains are: Teaching and learning, learning environment, community participation and leadership and management. Thus, this research attempts to assess community participation in the implementation of SIP and factors that hindering community participation of Wolkite town. In other words, Community Participation in the implementation of School Improvement Programs in secondary schools of Wolkite Town is the center of the interest of my study.

1.2 Statement of the problem

For attainment of high-quality education, the capacity of schools has to be developed. As ESDP IV, it is necessary to shift attention to quality concerns in general and to those inputs which

facilitate and processes which translate more directly into improved student learning and which help change the school into a genuine learning environment (such as: quality focused school supervision, internal school leadership, increased student participation, school-community partnerships). By strengthening the internal conditions of the schools, what Ethiopia so far has undertaken to provide quality education for attainment of high-quality education, the capacity of schools has to be developed. As ESDP IV, it is necessary to shift attention to quality concerns in general and to those inputs which facilitate and processes which translate more directly into improved student learning and which help change the school into a genuine learning environment. But the activities undertaken to improve the quality of education are not in a position to enable students to achieve high learning out comes with its dimensions.

Training policy promulgated in1994 the education management system was desaturated to the grass root level. the guidelines prepared by ministers of education in 1994 EC indicate, the duties and responsibility of KETB, PTSA and SIC to help theme actively participate in school activities and facilitate school community relationship (MOE,2010)

Improving school and students' success is not achievable unless government efforts are supported by community. Furthermore, the Ministry of Education (2005) notes that although community participation in the contribution of finance and educational materials is increasing from time to time, further effort is needed to improve school community relationship. In case of identifying research knowledge gap the researcher reviewed related works done by other researcher like Abera (2015), Dereje (2012) and Habtamu (2014) MA thesis paper found gaps in participating all stakeholders specially students which are main beneficiaries of SIP and those researchers work is sensitive to over generalization to large population cover wide area with less in depth investigation of issues understudy.

Finally, the researcher made preliminary investigation based on Wolkite town education officer port the situation identified researchable problem of low level of community participation of mentioned schools of yabrus secondary

1.3 Basic Research Question

1. What are the practices of community participation in teaching -learning in Yaborus secondary and preparatory schools of Wolkite Town?
2. What opportunities are available to leadership in SIP implementation in the district in terms of community Participations?
3. What major challenges affect community participation to create conducive school embodiment in the implementation of SIP in Yaberus secondary and preparatory schools of Wolkite Town?

1.4 Objective of the study

1.4.1 General objective

The main objective of this study was to assess the practices and challenges of community participation in the implementation of School improvement programs in yaberus secondary schools of Wolkite Town.

1.4.2 Specific objectives

The specific objectives of this study were:

- (1) describe the existing practices of community participation in the implementation of SIP in yaberus Secondary Schools of Wolkite Town;
- (2) Identify challenges that affect community participation in the implementation of SIP in Wolkite Town secondary schools;
- (3) Suggests measure to be taken for the challenges that hinder community participation in the implementation of SIP in Wolkite Town secondary schools.

1.5 Significance of the study

The study might help Wolkite town Education office, principals, PTSAs, KETBs and SICs members to filling in the knowledge gap related to developing strategies for improving community participation for SIP. The consumption of policy makers, at national or local levels and for PR actioners to correct their weakness suggest possible options for the improvement of community participation in the implementation of SIP in the yaberus secondary school of

Wolkite Town. Share experience about existing practice of community participation in the implementation of SIP in the government schools with other government schools of the Wolkite town education office if the TEO willingly accept it and support researcher in doing so. Provide further information for those who may conduct further study on this area. Provide valuable contribution to enhance community participation in SIP.

Finally, the copy of this study document is available at Wolkite Town Education Office.

1.6 Delimitation of the study

The study was designed to assess existing practices and challenges of community participation in the implementation of SIP in Government secondary school of Wolkite Town. This Town has four secondary schools, from these the researcher had been selected one secondary school namely, Yaburus secondary school in Wolkite town to investigating issues such as community participation practice and challenges in the implementation of SIP in Wolkite secondary schools. The study was delimited to one secondary school in Wolkite Town because of the researcher facing time, financial and transportations constraints. Due to this reason the researcher delimited within one secondary school. To make the case study manageable the researcher was focused on community participation alone from the SIP domains.

1.7 Definition of key terms

Definitions of key terms are given more of by the meanings they own in this study and some of them are operationalized.

School: - an institution for educating children

Improvement: - Is the action of providing better than previous situation.

Program: - Is a schedule or planned serious of events related to the activities in long term aim.

School Improvement Program (SIP);-It is an approach or a program that bringing change in a school by enhance quality of student learning and achievement. It is aim used to making school better place for learning and to enhance student out comes as well as school capacity to managing change. Abera (2015).

Communities; - can be defined the people who live in a particular area the characteristics that the members share, such as culture, language, tradition, law, geography, class, and race. Some communities are homogeneous while others are heterogeneous.

1.8 Organization of the study

This study has organized in to five chapters. The first chapter dealt with the problem and its approach. The second is concerned with the review of related literature while the third chapter provided the readers with the research designs and methodology of the

CHAPTER TWO

2 Review of Related Literature

This chapter presents an overview of the major concepts of school improvement program and community participation. It covers the concept, historical development, experiences and domains of SIP briefly as well as community participation concept, experiences, reasons for participation, problems associated with it, empowerment mechanism and stakeholder's responsibility. The purpose of the review was to identify what has been done by different scholars (identify the gap) in the case of community participation and in so doing appreciate the experiences, challenges and lessons that can be learned from the implementation of SIP in variety of contexts.

2.1 Concept of School Improvement

School improvement program means making schools better places for learning. This relies on changes at both school level and within classrooms, which in turn depends on schools being committed to fulfill the expectations of children and that of their parents. In other words, school improvement is a distinct approach to educational change that intends to enhance student learning and strengthen the school's capacity to manage change. It is a systematic process which usually aims at altering schools by spiraling the major domains of school improvement programs teaching and learning process, leadership and management, school environment and community participation in an attempt to improve the quality of education.

2.2 Historical development of School improvement

In the 1980s school improvement program was dominated by curriculum development and a belief that "good ideas were travel on their own" Earl (2003:11). Researchers at the time was suggested that schools were key unit of change and had identified a range of characteristics of effective schools (e.g., professional leadership, shared vision and goals, focus on student learning, parental involvement, and professional development). The focus in school improvement program will on helping individual schools change themselves.

Nevertheless, after a decade of school improvement activities the overall result was disappointing. Neither government policies nor initiatives within schools had produced widespread or sustainable change. Revisiting the RAND Change Agent Study of the 1970s,

McLaughlin (1990) in Earl (2003:11) states that, "the net return to the general investment was the adoption of many innovations, the successful implementation of a

2.3 Countries Experience in School Improvement Program Implementation

This part dealt with some experiences over the world which exercised SIP. Accordingly, an attempt has been made to assess of their research findings and literatures on the issue of SIP on the ground long history on the development of the program and experience. These countries will selected due to their acquired long exercising in SIP (United Kingdom), similarity with Ethiopia in decentralizing of SIP implementation at local level (Canada and South Africa).

2.3.1 Canada

In Canada the Manitoba school improvement program (MSIP) was under taken by charitable organization since 1991, and since emphasis on enhancing schools' capacity for development by involving staff, students and the community at large. It also gave due attention to teacher development and professional growth (Harries, 2000) in Habtamu (2014). Established initially with a very definite urban focus, the program has in recent years expanded to include some of the provinces rural and northern schools within its network.

