

***ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES***

***SCHOOL BASED FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO
DIFFERENCES IN STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT AT
HIGH AND LOW PASSING RATE SCORERS OF GOVERNMENT
SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF ADDIS ABABA
AT NATIONAL EXAMINATION***

**BY
GETAHUN WORKINEH**

**JUNE, 2002
ADDIS ABABA**

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES**

**SCHOOL BASED FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO
DIFFERENCES IN STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT BETWEEN
HIGH AND LOW PASSING RATE SCORERS OF GOVERNMENT
SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF ADDIS ABABA AT
NATIONAL EXAMINATION**

**BY
GETAHUN WORKINEH
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
APPROVED BY EXAMINING BOARD**

CHAIR PERSON, DEPARTMEN
GRADUATE COMMISSION

ADVISOR

EXAMINER

EXAMINER

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and for most, I would like to express my heart felt thanks to my thesis Advisor, Dr. Deerebessa Doffera who gave me valuable comments and suggestion, particularly when I was seriously in trouble to reshape the title, and draft the initial research instruments. I also would like to thank Dr. Temechegn Engida, who gave me critical comment to reshape my thesis topic at the last hour during proposal defense.

In addition to these intellectuals, I also would like to express my thanks to my immediate office boss, Ato Endale Shewangezaw who was co-operating me in arranging some time to work on my study during my office work genuinely, which otherwise, it would have been very difficult to materialize the study due to time constraints.

Lastly I would like to express my thanks to W/o Elsa Mekonnen and W/t Kokebe Taddese, who were not bored of typing and re-typing the report now and then as the study format was demanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	I
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	II
LIST OF TABLES	IV
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	VI
ABSTRACT.....	VII
 CHAPTER ONE	
1. Background of the Problem	1
1.1 Statement of the Problem	6
1.2 Objectives of the Study.....	7
1.3 Significance of the Study.....	8
1.4 Delimitation of the Study	9
1.5 Limitation of the Study.....	10
1.6 Operational Definition of the terms.....	10
 CHAPTER TWO	
2. Review of Literature	13
2.1 The need for Quality of Education.....	13
2.2 Studies on Quality of Education	15
2.3 Specific School Factors Contributing to Achievement Difference.....	19
2.3.1 School Material Inputs	24
2.3.2 Teaching Practices as Influencing Elements on Students Achievement.....	32
2.3.3 Teachers Quality as Influencing Elements on Students Academic Performance.	41
2.3.4 School Management and Structure as Influencing Element of Students Academic Performance.....	46
 CHAPTER THREE	
3. Methods and Procedure of the Study	49
3.1. Methods of the study	49

3.2. Population of the study	49
3.3. Subjects	50
3.4. Sampling Procedure	51
3.5. Data Collection Instruments	52
3.6. Research Variables	54
3.7 Data Collection Procedure	55
3.7.1 Tryout Instruments.....	55
3.7.2 Data Collection Periods	56

CHAPTER FOUR

4. Analysis and Interpretation of the Findings	57
4.1 Description about Sample Schools	57
4.2 School Characteristics	60
4.3 Characteristics of School Management Bodies.....	89
4.4 Student Characteristics and School Background.....	103
4.5 Teachers Characteristics and Teaching Practices	114

CHAPTER FIVE

5. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendation	134
5.1 Summary	135
5.2 Conclusion.....	143
5.3 Recommendation.....	147

Reference

LIST OF TABLES

		PAGE
1.	Population and sample size of the subjects	51
2.	Sample Number of Teachers and Students.....	52
3.	Distribution of Items on Questionnaires.....	53
4.	Distribution of Items for Interview	53
5.	Areas of Observation	54
6.	Physical Conditions of Sample Schools	60
7.	High and low passing rate scorer schools at E.S.L.C.E. and E.G.S.E.C.E.	63
8.	Principals Responses about School Status	63
9.	Zone Officials Responses about School Status in Zone	63
10.	Availability and Functionality of Some School Facilities and Equipment at Low Scorer Schools.....	64
11.	Availability and Functionality of some School Facilities and Equipment at high Scorer Schools.....	65
12.	Availability of Some School Facilities at low Scorer Schools....	66
13.	Functionality of some School Facilities at Low Scorer Schools....	66
14.	Availability of some School Facilities at High Scorer Schools.....	67
15.	Functionality of some School Facilities at High Scorer School....	67
16.	Some of Educational Materials Provision.....	70
17.	Status of Chalck-board and Class size	73
18.	Conditions of Class rooms Facilities	76
19.	Class size of both type of Schools (1990 - 1994).....	80
20.	General School Facility	81
21.	Sources of School Finance.....	83
22.	Number of Text-books Provision Ratio for 1:1 and 1:2 by Subjects.	84
23.	Number of Text-books Provision Ratio for 1:3 and above	85
24.	Books Distribution Ratio of Both Type of Schools (1990-1994)..	86
25.	Principals Responses about some School Facilities.....	87
26.	Distribution of Text-books and Library Borrowing System.....	88
27.	Background of both type of School Principals and School Conditions	90
28.	Principals Response about Problems Affecting their Managerial	

Functions.....	92
29. Principals Responsiveness to Teachers' Requests.....	96
30. Students Response about Cooperativeness of the School Administrators	98
31. School Principals Involvement in Academic Affairs.....	99
32. Principals Response about School Practice and their Duties.....	102
33. Feeder Schools of Both type of Schools.....	104
34. Students Characteristics of Sample Schools	106
35. Students' Response about Class Participation on Subjects Often they feel Difficult.....	107
36. Students Behaviors Observed in the Class.....	109
37. Teachers' Responses Regarding Students Related Behaviors.....	111
38. Characteristics of the Teaching Forces.....	115
39. Teachers Responses about Upgrading Training and other School Services.....	118
40. The use of Laboratories and Teaching aids by Teachers'.....	119
41. Teachers' Response Regarding Teaching Aids.....	120
42. Students' Responses about Teachers' Classroom Activities.....	121
43. Methods of Teaching in the Class.....	124
44. Background of the Department Heads.....	125
45. Department Heads Responses about Teachers Teaching Performance.....	126
46. Teachers' Teaching Behaviors in the Classrooms.....	129
47. Zones Educational Program Heads Responses on School Achievement	132

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Title
1.	Students' questionnaire
2.	Teachers questionnaire
3.	Head teachers' questionnaire
4.	Principals structured interview
5.	Observation schedule
6.	Zone education officials interview

ABSTRACT

Various Factors have been thought of as determinates or influential elements that affect students' academic achievement in the schools. These many factors may be into two large categories; i.e. socio-economic factors and school based factors. Although educators consider both factors as equally responsible for students' academic achievement, some writers consider economic factors as broad factors that influence students academic achievement in developed countries, while school based factors considered as broad factors that influence students academic achievement in developing countries.

According to the result of the study conducted in 22 developing countries and reported to world bank for discussion, school based factors were highly recognized as influencing factors in determining students academic achievement in developing countries. On the other hand, the socio-economic factors were stated as influencing factors in determining students academic achievement in developed countries. Fuller (1998).

Based on these empirical studies, the researcher of this paper tried to investigate whether these school factors are liable for the current academic achievement differences observed in government secondary schools of Addis Ababa. To make the study more concrete two types of schools, i.e. high and low scorer are identified based on their four years E.S.L.C.E results and one year E.G.S.E.C.E result.

Four major areas of school factors, i.e, school conditions and its facilities, characteristics of school management and its efficiency; teachers characteristics and teaching practices and students background and their characteristics have been investigated and analyzed by different research instruments as much as possible.

The high scorer schools, found at better condition in many school based factors as compared to the low scorer schools. On the other hand, some school factors become the same between the two schools and could not become the factors for students' achievement differences.

Since this study compares status of school factors between the two type of schools (high and low scorer), it is possible to say that a comparative study has been applied in tackling this study.

Although much of the analysis has been based on personal observation and interviews from various subjects and hence becomes qualitative in nature, no less part is given to make the study quantitative too, particularly in analyzing various questionnaires distributed to subjects.

Teachers, students, school principals and educational officials have been the subjects of this study. Questionnaires, structured and unstructured interview, and observation have been employed as research instruments.

According to the findings obtained both schools have been found different in some aspects such as teachers' qualification, experiences, efficiency of school principals and provision of teaching materials and school facilities in general. Although much is not investigated the academic background of students enrolled to each type of the school under study is different. Both types of schools' students are also found different in terms of their interest and academic discipline they exhibit in the schools.

Since the high scorer schools have been found at better condition in terms of the above finding differences, a number of recommendations as to how to enrich the school facilities, how to overcome financial problems at the low scorer schools have, how and when to distribute teaching materials in the school and how to initiate students' moral for academic performance and likes have been forwarded at the last chapter.

CHAPTER ONE

1. Background of the problem

Since formal education is a purposeful and deliberative human action towards the acquisition of knowledge, skill and attitude through setting goals or objectives, it has to be evaluated periodically. Although what to evaluate and how to evaluate differs from one form of evaluation model to others moderately, evaluation of specific educational outcome is necessary to compare the behavior observed with intended instructional objectives. Even if the outcome (out put) of educational activity is measured in many ways using different means, tests or examinations, be formative or summative; classroom or standardized; formal or informal; achievement or diagnostic are one of the various instruments meanses of evaluating instructional objectives.

Achievement tests as one of the instruments used to select, place or certify students at the end of any academic period are often determined by many factors. Erick Hanushek (1979) cited in Nebiyu (2000: 238), educational output (all desirable changes in students behavior) is a function of student innate ability, characteristics of the student, family background, school inputs including teachers and characteristics of the peer group. Though the above variables are considered as factors affecting educational outcomes that can be, and cannot be measured in tests forms, John Carroll (1963, 1989) as cited in Nebiyu (2000: 241), there are five constraints or classes of variables that would account for variation in school achievement. These variables are: Aptitude, perseverance, ability, opportunity to learn and quality of instruction. To this model, aptitude refers to the amount of time used to master under optimal condition and student motivation; while perseverance refers to the time students willingly and actively engaged in learning. It is observable from this model that if students are well motivated and engaged

more time in learning, success in achievement would occur, otherwise the opposite may happen. Moreover, according to a short review in Ethiopian Journal of Education (1969: V-3: 52), a vigorous and flourishing educational system is, one where the following five component units are healthy and, where there is an effective and lively communication among the components. Hence, the components are: Students, teachers, facilities, curriculum (Syllabuses) and administrators. The reviews further stated that the opposite would occur even if one of the five components is diseased.

According to Lewis as cited by Stephen (1986), facilities, equipment, materials, manpower, curriculum and financial inputs required for running educational activities, the process of implementation of school curriculum such as the role of teachers and school headmaster, the involvement of pupils and community in the process of education, the time spent in the class, and techniques of material utilization are significant school-based factors or variables that determine student achievement.

According to the National Learner Baseline Assessment study findings of Namibia, (1992: 61) the following four major areas affecting students achievements are identified. These are: Community contexts, individual learner characteristics and family background, and school qualities. The finding further stated the school quality as: Teacher qualities, classroom and instructional materials and facilities and school level organization.

Once the child enters school, the quality of school may influence his/her level of literacy and academic skills. The quality of school refers to the character of the instructional process experienced by each student and the school's efficacy in developing cognitive proficiencies. Although the level of material inputs in school determines the quality of school, Fuller (1986: 14-15) further stated three additional non-material inputs that contribute to school quality.

1. Teacher quality. This includes schooling, social background, verbal proficiency, and motivation of teachers.
2. Teacher behavior in classroom. The efficient use of instructional time, the level of performance standards and expectations set for students, the extent to which teachers evaluate students' performance, teachers ability to motivate students to learn also are important inputs.
3. Organization of the school. This includes the headmaster management capability, feeling of camaraderie among teachers, norms of achievement set by headmaster and school's legitimacy in the community.