Just as internal and external evaluation processes are a key element of each MSIP schools program; it has been as central part of the whole MSIP endeavor, each MSIP School is assessed on a common set of criteria, and projects have to be school based and teacher initiated should focused on the needs of the adolescent students; have to address fundamental issues of educational improvement and students learning for at risk students; have to the potential for long term impact on the school and should be designed or developed to incorporate a collaborative and participatory approach with in the school and include an appropriate evolution component (Earl and Lee.1998) in Habtamu (2014).

2.3.2 South Africa

Attempts to improve schools in South Africa had various forms. For instance, decentralization of educational activities and strengthening districts was among the strategy used to empower the local level actors and communities. Specifically, however, the national effort to improve South Africa's schooling system was started since 1994 with an initiative having two parallel moves: a

reform agenda led by government and a school improvement agenda, implemented by non-state agencies and funded by the private sector and civil society

(Chinsamy, 2002). This implies the possibility of mobilizing non-government actors in support of school improvement initiatives in their own in a systematic and packaged approach. Overall, documents show that several actors have attempted to improve South African schools by focusing on teachers 'subject knowledge and teaching skills, school management and governance as key component of change (Chinsamy,2002) again.

Evidently, one can also learn the substance of paying attention to teachers' and school governance related issues enhanced change.

2.3.3 United Kingdom

United Kingdom is one of the countries that have a long history by exercising school improvement program to enhance the provision of quality education. According to Hopkins

(1987:8), school improvement in the UK which provided a context for more detailed discussion of the four major themes that emanated from International SIP: namely school-based review for school improvement, the role of external support, the role of the head-teacher and internal change agents in school improvement and the development and implementation of school improvement policies by education authorities. Improvement of quality education for all (IQEA) is the result of international school improvement program which focuses on the improvement of teaching-learning by improving the main agents of the school. Supporting this idea Hopkins (2002:71) has discussed that IQEA project is fundamentally based up on central premises that without an equal focus on the development of capacity, or internal conditions of the school and classroom development, innovative work quickly becomes marginalized. This implies that development focusing to improve some area or partial improvement is not guarantee the school improvement; rather, the entire system needs the emphasis to be treated well to bring quality education and to realize school improvement in Chaltu (2015) .

2.4 Domains of School Improvement Program

School improvement domains are key areas of concern for improvement activities in which its main focus is enhancing students learning outcome. It serves as a frame of reference

coordinating activities, planning, monitoring and evaluation of school tasks. The domains of SIP vary from country to country based on their priorities. For instance, MOE (2006) and ACT (2009) in Dereje (2012) divided school domains into four categories.

According to ACT (2009) cited in Dereje (2012) the four domains of the school; includes; learning and teaching, leading and managing, conducive environment and community involvement. The domains represent the four key areas in which school improvement takes place. They describe the essential characteristics of an effective school the form a structure with which school can review question and analyze their systems and process ACT (2009).

2.4.1 The Teaching - Learning Process

The teaching learning domain deals with the context under which the curriculum is delivered.

This domain is mostly based on the decision made by teachers on what is to be taught, how it is to be taught plus how the progress of students evaluated. To this end, teachers are expected to possess advanced professional knowledge, the capacity to set expectations, to plan for success, and to assess learning outcomes by setting high standards for learning ACT (2009).

Overall, the teaching -learning process has become indispensable aspect of school improvement programs. In supporting this, in Chaltu (2015) cited wrote there should powerful learning and teaching which goes beyond setting targets for results that subsumes a range of cognitive and affective processes and outcomes, which lead the creation of students and teachers own capacity and confidence. Akin to the above, the teaching learning domain of the school improvement program of Ethiopia focuses on three major elements: teaching practice, learning and assessment plus curriculum. What is important is however, most of the school improvement initiatives advocate the teaching - learning domain as key real change because it focuses on students learning. Concerns like commitment to child learning are strategic and central. Often domain advert questions like how children learn and produce knowledge or focus on efforts to improve the quality of children learning experience Hopkins (2001).

2.4.2 . School Leadership

The leading and managing domain is considered with communicating a clear vision for a school and establishing effective management structures. Leaders set directions guide the school

community alignment of its purpose and practice. Effective leadership within the school is collegial, student-centered, and teachers focus on promoting a collective responsibility for improvement. Harris and Linda Lambert (2003) described the concept of leadership by explaining that leadership is an enacted variable that depends on interactions between leader, follower, and context.

2.4.3 Community Participation

Policy makers, educators, and others involved in education are seeking ways to utilize limited resources effectively in order to identify and solve problems in the education sector and to provide quality education for children. Their efforts have contributed to realizing the significance and benefits of community participation in education and have recognized community participation as one of the strategies to improve educational access and quality.

By developing deep and mutual relationships with people and organizations within their local communities, schools can gain not only information, knowledge, and support but also wisdom of moral purpose (World Bank, 1999).

It becomes abundantly clear that one of the keys for successful educational change is the step up of relationships. This implies that the conventional support-seeking practices accustomed by schools without demonstrating specific improvements in organization, functioning, and governance will take schools nowhere as real improvement requires genuine cooperation and meaningful participation of children, communities, teachers, and school directors. This means community participation should bring about inputs that will result in meaningful improvements in general and the learning of children in particular.

2.4.3.1 The Concept of Community Participation

For development of human resources, investment in education is essential to empower people with appropriate knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes, to enhance their quality of life, to improve their productivity, and to enable them to participate more fully in the development process. Communities can be defined by characteristics that the members share, such as culture, language, tradition, law, geography, class, and race. Some communities are homogeneous while others are heterogeneous; and some are united while others are conflictive (Shaeffer, 1992).

2.4.3.2 Community Participation in Education

Education takes place not only in schools but also within families, communities, and society.

Despite the various degrees of responsibilities taken by each group, none can be the sole agent to take 100 % responsibility for educating children. Communities and society must support parents and families in the upbringing, socializing, and educating of their children. Schools are institutions that can prepare children to contribute to the betterment of the society in which they operate, by equipping them with skills important in society. Schools cannot and should not operate as separate entities within society. Since each group plays a different role in contributing to children's education, there must be efforts to make a bridge between them in order to maximize the contributions. Many research studies have identified various ways of community participation in education, providing specific channels through which communities can be involved in children's education World Bank (1999) .

2.4.3.3 Existing Practices of Community Participation in SIP

From the practices of World Bank in the education sector, the Bank started making extensive efforts to learn about how participation could contribute to improving Bank's education projects. This started in late 1980s, around the time when participation started receiving attention in development field. The Bank has since been aiming to involve different stakeholders and is continuously working with various actors that play important roles in the education sector. According to the World Bank (1999) community.

2.5 Reasons for Community Participation in School Improvement Program

Education is a goal-oriented activity that requires the involvement of different stakeholders.

The community is among those whose contribution plays a significant role in preparing children to be competent in the changing world. Therefore, there must be active participation on the part of parents and community in the implementation of school improvement program.

2.5.1 Resource Mobilization

When government makes effort to expand access, and promoted the quality of education, its economy may not allow fulfilling both the quantity and quality demands without community participation. According to Townsend (1994) in Abera (2015), community participation in funding schools implies that the government and educational system in many parts of the world

are encouraging local communities to be more responsible for the SIP, both financially and in terms of the education program. An additional resource from the community is essential to SIP and to fulfill infrastructure, which enable the school to achieve its goals. In addition, expanding community finance may encourage participation to value education more highly, and greater parental involvement can promote the effectiveness of the school system.