Although the school-factors considered as vital ones, the author further stated that the social background of the pupils and the socio-economic aspect of the society have significant influence upon pupils achievement.

Though, student behavioral changes cannot be stated and measured by a single yard stick, the performance of students on test score can show students academic achievement in schools. The National Learner Baseline Assessment of Namibia, (1992: 62) used pass/fail rates, assessed achievement in english and maths for grade 7, and pupil enrollment and persistence rates (time in school) as learners performance indicators (outcome).

The same is true that E.S.L.C.E. results of four consecutive years and grade ten National Examination (EGSECE) results of the 1993 E.C. have been assessed and used as the selection criterion of the schools to demonstrate the existence of differences in achievement among government secondary schools of Addis Ababa.

E.S.L.C.E, as the long established national examination has been given at the end of secondary schools in Ethiopia for certifying students as completion of the level since the beginning of 1940's. Currently this examination is given at 25 government secondary schools of Addis Ababa, and serves as the selection purpose to higher education beside to its certifying purpose.

Considering the average point, i.e., GPA of 2.00 as a minimum passing point (including Maths and English), some schools of Addis Ababa achieved high percentage of students who scored a GPA of grater than 2.00, while others achieved low percentage as compared to each other.

In addition to E.S.L.C.E result, differences in achievement has been observed at grade 10 National Examination which began to be given in 1993 E.C. for the first time. Holding other factors constant, school factors are highly assumed to be the major factors, which have brought differences in passing score at National exams among government schools of Addis Ababa. To show this assumption, 6 schools i.e. 3 high scores and 3 less scores have been selected and the following conditions have been revealed.

The three high score; Bole, Yekatit and Wondirad got 53%, 44.2%, and 35.4% passing score ($GPA \geq 2.00$) respectively in 1991 E.S.L.C.E. On the other hand, the three less scores, i.e., Higher 7, Higher 12, and Kolfe Secondary Schools got 18.3%, 28.6% and 22.5% passing score ($GPA \geq 2.00$) respectively in the year 1991 E.C. The total average passing score in terms of percent for all the 25 schools was 33.3% during the year.

This situation farther repeated, and hence the above three high scores schools got 49.8% 38.5% , and 45.9% passing score ($GPA \geq 2.00$) respectively in 1992 E.C.

The 1993 E.C., E.S.L.C.E. was also demonstrated the same situation. The high score schools got 50.1%, 43.4%, and 48.3% average passing percent ($GPA \geq 2.00$) respectively while the less score schools got 28.2%, 24.7% and 18.9% average passing percent respectively. The average passing percent of all the 25 government schools of Addis Ababa in the year was 37.9%.

Likewise, the above 3 high score achiever schools have registered 36.5%, 38.9% and 33.3% passing rate at grade ten National Examination (E.G.S.E.C.E); while the average passing rate of all schools which have given grade ten National Examination is 28.5%. On the other hand, schools which have been registering low score at E.S.L.C.E. have also registered low score in grade 10 National Examination. The three less scores schools taken above have scored 21.1%, 27.9%, and 17.6% ($GPA \geq 2.00$) respectively at grade ten National Examination too.

As the above schools data indicate, differences among government schools of Addis Ababa is observable. Even though, factors which could bring such differences at schools are thought to be many which include the socio-economic status of the pupils and others, this study focuses on school-based factors which are assumed to be the major contributors of the differences. Therefore, as initial attributions personal contact was made with some of the above schools personnel and the following school based factors were pointed as the reason for school differences. The initial points forwarded were: Input problem: Such as lack of facility, shortage of qualified and inadequate experiences of teachers, large class size, poor class condition, and lack of financial condition; and problem of teaching-learning process: Such as lack of interest from student side to learn, lack of interest in teaching, poor school administration, problem of instruction, poor preparation for tests, less teaching and learning efforts, and absenteeism problems (teachers, directors and students).

Whether such school-based factors are the major difference and hence become the major reasons in deserving differences in passing rate between the low and high scorer schools of Addis Ababa, a thorough research study conducted and data are collected and analyzed on chapter four and the would be recommendation is given on chapter five.

1.1 Statement of the problem

Holding other non-school factors constant, it is assumed that school-based factors determine the achievement of students. These school-based factors could be many. But it has been repeatedly heard that people have been blaming for curriculum only for undesirable achievement in schools. “Curriculum are often accused of being the cause of bad achievements. Causation is however, usually multi-faceted, and poor teacher knowledge is clearly a problem in some countries as to why the curriculum is failing.” Fuller (1986:19).

Although people accuse curricula as the major factor of bad achievement, the writer mentioned some factors, which have strong influence determining students achievement. Fuller (1986:24) stated the following essential points regarding some factors bringing differences in students' achievement.

Where there is a shortage of books and materials, achievement is lower. Providing one book per child (and ensuring that the books reach the schools and are used by teachers and pupils) increases achievement and retention rate.

The author highly focused on school materials in determining students achievement. For instance, he pointed that Philippines primary school students achievement increased from 50% to 70% as the result of increasing pupil text book ratio from 10:1 to 2:1. The availability of books in school library and the

frequency pupil borrowed books and read affect students achievement in schools as the above author's view.

The writer of this paper also thought that it is such school-based factors which bring differences in students achievement among schools. Hence, specific school-based factors such as facility problem, problem in teaching learning process, and some other problems of school conditions are investigated to find out whether there are differences among these high and low passing rate scorers of government schools of Addis Ababa. Therefore, this paper tried to find out answers for the following basic questions.

1. How are the status of inputs (physical, facilities, equipment, instructional materials, class size and income) which are thought to bring differences in students' achievement at high and low passing rate score schools at National exams?
2. How are the qualification and experiences of teachers in high and low passing rate scorer schools to bring difference in students' achievement?
3. How are the instructional processes undergoing in both types of schools which result in difference in students achievement?
4. How do we see the efficiency and co-operativeness of school management in both type of schools which result in difference in students achievement?
5. At what status both types of school students found at their interest to attend their lesson?