Local communities and parents are increasingly playing a role in educational finance especially with regard to sharing the cost of buildings, maintenance and fulfilling for the success of SIP. In Ethiopian education system, to run SIP effectively, financial, material and human resources are very important. Therefore, the PTA or SIC members can play roles in generating resources. The committees can mobilize the community to contribute money, labor, and so on to build classrooms and schools. In agreement with this idea, the MOE

2.5.2 Parents/Community Participation in their Children's Education

The major objective of school improvement program is to improve student's achievement.

Therefore, parents and other community members are expected to participate in student's learning at school and at home. When parents and other community members involved in children's learning process, it is more likely that they succeed in school attending regularly earning higher grades, passing their class, graduating and going on to post-secondary education. When parents are involved in schools, children's education at home, they do better in school. In addition, when parents are involved in school, children go farther in school and the schools they go to are better (Henderson and Berla,1994) in Abera (2015).

2.6 Community Participation Empowerment in Implementation of SIP

As Anderson and Mundy (2014), the international literature on parent and community involvement in education at the school and the system level is structured around three broad themes: (1) parent and community participation in school governance and management; (2) parent involvement in teaching and learning; and (3) parent and community engagement at the system level (governance and accountability).

The World Bank and other international donors have promoted considerable investment in policies and structures to involve parents and community members as key stakeholders and

participants in School Based Management (SBM) structures associated with decentralization measures in developing world countries.

2.7 Stakeholder Responsibilities in Supporting Community Participation in SIP

Schools need participation of all stakeholders in school plan (strategic and annual plan), but most of the time school plan is prepared by school principals. Therefore, the school mission and vision are not visible to all stakeholders and the intended student's outcome and ethical centered activities are not achieved without participation of stakeholders MOE (2007).

School improvement is work that requires collaborative efforts of stakeholders, from plan preparation through implementation and evaluation.

CHAPTER THREE

3 Research Design and Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The objective of the study was assessed the existing practices and challenges of community participation of SIP. In this study the researcher had used descriptive study design and. Both qualitative and quantitative data are described and explained.

3.2 Research method

The aim of this study was to the investigation of community Participation SIP in yabrus secondary and preparatory school in Wolikte town. The researcher has used qualitative and quantitative data to collect information from representative sample to translate. Therefore, the researcher used mixed method. Qualitative data from interview of community members and PTA was used. And quantitative data gained from document, questionnaire which are collected numerically explained and described.

3.3 Source of Data

The data was collected from both primary and secondary source.

3.3.1 Primary Source of Data

The sources of primary data were school principal, teachers, parents, students and community representative's PTA, high school supervisors and education officer of the sample town.

3.3.2 Secondary Source of Data

The secondary sources of data were SIP related documents such as, SIP guidelines, SIP Framework, and Manuals from MOE (2006/2007) School Community participation plans, different records of SIC in community participations with their achievements and challenges, Journals, other Legal Documents and Books which found in the sample schools.

3.4 Population, Samples size and Sampling Techniques

3.4.1 Description of the study Area

Yaberus General secondary and preparatory school is the public (government) school. It was established in 1973 E.C. It is located in wolkite town at behind tele center. This school after establishment to later a few years (2 years). It was began in 1975 E.C to receipt grade 7 and

grade 11 students in the Rase These lassie school, during the time total number of students were small (i.e. the total number of male students was 145 and the total number of female students was 32, the total number of all students was 175 at that time). And also, the total numbers of teachers were small (i.e. the total numbers of male teachers were 12 and the total number of female teachers was 4, the total number of all teachers was 16).

The first principal of yaberus wolkite general secondary and preparatory school in 1973 E.C was Mr. Mergata Chiksa. He served for 7 years (1973-1980) at this school.

Through time, the school coming to increase in overall things(activities) (i.e. teaching learning process, increasing the total number of teachers and the total number of students, enhancing the quality of school and so on.)

Currently, in 2014 E.C there are many numbers of teachers and students. The total number of students are 3687(i.e male students are 1628 and

female students are 2059). And also, the total number of teachers are 156(i.e. male teachers are 100 and female teachers are 56). Now a days, Mr. Gezahign kebede served as the principal of this school.

The target populations of this study were teachers, students and principals in high school supervisors of purposely selected four secondary schools of Wolkite Town.

The population of this study consisted of all teachers, principals and students in Yaburus Secondary school of Wolkite town.

Regarding to teachers from total population of 156(100%) teachers, 46(45%) teachers, were selected as respondents through simple random sampling techniques. Because all respondents have equal chance to selected and also to obtain representative sample, from 3687 students,120students were selected by simple random sampling techniques, were selected by simple random Sampling techniques From 1(100%) principal, researcher had selected 1 principal from 1 and from 156 Teachers 46 were used to take based on purposive sampling technique from school because of the key informants were selected.

Table 1. population, Sample size and sampling techniques

| No | Respondents | Total population | Total sample | Percentage | Sample techniques | Data Collection Instruments |
|----|-------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|------------------------|---|
| 1 | Teachers | 156 | 31 | 24.5 | Simple random sampling | FGD |
| 2 | Principals | 1 | 1 | 100 | purposive sampling | Interview |
| 3 | Students | 3687 | 100 G.9=10,G.10=10,G.11=10,G.12=15 | 2.6 | Simple random Sampling | 3 FGD for 15 student 75 student for questionnaire |
| 4 | Community, | 350000 | 35 | .35 | Simple random sampling | Interview |
| 5 | PTA | 12 | 3 | 25 | Purposive sampling | Interview |

3.5 Instruments of Data Collection

The study employed both quantitative and qualitative data collection instruments. Both types of data were gathered by using appropriate data collecting tools in order to obtain information from respondents and school environment. Thus, questionnaires were the major data collecting tool used in this study. Interview, document analysis, and focused group discussion would be the

other data gathering tools employed enrichment & triangulation of the data obtained from questionnaires and provide in-depth information on the issue under investigation.

3.6 Questionnaire

The same questionnaire had been designed as both close ended and open-ended items, distributed to all samples of teachers, community representatives PTSA, KETB and SIC members.

The Questionnaires had been developed based on objective and purpose of the study using review of related literature. Most of the questionnaires were adopted from SIP guideline MOE (2010) as well as Abera (2015) MA thesis work questionnaires because of tested instruments are expected more effective than untested once. It was commented by the advisor, two postgraduate students and one language teacher for its relevance, completeness and clarity. It was translated into Amharic language by language teacher in the study area. The five points of rating scale was employed to obtain close ended data from respondents and Open-ended questionnaire were used to gather data from teachers & SIC members of sample schools.

3.6.1 Interview

Leedey and Ormrod (2005) describe that interview was a major tool in which a qualitative evaluator seeks to understand the perceptions, feeling and knowledge of people in program through in-depth, intensive interviewing. Semi structured questions will used to guide the interview in the study, because to manage the response relatively the researcher used semi structured questions. After explaining the purpose of the interview, for the interviewees (community, PTA and school principals) and getting their willingness, the researcher has conducted the interview. The interview questions constructed in English are later translated to Amharic language similar to the Questionnaire.

3.6.2 Document Analysis

The purpose of document analysis in this study was to assess the involvement of community in SIP during need assessment, planning, implementation, evaluation, fundraising, training etc. The secondary sources of data were SIP related documents such as, SIP guidelines, SIP frameworks, manuals, school community participation plans, different records of SIC in community participations with their achievements, challenges, Journals, other legal documents and books. The tool was used to validate and check the consistency of the primary source.

3.6.3 Focused group discussion

Focused group discussion was held with students to know their understanding as well as their feelings about SIP and community participation in implementing it. The issue of discussion was about the practices, problems and opportunities that existed but which the schools did not use when implementing the school improvement program. In order to conduct focused group discussion 14 teams of students which consist of 8-9 students were formed in respect to their schools and a one-hour discussion time was performed with researcher having the script which consists participants' ideas and their names.

3.7 Data Collecting Procedure

In order to collect data, first permission had been sought from the University. Then, permission has been also sought from the Wolkite Town Education Office for a voluntary, data collection from Yaburus secondary schools' educators in their administration and the same way had been followed to get permissions of principal for their respective schools.

The researcher and his one assistant data collector from each school distributed the questionnaires to 46 teachers. The questionnaire had been distributed after brief orientation about the purpose of the study and follow up had made. The questionnaires had been given to SIC members had been collected by the assistants after a week.

The study had been conducted in government school one secondary and preparatory schools found in Wolkite Town.

3.8 Method of Data Analysis and Interpretation

The purpose of this study has been to assess the existing practice of community participation in the implementation of SIP in Wolkite town Yaburus secondary schools. In order to achieve the objectives, data obtained from different sources through different data gathering instruments has been analysed based on the nature of the data. Therefore, both quantitative and qualitative data had been used and analyzed accordingly.

In this study data collected from respondents had tabulated and systematically organized using the methods of descriptive statistics (table) summarized by (mean and weighted means).

3.9 ethical consideration

To conduct any research the investigation is expect to be ethical. After the standard, moral and dignitaries of people under the study had been be venerated. And also, the researcher promised to the information which are collected from the respondent shall not be translated to third party in can does or it are not exploited for undertaking other than the purpose of the research study.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

4 INTRODUCTIONS

This chapter deals with data presentation, analysis and interpretation of data obtained from questionnaire, interview, and documents to answer the leading questions raised in chapter one. The present chapter has two major parts. The first part presents characteristics of the participants and the second part deals with the analysis and interpretation of the role of community participation in school improvement program in government secondary and preparatory schools of Wolkite town. It covers the existing practice and the opportunities available for community participation in the SIP implementation, the challenges encountered during the implementation process.

4.1. Characteristics of the Respondents.

Under this section the description of the characteristics of the respondents in terms of gender, age, level of educational qualification, specialization, work experience (service year) and responsibility in school they have been included. The following tables contains about the general characteristics of respondents involved in the study.

Table 2: General background of the respondents in terms of gender, age and educational level

| Levels | N | | % | | N | | % | | N | | % | | N | | % | | N | | % | |
|--------|----|------|----|-----|----|------|----|------|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|-----|------|---|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 35 | 79.5 | 18 | 100 | 13 | 92.8 | 10 | 71.4 | 4 | 100 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 100 | 76 | 63.3 | | | | |
| Female | 9 | 20.5 | -- | -- | 1 | 7.1 | 4 | 28.6 | - | | - | | - | | 44 | 36.7 | | | | |
| Total | 44 | 100 | 18 | 100 | 14 | 99.9 | 14 | 100 | 4 | 100 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 100 | 120 | 100 | | | | |
| 15-19 | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | 100 | 83.3 | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|-----|------|
| | 20-24 | 2 | 4.5 | 1 | 5.5 | 1 | 7.1 | 4 | 28.6 | - | | | | | | 20 | 16.7 |
| | 25-29 | 17 | 38.6 | 2 | 11.1 | 5 | 35.9 | 4 | 28.6 | - | | | | | | | |
| | 30-34 | 10 | 22.7 | 3 | 16.7 | 4 | 28.5 | 2 | 14.2 | 2 | 50 | | | | | | |
| | 35 & above | 15 | 34.1 | 12 | 66.7 | 4 | 28.5 | 4 | 28.6 | 2 | 50 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 100 | | |
| | Total | 44 | 99.9 | 18 | 100 | 14 | 100 | 14 | 100 | 4 | 100 | | 100 | 1 | 100 | | |
| | BSc/BA/ | 3 | 86. | 7 | 38. | 1 | 71. | 7 | 50 | 2 | 50 | | | 1 | 100 | | |
| | BED | 8 | 4 | | 9 | 0 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | MSc/MA | 6 | 13. | -- | | 1 | 7.1 | 2 | 14. | 2 | 50 | 1 | 100 | | | | |
| | /MED | | 6 | | | | | | 3 | | | | | | | | |
| | Diploma | -- | | 5 | 27. | 2 | 14. | 3 | 21. | - | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 8 | | 3 | | 4 | | | | | | | | |
| | Other | -- | | 6 | 33.3 | 1 | 7.1 | 2 | 14.3 | - | | | | | | 120 | 100 |
| | Total | 44 | 100 | 18 | 100 | 14 | 99.9 | | 100 | 4 | 100 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 100 | 120 | 100 |

Table -3 shows respondents' gender, age and educational level. Concerning gender 79.5% of the teachers, 100% ,100% of (principal, Supervisor, GEQIP), and 63.3% of students were males respectively. The rest 20.5% teachers, 28.6% SIC and 36.7% students were females. Analysis concerning gender show low participation of women in each category due to their less number in each category except students.

In case of respondents age majority of students (83.3%) found in age group 15-19 years. The other 16.7% students and 4.5% teachers were found with age group 20-24 years. The next age group 25-29 included 38.6% teachers, 11.1% KETB, 35.9% PTSA and 28.6% SIC. Furthermore 22.7% teacher and 50% principals grouped in age range of 30-34 years. Lastly, 34.1% teachers, 66.7% and 50% principal, 100% (supervisor, GEQIP expertise) found in age group 35 and above. From this one can conclude that majority of respondents (31.1% and 41.1%) other than students are found with age group 25-29 and 35 and above years. From this it is possible to conclude that majority of the respondents are matured enough to give valuable information for the study. With regard to educational level majority of respondents 86.4% teachers, 38.9%

KETB, 71.4% PTSA, 50% (SIC, Principals), 100% GEQIP expert were BA/BSc/BED degree holders. Furthermore 13.6% teacher and 50% Principals and 100% Supervisor were MA/MSC/ and students were included under other level which means secondary and primary level in this research context. Since the majority of respondent's educational level is on the desired stage it has potential efforts to contribute their knowledge about the issues under investigation.

Table: 3 Area of specialization, service year and additional responsibilities of Teachers, KETB, PTSA and SI

| Variables | Levels | Teachers (44) | |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|------|
| | | N | % |
| | Unit leader | 4 | 9.1 |
| | Department head | 5 | 11.4 |
| | Clubs | 14 | 31.8 |
| | Other | -- | |
| | Total | 26 | 59.1 |
| | Natural Science | 17 | 38.6 |
| | Social | 15 | 34.1 |
| | Language | 12 | 27.3 |
| | Other | -- | |
| | Total | 44 | 100 |
| | 1-5 | 13 | 29.5 |
| | 6-10 | 10 | 22.7 |
| | 11-15 | 13 | 29.5 |
| | 16-20 | 1 | 2.3 |
| | 21 and above | 7 | 15.9 |
| | Total | 44 | 99.9 |

Table: 4 shows responsibility, specialty, and service years of respondents. In case of teachers having responsibility other than teaching 9.1% were Unit leaders, 11.4% department head, 6.8% committee members and 31.8% were clubs' member. So those respondents may have additional contribution in answering open ended questions since they are working closely with school principals.

With regard to specialty (area of work) 38.6% teachers were categorized under natural science. Social Science included 34.1% teacher, 27.8% were specialized from language.

As indicated in the table 29.5% of teachers had work experiences 1-5 years, majority of teachers (52.2%) had work experiences 6-15 years including 6-10 and 11-15 years having 29.5% and 22.7% respectively. Lastly 16-20 years holds 18.2% experiences. The data implies that the majority of the participants would produce information from long year service. In case of Principals, Supervisor GEQIP expert the analysis was not included for the matter that the interview format didn't include those point, but the researcher believe that it is equally necessary for the study.