1.2 Objectives of the study

The major objectives of this study are: -

- 1) To find out whether school-based factors are the major problems that have been exhibiting differences in achievement among schools, and

hence indicate factors that require serious attention to alleviate the problem.

- 2) To indicate the good experiences of the schools that constantly show high achievement through utilizing school-factors, so that low achiever schools could learn from them.
- 3) To indicate the reality why some schools' students could perform better at their achievement than others.

1.3 Significance of the study

Achievement differences among schools owned by government have been observed for a long period of time. Parents, students even teachers and school administrators have been heard while they rank some government schools good at their students academic performance and rank some as poor. Hence, this study would investigate some school based factors in both type of schools and state the differences between these schools. In doing this, the researcher believes in that the study would have the following importance.

- 1) It provides information for concerned bodies, particularly for Regional and Zonal education officials to strictly follow the problems of those schools which are often exhibited less achievement as compared to each other.
- 2) It initiates teachers and school principals of low passing rate scorer schools to investigate their school problems and take remedial actions on their work.
- 3) It helps as literature to those who aspire to make further investigation in the area of related dimensions, such as, studies to be conducted on

non-school based factors like socio-economic status as factors contributing to differences in achievement, etc.

1.4 Delimitation of the study

Performance on academic achievement can be determined on many factors. These factors can generally be stated as Socio-Economic based factors and School-based factors. Since the Socio-Economic based factors are assumed to be alike for all government secondary schools of Addis Ababa and at the same time for high and low passing rate scorer schools, the study did not include such factors. In addition for the similarities of socio-economic based factors that the writer expects for all government schools, these factors will again require a thorough research study which cannot be handled by this paper due to manageability problem. Hence, the study concerned with school-based factors only.

In addition to the school-based factors, this study focused only on some selected (high and low achiever) government secondary schools in Addis Ababa. Although National Examination are give for non-government secondary school in Addis Ababa, these schools are purposely avoided from the study. Because, they often take bright students at the beginning of each level. For instance, they give entrance exams and select high scorers in grade 8 National Examinations to grade 9. Hence, they cannot be equivalent as of the government schools to include them in the selection process.

Lastly, National Examinations were including three different grade levels up to 1993 E.C., that is grade 8, 10 and 12. Since many secondary schools of A.A. have no junior secondary schools they administer in their compounds, the result of grade 8 is not taken as selection bases of high and low achiever schools. Hence, E.S.L.C.E result and grade 10 (E.G.S.E.C.E) result which began to be given 1993 E.C are only used for selection purpose. To clearly indicate the existence of

achievement differences among these schools, E.S.L.C.E results of four years i.e., 1990-1993 E.C have also been taken and indicated in appendix section of the report. The accessibility of the four years data at the current National organization for Examinations office and the consistence of the above schools as high and low passing rate scorers for all the four years could have forced the write of this paper to select the above four years.

1.5 Limitation of the study

Since some school based factors which are thought to be the causes for achievement differences among schools are best if studied longitudinally, the researcher does not fully claim that the study has no limitation as long as it is based on current school situations (factors) rather than on longitudinal study.

The other limitation is, the problem of controlling students background who join in these schools. Some students who get information about the success of high achieving schools could come from private and well-facilitated school irrespective of their legal/official assignment by education office. Since controlling this variable became difficult and impracticable, this study has minor limitation in this issue; hence it considered that all schools entry academic background is the same, as long as all students assigned to high and low passing rate scorer schools come from government and public feeding schools having equal status officially or legally by education office.

1.6 Operational definition of the terms

- **High achiever school** - According to the National Organization of examinations, students who score a GPA of 2.00 (including Maths & English) is said to be passed (NOE). Therefore, this paper considers the relative percentage of students who have scored a GPA of 2.00 and above in

terms of the total number of examinees took exam in the given year at the particular school. Comparing the percentage result, the school becomes "high achiever" if its percentage is higher than that of others.

- **Low achiever school** - As opposed to the high achiever, school which registered high percentage of students with a GPA of less than 2.00 compared to others is called low achiever school.

- **Qualified teacher** - According MOE (19...),

A teacher who teaches at higher secondary sections, i.e., grade 9-12 must have the first degree in his/her subject.

- **Interest** - To make somebody want to do, buy, eat etc., something (Hornby; 1995: 662). But this paper defines "teacher-interest" as being punctual to classes, preparing lesson plan and motivating the learners. At the same time, the paper considers student interest in terms of performing assignments, class works, home work given by teachers consistently and attend class without being absent above the maximum limit of school regulation.

- **Well - organized library** - Library that is facilitated to make study by learners, for instance (adequate space, books, seats and conducive environment such as free from noises) etc.

- **Well - equipped Laboratories** - Laboratories that are facilitated to make reasonable experiments suggested on the curriculum guides. (Text books and syllabuses).

- **E.G.S.E.C.E.** National examination given by National Organization for examinations to certify the completion of grade ten education since 1993 E.C has now named Ethiopian General Secondary Education Certificate Examination.

- **E.S.L.C.E.** National Examination given by National Organization for examinations to certify the completion of grade 12 is known as Ethiopian School Leaving Certificate Examination.

CHAPTER II

2. Review of Literature

2.1. The need for the quality of Education

Regardless of economic, social and political development of a given country, the need to have the quality of Education becomes the concern of all countries in the world. Education services to all the people of a given country in improving the standard of the life in a general term. As the quality of Education increases, the productivity of the people increases and more material wealth is produced which in turn enhances the other sphere of development. According to Nebeyu (2000:45)

Both society and individuals benefit from education through increased productivity, improvement of quality of life and increased standard of living.

As the above quotation indicates, as the output produced by individual is increased as the result of quality of education, the society's living standard is improved. Therefore, according to the author's view, the quality and better education one has and the higher earnings he/she has as member of a given society indicates the society's economic development.