4.2. Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of Data

This part deals with the analysis and interpretation of data collected from different sources through questionnaire, interview, focus group discussion and document analysis. With specific reference to the analysis of the data gathered through questionnaire a five-scale extending from very low (1) to very high (5) with Likert scale, the results gained in the form of mean and weighted mean values were used to summarize the results. Moreover, WM was preferred in analysis, because it adequately represents the distribution of values than average or mean where the frequency of values is different. In case of interpretation, all the $WM \leq 1.5$ were taken as very low, $1.5 < WM \leq 2.5$ were treated as low, $2.5 < WM \leq 3.5$ were interpreted as medium, $3.5 < WM \leq 4.5$ values were high while the weighted mean values above 4.5 were interpreted as very high. As a whole $WM < 3$ below average and $WM > 3$ above average. Oneway ANOVA was used to examine the response of groups by comparing the amount of variation between groups and within groups if probability of finding error was to be estimated at 5% ($p < 0.05$). Respondents of the students in focused group discussion similarly indicated that either students themselves or their parents were not main participants in planning, implementation, and evaluating of SIP. PTSA also have less participation in SIP and community mobilization to school-based activities. One of the

members of focused group discussion in Yaburus secondary school said that: - *our parents were communicated by the school management bodies for financial contribution and were not participating in different activities of the school.*

Literature have shown that as there are different areas of community participation for SIP implementation. According to Epstein and Salinas (2004) parental involvement in SIP, family and community partnership has six forms including parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home decision making, and collaborating with the community.

Since the questionnaire were administered to four groups of respondents, it was obviously need to check as there was group variation or not. For this purpose, one-way descriptive statistics was carried out and summarized as follows in table with its explanation next to that.

| | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>Df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| <i>Between Groups</i> | 3.998 | 3 | 1.333 | 3.009 | .035 |
| <i>Within Groups</i> | 38.094 | 86 | .443 | | |
| <i>Total</i> | 42.092 | 89 | | | |

Averagely, the mean values of items under existing practice of community participation for teacher, KETB, PTSA, and SIC were 2.89, 2.48, 2.76 and 3.04 respectively ranging from low to high. This shows the dissatisfaction of respondents on the extent of community participation and the average of WM for all group in total was 2.83 below average point 3. Whether there is a significance difference among the four groups of respondents with regard to items under existing practices of community participation in implementation of SIP, the one-way analysis of variance was employed. The F ratio of 3.009 is significant because “ $p=.035$,” that is, $p(F)$ is smaller than $\alpha = 0.05$. This p -values, $p(F)$ tell us the means of the four groups were significantly different. This indicates as there are different views between respondents on each item.

Table 4: Opportunities available for SIP in community Participation

In table 7, (10) ten questions were designed to assess opportunity available for community participation. It was also contained responses of the four categories of respondents separately mean and WM in total of all participants of each question.

| No | Items | T | K | P | S | WM |
|----|--|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | N=44 | N=18 | N=14 | N=14 | |
| | | M | M | M | M | WM |
| 1 | Parents has PTSA, KETB, and SIC member actively participate in the school improvement management | 2.97 | 2.33 | 3.14 | 3.07 | 2.89 |
| 2 | Community commitment and responsibility towards SIP is increasing | 2.43 | 2.28 | 2.85 | 2.64 | 2.50 |
| 3 | Community involved in decision making on their children issues and SIP | 2.41 | 2.22 | 2.00 | 2.86 | 2.38 |
| 4 | Work burden of teachers and principals reduced by SIP | 3.64 | 2.11 | 3.36 | 2.93 | 3.18 |
| 5 | Community involved in decision making process about their children's education | 3.09 | 3.11 | 2.43 | 3.36 | 3.03 |
| 6 | The school develop a good trend develop to strategic plan and community mobilization for implementation of SIP | 2.79 | 2.39 | 2.86 | 3.21 | 2.79 |
| 7 | Community attitude towards recognition of education increased by SIP | 3.11 | 2.72 | 3.43 | 2.86 | 3.04 |
| 8 | Attractive and save school environment | 3.5 | 2.33 | 2.71 | 2.93 | 3.06 |
| 9 | Behavioral change of students due to participation of community in implementation of SIP | 2.84 | 2.72 | 1.86 | 3.21 | 2.72 |
| 10 | The school decrease dropout and repetition rate working with the community participation | 2.48 | 2.5 | 3.50 | 2.64 | 2.67 |
| | Average mean | 2.93 | 2.47 | 2.81 | 2.97 | 2.82 |

Key T= teacher, P=PTSA, K= KETB, S=SIC, N= number, WM =weighted mean & m=mean

Table-7 shows available ways (opportunities) for community participation in SIP implementation. Clearly results from the table shows item 2 and 3 rated as low. These includes increasing community participation and responsibility towards SIP, and community involved in decision making on their children's issues including SIP. The rest items 1,4,5,6,7,8,9 and 10 rated as medium with WM ranging from 2.67 – 3.18. Moreover, from the items in table-7 only item 4,5,7,8 with score value of (WM = 3.18, 3.03, 3.04 and 3.06) respectively were above an average weighted mean which is 3. Lastly there were no respondents rated under very low, high and very high. From this point of view, it is possible to say that there was no available ways (opportunities) proposed to participate community in SIP.

In addition to the information gathered through the questionnaire of (teachers, KETB, PTSA, and SIC) interview of (principal, supervisor and GEQI expertise) and focused group discussion of students were also conducted. In this regard, one principal from Yaburus preparator secondary school said: - *mostly it is the end of academic year schools inform parents strength and weakness as work reports and to some extent we try to reach community by structure from parents like PTSA and KETB.*

The other respondents like school supervisor and GEQI expertise have almost shared idea as they more emphasize on empowering principals of school by giving training rather than focuses to all stakeholder. In supporting these students in focused group discussion said that our family equipped us with school material and try to participate at the end of year on our success and further we didn't see when family come to school collectively for discussion or school activities. There should be structured and institutionalized ways to participate family and community at school level in programed and time bounded for selected school activities including SIP.

As Anderson and Mundy (2014), the international literature on parent and community involvement in education at the school and the system level is structured around three broad themes: (1) parent and community participation in school governance and management; (2) parent involvement in teaching and learning; and (3) parent and community engagement at the system level (governance and accountability).

In case of identifying whether there is a significance mean difference among the four groups of respondents with regard to opportunities available for community participation in implementation of SIP, the one-way analysis of variance was employed. Concerning this, the data clearly show that the opportunities available for community participation in SIP is below average. But F-ratio of 2.136 indicated that there is no statically significant difference through the group in relation to their outlooks on community participation due to $p= 0.102$, so that, $p(F)$ larger than $\alpha=0.05$ which revealed that as there was insignificant mean difference between the teachers, KETB, PTSA and SIC groups of respondents.

Table 5: Challenges that hindering the implementation of school improvement program in community participation

As it can be seen in table below 17 questions were administered to identify challenges of community participation based on the mean and WM result related to these questions and the interpretation follow it used to summarize the result.

| No | Items | T | K | P | S | WM |
|----|--|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | N=44 | N=18 | N=14 | N=14 | |
| | | M | M | M | M | WM |
| 1 | Degree of participation of community in SIP planning process | 2.36 | 2.39 | 2.07 | 1.86 | 2.24 |
| 2 | Level of community participation in implementation of SIP | 1.61 | 1.78 | 2.21 | 1.86 | 1.78 |
| 3 | Degree of community participation in monitoring and evaluation of SIP | 3.02 | 2.78 | 3.21 | 2.86 | 2.98 |
| 4 | Level of understanding on part of the community about the value of education | 3.00 | 2.39 | 3.21 | 3.07 | 2.92 |
| 5 | Participation in terms of different school meetings | 2.23 | 2.17 | 1.79 | 1.79 | 2.08 |
| 6 | Community interest to participate in SIP | 3.36 | 2.56 | 3.29 | 3.29 | 3.18 |
| 7 | Degree of community's lack of confidence in school activities | 3.41 | 2.94 | 2.36 | 3.07 | 3.10 |
| 8 | The extent of financial and material support from | 2.91 | 1.89 | 2.93 | 3.29 | 2.77 |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|------|------|------|------|------|
| | community | | | | | |
| 9 | Work burden on school principal to coordinate school and community-based activities properly | 3.29 | 3.00 | 3.21 | 2.86 | 3.16 |
| 10 | Participation in terms of parents support to enhance students' performance | 2.23 | 1.83 | 2.07 | 2.21 | 2.12 |
| 11 | Level of communication between parents and school | 2.82 | 2.78 | 2.14 | 2.93 | 2.72 |
| 12 | The extent of good governance in school | 2.86 | 2.33 | 3.50 | 2.57 | 2.81 |
| 13 | Participation of different school-based team (PTSA, KETB, SIC) to mobilize the community | 3.34 | 2.83 | 2.79 | 3.07 | 3.11 |
| 14 | Level of teachers' commitment to empower community (parents) | 3.66 | 2.83 | 2.29 | 2.57 | 3.11 |
| 15 | Effects of far distance between school and community residence on participation | 3.14 | 2.67 | 2.71 | 2.86 | 2.93 |
| 16 | The extent of improvements made by school directors and teachers in working with community | 2.56 | 2.06 | 1.71 | 1.64 | 2.20 |
| 17 | Level of giving training about SIP for community concerning their duties and responsibilities | 1.66 | 2.22 | 1.57 | 1.71 | 1.77 |
| | Average mean | 2.79 | 2.44 | 2.53 | 2.56 | 2.65 |

Key T= teacher, P=PTSA, K= KETB, S=SIC, N= number, WM =weighted mean & m=mean As it can be seen from Table – 9 item 2, and 17 rated (WM = 1.78, 1.77) respectively and the values showed almost the low-level ranges from the other. These includes the level of community participation in implementation of SIP as well as training given for community concerning their duties and responsibilities. This indicate as there are critical challenges hinder participation and lack of training also affect participation negatively. Beside to this, the low rated weighted mean value 2.24, 2.08, 2.12, and 2.20 of item 1, 5, 10, and 16 shows degree of community participation in SIP planning, attending school meeting, parents support to enhance students' academic performance and extent of improvement made by school directors and teachers in working with community.

All the other items, degree of community participation in monitoring and evaluation of SIP, material and financial support, communication between parents and school, active participation of different school-based team, including extent of good governance, teachers' commitment to empower community in school activities were rated medium with a WM score ranging from 2.72 to 3.18. Since no item rated under high and very high WM score by considering the average score 3 only below one third of items which include (6, 7, 9, 13, and 14) had scored weighted mean (WM = 3.18, 3.10, 3.16, 3.11, 3.11) greater than average point respectively. So, this indicate as there are obstacles to be resolved to increase community participation in SIP implementation.

Additionally, open ended questionnaire response of most respondent indicated wolkite town education office gap in supporting schools. For instance, one of the Yaburus sec. school teacher responded to open ended questionnaire wrote: -

“Wolkite city education office and GEQIP including school supervisor mostly emphasize on sending written material concerning SIP and prefers to communicate with school principal rather than deals with practical work which empower community participation in solving problems related to SIP activities”.

Similarly, the interview with principals, school supervisor, GEQIP expert and document analysis was found that support given from Wolkite town education office to school and participation of stakeholders (Teacher, KETB, PTSA, SIC) activities done in mobilizing community for SIP implementation and active participation from these group was inadequate.

A team of students' representatives in FGD also questioned Teacher, KETB, PTSA, SIC, school supervisor and GEQIP expert in participating community to SIP implementation. Even school principal has no clear outline strategies of community participation in SIP.

In supporting this, MOE (2007) stated “Schools needs participation of all stakeholder in school plan (strategic and annual plan), but most of the time school plan is prepared by school principals.” Therefore, the school mission and vision are not visible to all stakeholders and the intended student's outcome and ethical centered activities are not achieved without participation of stakeholder.

Overall, whether there is a significance opinion difference among the four groups of respondents on the extent of community participation in the implementation of school improvement program, the one-way analysis of variance was employed. The F ratio of 4.616 is significant because $p = 0.005$, that is, $p(F)$ is smaller than $\alpha = 0.05$. This $p(F)$ tells us that existence of significant mean difference between groups on items related to Challenges that hindering community participation in the implementation of SIP. Even though there is mean difference the mean values of the respondent's participation in resolving problems to achieve SIP are below average and it should be activated. It is based on the contribution of community participation that the MOE designed community school partnership as one of its strategies to be employed to improve schools and to quality of education MOE (2007).

CHAPTER FIVE

5. Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations

The chapter deals summary of the main points, conclusion drawn and recommendations suggested

5.1. Summary

Accordingly, the study was intended to answer the research guiding questions concerning community participation in the implementation of SIP in government secondary and preparatory schools the case study of Yaburus secondary and preparatory school in Wolkite town. Both quantitative and qualitative data analysis were used. The information gathered through interview, focused group discussion and document review were analyzed in narration under each category of questionnaires in Tables. They were organized to provide answers to the following question.

What are the practices of community participation in the implementation of SIP in Government secondary and preparatory schools of wolkite town?

What opportunities are available in SIP implemented in the district in terms of community Participations?

What major challenges affect community participation in the implementation of SIP in government secondary and preparatory schools of wolkite town.

To answer the above basic research questions questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, document reviews and focused group discussions were employed to gather data from selected samples, descriptive survey methods was used. To analyze data both descriptive statistics. Based on the above analysis made, the following were major findings of the study:

Existing practice of community participation

Concerning SIP problem identification, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation the level of community participation ranges from 2.38 to 3.09 weighted mean in which planning as well as monitoring and evaluation was low leveled score. Community participation in consultation with teachers, participation in different school meetings, financial and material supports for school accounts weighted mean values 2.72, 2.76, and 2.96 respectively which indicate medium level and below average.

In relation to community participation in contribution for the development of school polices and taking parts in school supervision committee has low value with weighted mean 2.48 and 2.33. Therefore, they are expected to participate for further success of SIP and student's achievements.

With regard to school activities in facilitating community participation towards SIP implementation: community-based structure work to mobilize community, regular school community meeting program, degree of school transparence to community and school plan to use community-based opportunities were medium level with WM 2.86, 2.82, 3.12 and 2.97 in their respective written order.

The level of giving training about SIP for community concerning their duties and responsibilities was very low with weighted mean value 1.77. This indicated that there are high challenges for community participation in SIP.

The weighted mean value of community participation in implementation of school improvement program was rated as very low with 1.78 score. Therefore, the status of community participation in implementing SIP was insignificant.

Community participation in terms of parents support to enhance student's performance and attending different school meetings to discuss SIP including school activities were low with weighted mean values 2.12 and 2.08. These mean values show the existence of high degree challenges.

The extent of improvements made by school directors as well as teachers in working with community was low scored weighted mean 2.20. The weighted mean values revealed that there is challenges for community participation in SIP.