Besides to the contribution for economic development of the nation, quality education develops strong and acceptable culture of the society and discourages unacceptable and harmful culture. As the new education training police of Ethiopia indicates (1994:1)

Education enables people to identify harmful traditions and replace them by useful ones. It helps people to improve, change as well as develop and conserve environment for the purpose of an all-rounded development by diffusing science and Technology into the society.

The bad culture which has been hendering people from development could only be improved by providing quality education to the people. People may not identify the good and bad, and hence continue to live with all sorts of culture as they become important and useful, but if quality education is provided, people face little problem to identify the good and bad of the culture, and hence could discard the harmful which affects societal development.

Environmental protection and diffusion of science and Technology can only be enhanced through the provision of quality education. The New Education and Training policy of Ethiopia (1994:6) strengthened this issue by indicating the objectives of the Education in the following way:

... bringing up citizens endowed with human outlook, country side responsibility and democratic values having developed the necessary productive, creative and appreciative capacity to participate fruitfully in development and utilization of resources and the environment at large.

The above quotation tells us that 'education' here refers quality education should make each individual responsible, for the society and should make him/her to produce and creat his/her part in the process of production. The next big question that must be raised wound be how the quality of education is interpreted. As Hcyneman and White (1986:7) stated:

Educational qualities has many dimensions. In the poorest countries or qualitative changes may simply mean more resources. As more resources become available, the types of goods and services available in the school must be considered: the basic abilities, Education, professional training, and in-service programs, for teachers; availability of text-books, availability of other support materials, physical plant and so on.

As the above quotation indicates, abounded resources found in the school will not bring quality in education. Beside to fulfilling resources, people who are realizing and using these resources must be trained. The appropriate physical plants and teaching materials have to be provided. In addition to this point, Heyneman and White (1986:7) in short stated that further pointed that as “school quality is a function of how students and others spend their time, both in and out of school”. The method how students and those who do have attachment with school use their time, i.e., whether they use for good deed or not determines the school quality. The above authors further stated that the availability of other learning modes at home, in the media and the commonly determines the school quality importance.

2.2. Studies on quality of Education

The quality of Education is often claimed by many countries, regardless of their economic and social development. As education is the key element for societal and individual development, every nation whether its poor or reach requires the quality of education that much its existing level of development.

Change agents who are in line of operation (teachers) must get training. The number of text-books must increase beside to their qualities. Buildings and Equipment that facilitate learning must also improved or changed. Hence, quality of education means a comprehensive change rather than a specific change.

Erkiyhun (2000:9) stated by citing Chantavarich (1990), the quality of education defined as tantamount to more passed students, will be equipped with facilities, low teacher student ratio and long service of school personnel. The author would like to mention here that inputs and output improvement are the essential determinates of quality of education.

Fuller (1986), on the discussion paper report presented to the world bank, related the quality of education in terms of material inputs allocated to schools per pupil (resource concentration), efficiency with which a fixed amount of material inputs are organized to raise the students achievements. This writer wanted to stress quality of education to in puts required to run school, and process which deals with efficient input organization.

Many studies on the other hand relates quality of education in terms of quality of schooling, but these studies divided into two in terms of defining quality schooling. Those that relate as school improvement hence give more emphasis to process variables and how to combine inputs to realize effective schooling; and those that relate school quality as effectiveness in schooling which in turn measured quantitatively from large scale studies.

Generally, at whatever ways school quality is defined, the central concept of school quality is to give quality of education in school which could boost students achievement. Hence, as Erkiyhun (2000:11) indicated by citing Craig (1995).

The central role individual school plays in raising students achievements is often overlooked. Teachers training, supervisory supports and facilities are all important and often the focus of national policy initiatives. However, there are other school-level factors many of which are process related, like effective leadership, school flexibility and autonomy, school climate, and the teaching-learning process which also have a significant influence on student learning.

It is possible to conclude from the above that availability of resources does not insure the existence of quality school which could boost student achievement, rather the interaction and school climate, largely which we call process, is essential and vital part.

Although many research studies confirm as socio-economic (family) background and school-factors interplay in determining the academic achievement of a learner, different research studies have different stand on stressing which of the above two general categories play significant role in determining academic achievement of a learner.

As Cloleman (1966:325) indicated by citing Chinapah (1983), school factors bring little or no effect after family background variables considered for academic achievement of students.

On the other hand Fuller (1986) has stated the emphasis of the researchers on solely studying the family background factors as determining factor, so that they could have been confirmed what Coleman and other concluded, where as the school factors have caught little attention to be studied, but to Fuller these factors particularly material factors have significant influence on students achievement beside to family ground. As Erkiyhun (2000) indicated by citing Reynolds and others (1994:20), 12-18% of variance in studnets outcomes could be attained by classroom and school factors.

Therefore, as reviewed by Reynolds (1994), many school effectiveness research have been taken by U.S.A. Britain, Canada, Hongkong, and Norway. The school effectiveness research conducted in Canada, for instance, in three major areas, i.e., on school climate, effective leadership and teacher effectiveness; where as, the

Hong Kong's research focused on styles of principals leadership and organizational climate. This Hong Kong's research ended with the conclusion that school organizational factors play significant role in determining students achievement.

Although the United Kingdom school effectiveness and improvement research was late to be conducted as compared to other developed countries, It has contributed a lot to how school effectiveness research could be conducted. Therefore, it raised five basic questions in the field of school effectiveness on the following issues:

- Do schools have effect upon pupils?
- Are schools equally effective upon different aspects of pupils achievement?
- Are schools consistently effective or ineffective over time?
- Do schools have the same effect upon all pupils?
- What are the characteristics of effective school organization?

Taking school factors as influencing element, Erikiyhun (2000:15) indicated Mortimore (1988) as substantial school effects could be observed on attainment at a point in the case of mathematics, for instance, the influence of the school was found 10 times more important than the influence at home.

The same is true that several studies have been made by developing countries on school factors and home factors in combination and in isolation as to whether they influence students academic achievement. The Mauritius study conducted by Chinapah (1983), the participation and performance of primary school which stressed on home and school factors in determining students academic achievement is the one. Accordingly, the study raised such questions as whether school inputs are differ among schools. Based on the several questions raised the study has come to be ended with such findings as: Well-equipped schools have

higher achievement to that are not; pupils with good teacher relation performs better than that are not, and pupils from well-to do family perform better than that are not, etc.

As the same time, The southern African consortium for Monitoring Educational quality (SACMED) formed a net work of ministries of education among member countries (Kenya, Malawi, Namibia, Tanzania (Zanzibar), Zambia, Mauritius and Zimbabwe) in 1998 and studied the quality of education in each country with the assistance of International Institute for Education Planning (IIEP). The study was mainly focused on grade 6 students. This study largely set to answer the characteristics of grade 6 learners, teachers and principals; what were the approaches, goals and perception of teachers and principals; teaching condition in primary school and general condition of schools.

The findings of the study showed that lack of equipment and facilities (Zambia, Zimbabwe) lack of text boos (Zimbabwe), unqualified teachers (Zambia and Zanzibar), lack of books and writing materials (Zimbabwe), high repeaters and an repaired buildings, high inequity (Zanzibar), high pupil-teacher ratio, lack of seating (Zimbabwe), less frequency of tests/home works (Zambia, Zimbabwe), district variation (Mauritius) and student absenteeism were the major problems for the low performances of schools.

2.3. Specific School Factors Contributing to Achievement Differences

School Factors contributing to achievement are considered many. They include factors related to Administrative and facility. According to National Learner Baseline assessment sluary of Namibia, (1992:62), These factors are stated as school Qualities which include teacher qualities, classroom & instructional materials, Facilities and school level organization. On the other hand while the quality of education in primary school studied in Zimbabwe (1998:25-49) the

following school factors were assessed, Characteristics of the pupils, character of the teachers, teaching conditions, facility (building, texts and materials).

According to Fuller (1986:14-15), he pointed that school quality determines the academic achievement of learners which he refers “school quality” as the character of instructional process experienced by each student and the school’s efficacy in developing cognitive proficiencies. He further pointed that in addition to material inputs, the following non-material inputs have significant contribution in school quality, which in turn contribute to achievement.

1. Teacher quality. This includes schooling, social background, verbal proficiency, and motivation of teachers.
2. Teachers behavior in classroom. The efficient use of instructional time, the level of performance standards and expectations set for students, the extent to which teachers evaluate students’ performance, teachers ability to motivate students to learn also are important non-material inputs.
3. Organization of the school. This includes the head master management capability, feeling of camaraderie among teachers norms of achievement set by head master and the school’s legitimacy in the community.

Generally, the above school factors (variables) are considered as the essential elements in boosting students achievement in schools. Inputs (material and non-material), processes (largely instructional activities and school management affairs) have captured significant portions as school factors contributing to learners achievement.

Although few elements of the school quality indicated by Bruce (1986:20) later proved as they do have minimum influence on students' achievement, the author has mentioned the following elements:

1. Specific material inputs:

- Class size,
- School size,
- Instructional materials (Texts, reading materials and desks),
- Instructional media (radio)
- School building quality,
- Library size and activity,
- Science laboratories.

2. Teachers Quality:

- Teacher's length of schooling (qualification),
- In service teacher training,
- Teacher's length of experience,
- Teacher's verbal proficiency,
- School's percent of full-time teachers,
- Teacher's punctuality and (low) absenteeism.

3. Teaching practices/classroom Organization.

- Length of instructional programmes,
- Home work frequency,
- Active learning by students (participation)
- Teacher's time spent on class preparation.

4. School Management:

- Quality of principal
- Student repetition of grade

According to the above author, material inputs and teacher's quality have received the most attention by researches and studied many times. Whereas, despite increasing research on the influence of teaching practices and school management within industrialized countries, these areas have received very little attention in the third world.

As Erikihun (2000:27) indicated, Chinapha classified school factors that affect students performance in to five by combining school level factors with home based factors.

- School characteristics (type, region, teacher quality, teacher salary, class size),
- School process (teaching learning process, teacher behavior, pupils class room activities, pupil teacher interaction),
- Home characteristics (parental socio-economic status, home possessions, home literacy, ethnicity, personal characteristics),
- 'Home process (parental educational support, access and provision of private tuition, Economic support to school needs) and,
- Pupils' scholastic performance (Aptitude and achievement).

Regarding the school characteristics (factors) which affect academic achievement of students, Deresse and wangner (1990:8) have cited Chinapah (1983) as the following policy-related school inputs captured the author's attention, even if

inconsistent results were found regarding which of these inputs have direct positive impact upon students performance.

- Class size,
- School size,
- Physical School facilities,
- Expenditure per pupil,
- Method of instruction,
- Instructional time,
- Teachers personal and demographic character, and
- Teacher's education and experience
- .

On the same issue, Desesse and Wagner (1990:9) have cited Husen (1970) in pointing 16 teacher-related variables affecting pupils' scholastic achievement. Of the 16 teacher related variables the writers stressed the following variables as they do have strong positive relationship with students' performance

- Teacher's credentials and certification
- Teacher's ability and achievement,
- Teacher's experience,
- Teacher's expectations of students.

The National Baseline Assessment study of Namibia (1992:63) has also kept the learners achievement mode into three explanatory causes of variation in learner performance. These are: community context which include Language community, Urban/Rural setting, Community wealth and Labour demand; Individual learner characteristics and Family background which include pupil gender, age, home language, family social-class position, and child motivation and; finally School qualities which include teacher qualities, classroom and instructional materials, facilities and school level organization.

From the above study we can observe that Community context, family background and school quality have roles to play in determining learners' achievement. Further more, this study highly concentrated on school quality in influencing student achievement and hence stated the following (1992:64).