5.2. Conclusion

Even though community participation is one of the domains of SIP, the study indicates community participation is not on the desired stage. This is because of some of the challenges related to community, school, and stakeholders. The school's administrators, PTSA, KETB & SIC members and educational officials have responsibilities to provide the community with complete and accurate information regarding school improvement goals, program, and community duties and responsibilities on SIP. Every stakeholder has responsibilities to know what the school does in relation to SIP, its problems and opportunities, to solve the problems. The school principals and teachers have the responsibilities to furnish parents and the whole community with clear and accurate information regarding the objective of education, school goals. It is found out that community contribution in SIP problem identification, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation was low. From this it is possible to conclude that community has no clear vision expected out comes from SIP due to their less participation in school activities. On the other hand, the schools lack proper discussion time with definite regular schedule of community and school, empowerment given for community through training their duties and responsibilities including the existing school status was insignificant.

Moreover, the stakeholders themselves teachers, KETB, PTSA, and SIC were not made to participate fully in SIP implementation and there was reluctance on their side also to take parts in mobilize and coordinate community towards the desired goals of SIP in generally and student's success particularly. This seemed resulted from the low consideration given to the importance of School improvement program.

5.3. Recommendation

Depending on the findings and the conclusion made, the following recommendations are forwarded. The city education Office in collaboration work with schools increase the awareness of community and parents including basic stakeholders (teachers, KETB, PTSA). It is better to

discuss SIP issues and give training before planning process as initiation point to retrieve pre-knowledge about SIP. They have to be informed on the overall goal desired to be achieved currently through community participation.

GEQIP expert and school supervisor advised to encourage school community by providing them with professional support related to SIP and school in developing different strategies to overcome challenges that might hinder community participation. They should help schools to share best practices. It is advisable that school Principals: -

Practice democratic participatory leadership style. Explain to community their roles and responsibility in SIP.

Prepare participatory calendar for all SIP activities and give for stakeholder. Involve community in decision making.

Evaluate the ongoing process of SIP and take corrective measures with all participants

Develop network with regular communication to reach community. Teachers and school-based structures (KETB, and PTSA) actively participate by themselves, mobilize and empower community in general parents in particular continuously. They should enable community to work with school in maximize student's achievement by implementing SIP accordingly.

REFERENCES

Abera Bereda (2015). Current practice of community participation in school improvement program the case of Gurage zone General secondary and preparatory schools. (Unpublished MA Thesis). Addis Ababa University.

Abiy Zegeye (2009). Research Methods: Preparatory module for Addis Ababa University graduate programs. Graduate Studies and Research Office.

Anderson, B.M. (1992). Education for All. What are we waiting for? New York: United Nation Children's fund program publications, U.S.A.

Anderson Stephen and Mundy Karen (2014). School Improvement in Developing Countries: Experiences and Lessons Learned. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto. Foundation AGA KAN Canada.

Ayalew shibeshi (1991). Approach to Educational organization and management. A.A.U unpublished.

Best, J. W. and Kahn, J. V. (1993), Research in Education' Seventh Edition, USA, Allyn and Bacon.

Best, J.W. And kahn, J.W. (2003). Research in Education. New Delhi: prentice hall PLC.

Chaltu Sani (2015). An assessment practices and challenges of school improvement program Implementation in selected secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone. (Unpublished MA Thesis). Addis Ababa University.

Chinsamy, B. (2002). "Successful School Improvement and the Educational District

Office in South Africa: Some Emerging Propositions". Extracted from <https://www.research gate net publication>.

Dekker M. (2010). The Malawian view on Community Participation in School Development: a qualitative program evaluation in the south of Malawi. (Unpublished MA Thesis).

Dereje Hofosha (2012). The Implementation and Challenges of School Improvement Program in Government Secondary Schools of Oromia Special Zone surrounding Finfine. (Unpublished MA Thesis). Addis Ababa University.

Earl (2003). "Manitoba School Improvement Program: Final Evaluation Report". Available at, [http://www Pace Work org](http://www.PaceWork.org).

EFA (2009). EFA global monitoring report: Overcoming inequality: why governance

Appendix A
Wolkite university

College of Education and Behavioral Science

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Questionnaire for secondary and preparatory school teachers

Dear respondent

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data on the role of community participation in yaburus secondary and preparatory school. Your co-operation in providing relevant data frankly and timely will be of a great help of the study. I would like to assure you that your response will be used only for the purpose of the study only. Therefore, you are kindly requested to respond to each of the items carefully.

Note that: - It is not necessary to write your name on the questionnaire paper.

Thank you in advance

Part one: - Personal Information

Write the required Information or encircle the letter of your response.

Name of School.....

Gender male female.....

Age....., years

Educational qualification

A. BA/BSC/BED B.MA/MED/MSC

C. If any other, please specify

Number of years of service

1-5 B. 6-10 C. 11-15 D. 16-20 E. Above 21

Areas of specialization

Natural science B. Social science. C. Language D. If any other -----

Your responsibility in the school in addition to teaching

I. Unit leader II. Department head III. Members of PTSA, KETB or SIC

IV. Club or committee members V. If you have any responsibility in the school at al

Part Two (2)

There are different indicators that can be used to indicated community involvement, opportunities available for participation and obstacles hinder participation in SIP. Please put an “X” mark in the boxes provided for each item.

[1 – Very low, 2 – Low, 3 – Medium, 4 – High, 5 – Very high]

The extent of participation of KETB, PTSA and SIC in the activities of SIP

| No | Items | Scales | | | | |
|----|--|--------|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | In case of problem identification for school-based need assessment of SIP | | | | | |
| 2 | Participation by implementation of SIP | | | | | |
| 3 | Parents have been providing both financial and material supports to the School | | | | | |
| 4 | Parents have started to express their opinions regarding their children’s Achievement and discipline | | | | | |
| 5 | Participation in creating conducive school environment | | | | | |
| 6 | The school has clear plan to make use of community-based opportunities | | | | | |
| 7 | Contribution of community-based school structure (PTSA, KETB, SIC) TO mobilize community to involve in school activities and SIP | | | | | |
| 8 | The school has been transparent to the local community in different | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | school meeting and media | | | | | |
| 9 | Participation of community of community in monitoring and evaluation of SIP | | | | | |
| 10 | Participation in decision making process of community in SIP | | | | | |
| 11 | The community has developed sense of ownership and belongingness | | | | | |
| 12 | Level of community participation to attain equity and access | | | | | |
| 13 | Community participation in contribution for the development of the school polices | | | | | |
| 14 | Participation in school supervision committee | | | | | |
| 15 | Consultation with teachers about their the progress and weakness of their children | | | | | |
| 16 | Duties and responsibility of community about SIP has been given | | | | | |
| 17 | Participation by planning of School improvement program | | | | | |
| 18 | The school has regular school community meeting program in SIP | | | | | |
| 19 | The extent of community participation in different school meetings | | | | | |

B) Opportunities available for SIP in community Participation

| No | Items | Scales | | | | |
|----|--|--------|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | Parents has PTSA, KETB, and SIC member actively participate in the school improvement management | | | | | |
| 2 | Community commitment and responsibility towards SIP is increasing | | | | | |
| 3 | Community involved in decision making on their children issues and SIP | | | | | |
| 4 | Work burden of teachers and principals reduced by SIP | | | | | |
| 5 | Community involved in decision making process about their children's education | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 6 | The school develop a good trend develop to strategic plan and community mobilization for implementation of SIP | | | | | |
| 7 | Community attitude towards recognition of education increased by SIP | | | | | |
| 8 | Attractive and save school environment | | | | | |
| 9 | Behavioral change of students due to participation of community in implementation of SIP | | | | | |
| 10 | The school decrease dropout and repetition rate working with the community participation | | | | | |