In school systems where school quality is uniformly high, we see very little variation in average student performance across schools, and much more variability among different children with in schools. This is the case with Botswana's well financed Junior Secondary Schools, for example.

The above finding could show us that in schools where teachers quality, material inputs, and other school related factors which contribute to school quality are almost

the same, variation in learners performance is not observed as such, otherwise, the opposite would occur in schools where such uniformity is not observed. In connection to this point when the American academic of students assessed, Riss (2000:2) stated the following.

... The single most dominant factor affecting student academic gain is teacher effect. Student who had three consecutive years of poor teaching could lag academically by more than 50 percentile points behind his/her peers who had received good teaching.

From this quotation, we can understand that teacher's quality in terms of qualification and experiences, teacher's practices, (methods of instruction) etc., have significant effect on students achievement.

2.3.1. School Material Inputs

School material inputs such as school size, class size, instructional materials (Text books and reading materials), school building, Audio visual materials are considered as influencing elements in determining students achievement. Various research studies, however, show different concepts regarding each element and hence give value difference to each of them as factor influencing students achievement. Therefore, this paper would see each of them as much as possible in relation to their Impact on students academic achievement.

2.3.1.1. School Size

The small schools literature began with the large scale quantitative studies of the late 1980s and early 1990s that firmly established small schools as more productive and effective than large ones. These studies involving large number of students and schools, confirmed that students learn more and better in small schools (Lee & Smith, 1995). Students make more rapid progress toward graduation (McMullan, Sipe, and

Wolf, 1994). They are more satisfied with small schools, and fewer of them drop out than from large schools (Pittman & Haughwout 1987). Students behave better in smaller schools, which thus experience fewer instances of both minor and serious information's (stockard and Mayberry, 1992).

As one researcher summed it up, "a large body of research in the affective and social realms over whelmingly affirms the superiority of small schools" (cotton, 1996b). Another researcher noted that size exerts a "Unique influence" on students' academic accomplishment, with a strong negative relationship linking the two: the larger the school, the lower the students' achievement levels (Howley, 1994).

Even if some few studies have showed large schools have positive benefits for some students, they find such benefits to be of far less magnitude than are the disadvantages of such schools for many others (Gladden, 1998). The question that must be raised here is that, : how big or small school is?" . This question has captured the interest of many researchers and has been controversial for a long. A 1990 study of school size research recommended up to 800 students for high schools (William's, 1990). The National Association of secondary school principals recommended a limit of 500 for secondary schools (1996), yet two researchers who correlated size and test score performance come up with 600-900 as the size that works best (Lee & smith, 1997). In general, we can observe two non-contradictory but two different approaches of emphasizing school size. Those who are emphasize the importance of the school as a community tend to set enrollment limits lower than do those who emphasize academic effectiveness, at least as measured by test scores. But both approaches emphasize the need to have small size school to that of large school size.

Realizing the promise small schools offer requires more than controlling the size, it also a matter of adopting a focus for the school (Gladden, 1998) and of restructuring practices and arrangements in the school at the system level (Hallett, 1995; Lee, Smith & Coroninger, 1997).

On the same issue, Bruce (1986:20) has reported that holding family and social background of students constant, school size as one of the school material inputs affecting scholastic achievement of students from a set of school level factors, has positive correlation with students performance. To this author, of the nine analysis made at various studies 4 of them only show negative effect in affecting Learner's' performance. Therefore, school size has positive relation ship with students performance.

According to Johnson, (2000:5) the following was indicated about small classes influence on academic achievement.

Having fewer children in class reduces the distractions in the room and gives the teacher more time to devote to each child. The average time a teacher can spend with each child, then, appears to be important in the learning process.

As the above quotation show, the time each child would have with teachers increases and teachers could help each individual student frequently and, therefore; the expected outcome from the learners' could likely occur.

2.3.1.2. Instructional Materials

Instructional materials such as text-books and reference books are thought to be essential inputs in influencing students achievement or academic performance. The availability of Text-books and reference books in schools' book stores and libraries doesnot gurantee the quality of school, unless they are distributed and given to learners on time during a given academic year. According to the policy Research number one of Mauritius on the quality of Education (1998:46), 85.3 percent of grade 6 pupils in Mauritius attended schools where they were allowed to borrow books. Others have library but don't borrow books to learners. Hence, the study recommended that, "the ministry needs to review this situation because it is a poor use

of resources if library books are available-but are not being used to the maximum level.”

Although literatures signify the impact of instruction materials (Text books, references and Desks) on students’ academic achievement, inconsistent findings have been observed at various research studies.

In Nebeyu (2000:261), considering physical resources as they include school building, equipment, supplies, laboratory, library books and text-books in the school, he cited the following findings on different studies.

- In Levin’s study, books in the library per student were found to be unrelated to verbal achievement of 597 while students enrolled in 36 schools in a large Eastern city.
- In Hanushek’s (1989) recent review of the literature, only 12 of 74 studies that examined a relationship between facilities and student achievement found significant results.
- Plowden Report (1967), which took place nearly at about the same time as the EEO survey in U.S. and is comparable in many aspects to that of Coleman’s study, reported that home influence far outweighed the effect of school in developed countries.

As the whole, the above studies findings show that school materials such as text-books, reading materials including building and equipment have little effect on students achievement. Moreover, according to Heyenman & Loxely (1983) cited in Nebeyu (2000:262), “According to the available evidence, only in developing countries, school facilities were found to be important and socio-economic status less influential to learning”.

Beside to some of the above positive effect of instructional materials (text books, reading materials and desks) stated above, Bruce (1986:29) has reported the positive effect of instructional materials on students performance as found from different countries.

- In Uganda's, text-books availability strongly influenced achievement in English, dwarfing the effects of the child's social class.
- In Malaysia Chile, and Latin America text-books availability was related to higher achievement.
- In rural Brazil, students with parents who had received no schooling were almost three times as likely to pass primary school if they had used two or more books compared to students in the same group who had no text-books in the school.