C) Challenges that hindering the implementation of school improvement in community participation

| No | Items | Scales | | | | |
|----|--|--------|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | Degree of participation of community in SIP planning process | | | | | |
| 2 | Lack of community participation in implementation of SIP | | | | | |
| 3 | Degree of community participation in monitoring and evaluation of SIP | | | | | |
| 4 | Misunderstanding on part of the community about the value of education | | | | | |
| 5 | Participation in terms of different school meetings | | | | | |
| 6 | Community interest to participate in SIP | | | | | |
| 7 | Due to community's lack of confidence in school activities | | | | | |
| 8 | Lack of financial and material support from community | | | | | |
| 9 | Work burden on school principal to coordinate school and community-based activities properly | | | | | |
| 10 | Participation in terms of parents support to enhance students' performance | | | | | |
| 11 | Level of communication between parents and school | | | | | |
| 12 | The extent of good governance in school | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 13 | Weakness of different school- based team (PTSA, KETB, SIC) to mobilize the community | | | | | |
| 14 | Level of teacher’s commitment to empower community (parents) | | | | | |
| 15 | Due to far distance between school and community residence | | | | | |
| 16 | The extent of improvements made by school directors and teachers in working with community | | | | | |
| 17 | Level of giving training about SIP for community concerning their duties and responsibilities | | | | | |

Appendix B

Wolkite university

College of Education and Behavioral Science Department of Educational planning and Managment

PTSA, KETB and SIC member’s questionnaire

Dear members of PTSA, KETB and SIC

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data on Yaburos secondary and preparatory school co-operation in providing relevant data frankly and timely will be of a great help of the study. I would like to assured that your response will be used only for the purpose of the study only. Therefore, you are kindly requested to respond to each of the items carefully and response fully.

Note that: - It is not necessary to write your name on the questionnaire paper.

Thank you

Part one: - Personal Information

Write the required Information or encircle the letter of your response.

Name of School _____

Sex

male _____ female _____

Age _____ years _____

Educational qualification

A. Certificate B. Diploma C.BA/BSC/BED

D. If any other, please specify _____

Your responsibility other than committee member if any _____

Part Two (2)

There are different indicators that can be used to indicated community involvement, opportunities available for participation and obstacles hinder participation in SIP. Please put an “X” mark in the boxes provided for each item.

[1 – Very low, 2 – Low, 3 – Medium, 4 – High, 5 – Very high]

A) The extent of participation of KETB, PTSA and SIC in the activities of SIP

| No | Items | Scales | | | | |
|----|--|--------|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | In case of problem identification for school-based need assessment of SIP | | | | | |
| 2 | Participation by implementation of SIP | | | | | |
| 3 | Parents have been providing both financial and material supports to the School | | | | | |
| 4 | Parents have started to express their opinions regarding their children’s Achievement and discipline | | | | | |
| 5 | Participation in creating conducive school environment | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 6 | The school has clear plan to make use of community-based opportunities | | | | | |
| 7 | Contribution of community-based school structure (PTSA, KETB, SIC) TO mobilize community to involve in school activities and SIP | | | | | |
| 8 | The school has been transparent to the local community in different school meeting and media | | | | | |
| 9 | Participation of community of community in monitoring and evaluation of SIP | | | | | |
| 10 | Participation in decision making process of community in SIP | | | | | |
| 11 | The community has developed sense of ownership and belongingness | | | | | |
| 12 | Level of community participation to attain equity and access | | | | | |
| 13 | Community participation in contribution for the development of the school polices | | | | | |
| 14 | Participation in school supervision committee | | | | | |
| 15 | Consultation with teachers about their the progress and weakness of their children | | | | | |
| 16 | Duties and responsibility of community about SIP has been given | | | | | |
| 17 | Participation by planning of School improvement program | | | | | |
| 18 | The school has regular school community meeting program in SIP | | | | | |
| 19 | The extent of community participation in different school meetings | | | | | |

B) Opportunities available for SIP in community Participation

| No | Items | Scales | | | | |
|----|--|--------|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | Parents has PTSA, KETB, and SIC member actively participate in the school improvement management | | | | | |
| 2 | Community commitment and responsibility towards SIP is increasing | | | | | |
| 3 | Community involved in decision making on their children issues and SIP | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 4 | Work burden of teachers and principals reduced by SIP | | | | | |
| 5 | Community involved in decision making process about their children's education | | | | | |
| 6 | The school develop a good trend develop to strategic plan and community mobilization for implementation of SIP | | | | | |
| 7 | Community attitude towards recognition of education increased by SIP | | | | | |
| 8 | Attractive and save school environment | | | | | |
| 9 | Behavioral change of students due to participation of community in implementation of SIP | | | | | |
| 10 | The school decrease dropout and repetition rate working with the community participation | | | | | |

C) Challenges that hindering the implementation of school improvement in community participation

| No | Items | Scales | | | | |
|----|--|--------|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | Degree of participation of community in SIP planning process | | | | | |
| 2 | Lack of community participation in implementation of SIP | | | | | |
| 3 | Degree of community participation in monitoring and evaluation of SIP | | | | | |
| 4 | Misunderstanding on part of the community about the value of education | | | | | |
| 5 | Participation in terms of different school meetings | | | | | |
| 6 | Community interest to participate in SIP | | | | | |
| 7 | Due to community's lack of confidence in school activities | | | | | |
| 8 | Lack of financial and material support from community | | | | | |
| 9 | Work burden on school principal to coordinate school and community-based activities properly | | | | | |
| 10 | Participation in terms of parents support to enhance students' | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | performance | | | | | |
| 11 | Level of communication between parents and school | | | | | |
| 12 | The extent of good governance in school | | | | | |
| 13 | Weakness of different school-based team (PTSA, KETB, SIC) to mobilize the community | | | | | |
| 14 | Level of teacher's commitment to empower community (parents) | | | | | |
| 15 | Due to far distance between school and community residence | | | | | |
| 16 | The extent of improvements made by school directors and teachers in working with community | | | | | |
| 17 | Level of giving training about SIP for community concerning their duties and responsibilities | | | | | |

Appendix C

Wolkite university college of education and behavior science

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Interview guide Question for Yaburus secondary and preparatory school principals

Dear respondent

The main objective of this interview is to collect data for the study on community participation in the implementation of SIP. So that, you are kindly requested to respond to the interview questions.

Thank You

What activities did the community carry out in SIP?

What preparations were made (in terms of community participation) to implement the SIP in your school?

Is there proposed means to participate community in different school activities?

How?

What opportunities are there to participate community in implementation of SIP?

What are the major challenges that hinder community participation in the implementation of SIP?
What is the solution?

How do you inform the success and difficulties of your school to the society?

How do you evaluate the support you get from the City level with regard to SIP?
Appendix5

Wolkite University College of Education

And Behavioral Science

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Focused Group Discussion Questions for Yaburus secondary and preparatory schools Students

Dear Students / Respondents,

I am a graduate student of School Leadership in education at Wolkite university

The main objective of this discussion is to collect data for the study on the assessment of School Improvement program implementation practices, challenges and opportunities in Yaburus secondary and preparatory schools. You are; therefore, kindly requested to provide necessary information on different issues related to the study. It is very important that you provide honest responses as frankly as possible.

Thank you in advance

FGD Guiding Questions for Students.

Do you know about the school improvement program?

Have you ever been given a chance to participate on training of SIP?

Did you participate in developing SIP plan, implementation and evaluation?

Did the community participate in your school activities including the implementation of SIP?

How did your family help you in your academic issues?

Did the School have regular program with parents/community to discuss educational success and SIP?

7.How often did PTSA and KETB mobilize community to involve in school activities and SIP?

Have you given tutorial support from your teachers sufficiently?