Generally, according to Bruce world bank report of (1986:30) of the 22 analysis made on the impact of text-books and reading materials on students achievement, 14 of them have grater impact and positive correlation with achievement. Therefore, based on many studies and discussion reports, instructional materials such as books, reading materials and desks have significant influence on Learners' achievement.

2.3.1.3. Library Size and its Activities

According to Brennan (1992:4) the following was writer about the role library plays:

Libraries play a unique role in bridging the gaps between disciplines, and more specifically, in helping students apply science and mathematics concepts to the other disciplines. Science curricula can be enriched in library media centers by providing hands-on displays and learning centers, electronic data bases that contain the latest scientific information,

guest speakers and demonstrations, and displays of student-produced science project.

As the above quotation reminds us, library has several advantages and uses in developing human knowledge particularly in science and mathematics which in turn applicable to other parts of disciplines through logical deduction or inferences. The same author, Brennan (1992:4) stated that:

Research shows that students perform better on tests of research skills and comprehension skills when they have access to a good library media center and professional library media specialist.

It is clear to observe from the above that individuals can read and get up to date information on research technique if library is facilitated for them.

While literature's state the above benefits of the library and its activities, research studies have shown similar cases in various situations. According to Lance and Keith-curry (1994) on the study of the impact of school library media on academic achievement, the following findings have been forwarded in questions and answers forms:

1. Is there a relationship between expenditures on Library Media Centers and test performance, particularly when social and economic differences between communities and schools are controlled?

Yes. Students at schools with better funded library Media centers to achieve higher average reading score's, whether their schools and communities are rich or poor and whether adults in the community are well or poorly educated.

2. Given a relationship between Library Media Center expenditures and test performance, what intervening characteristics of library media programs help to explain this relationship?

The size of Library Media center's total staff and the size and variety of its collection are important characteristics of library media programs which intervene between library Media Center expenditures and test performance. Funding is important' but, two of its specific purposes are to ensure adequate levels of staffing in relation to the school's enrollment and a local collection which offers students a large number of materials in a variety of formats.

3. Does the performance of an instructional role by library media specialists help to predict test performance?

Yes. Students whose library Media Specialists played such a role tended to achieve higher average test score.

Generally, the above quotation indicates that library has significant place in determining students achievement. Students who are working with adequate and facilitated library show good achievement, while students doing in opposite facilities show opposite results.

As the world bank discussion report made by Bruce (1986:20), from 18 analysis's made on the influence of library size and its activities on students performance, 15 of them have shown positive impact. Therefore, it is possible to say that library and its activities have direct relationship with learners' performance.

2.3.1.4. Instructional Media.

Teaching and Learning activities which take place by instructional media are often effective and hence better understood by the learners. Considering instructional materials as media, schramm has realized the importance of multimedia instruction which facilitate the effectiveness of learning as follow:

...We have pointed out that almost all teaching is multi-media, and that “teacher instruction” as measured in most experiments and compared with “media instruction” is usually teacher plus text book plus chalk board and often plus more. We have thousand years of educational history to tell us that teachers themselves believe multimedia instruction is more effective than a single medium (1977:38).

From the above idea, we can observe that instruction utilizing various media are more effective than that uses limited media or few media.

On a survey study of pedagogical centers in primary schools of Addis Ababa, Amare and Tasew (1996:36) indicated that:

The availability of educational materials has received increasing attention in the last couple of decades because of growing evidence that it is an important correlates and a probable determination of classroom achievement.

The above idea clearly tells us that instructional media has major roles in determining students achievement.

2.3.1.5. School Laboratories

Whether school laboratories affect student academic performance remain controversial. But, government and other financing agencies have been spending sizable resources in building school laboratories and in financing the purchase of laboratory equipment. According Bruce (1986) discussion paper reported to the world bank, school laboratory has shown positive effect on student academic achievement on studies conducted at three developing countries, i.e. India, Thailand and Iran. Of the several indicators number of students in laboratory classes and time spent in laboratory classrooms were related to achievement. However the subsequent Latin

American Survey used these items and found no significant relationship with pupil performance.

2.3.2. Teaching Practices as influencing elements on Students' achievement

Teaching practices are the major influencing elements on students achievement. Teaching practices, according to this paper include length of instructional programme, Homework frequency, active learning by students, teacher's expectation of pupil performance, Teacher's time spent on classroom participation, method of instruction and motivation provided to learners by teachers.

2.3.2.1 Teachers' Motivation

Motivation is provided for an effort done by an individual or group. Of course, the type of motivation provided varies from one form of effort to another. Teachers as changing agents who always work to bring a desired behavior on students should use this instrument, i.e., motivation to encourage their learners and hence reach the desired goal. According to DANTEs subject standardized tests (1992:7),

Students are like all other workers in wanting a tangible return for their efforts. If such motivation is to be effective, they must believe that their "take-home pay" is worth while, and that their efforts will be suitably rewarded.

Many lessons with objectives which are not obvious will pay off well during later instruction, but the student does not appreciate this fact. It is important for the teacher to make them aware of these applications which are not immediately apparent if the student's motivation is to be maintained. Likewise, the devotion of much time and effort to drill and practices which do not directly contribute to students' achievement should be avoided.

Student motivation can be termed into two ways. Negative motivations which engender fears and be accepted by the student as threats. “Negative motivations have uses in limited situations, such as the instruction of “Captive” groups, they are not characteristically as effective in promoting efficient learning as positive motivations” (Dantes, 1992:7).

According DANTES (1992:8), If students feel the motivation of teacher negatively, the results of motivation becomes negative and does not encourage students.

Motivation will also suffer when a student believes that his/her instructor is making unreasonable demands for performance and progress. The assignment of goals which the student considers difficult but possible usually provides a challenge which promotes learning. The assigning of impossible goals discourages the student, diminishes his/her efforts to perform adequately, and retards the learning process.

As the whole, the above idea denotes that motivation has to be provided for students for which they can perform or do it. According to Anderman (1998:2), the following importance of motivation is stated.

Few educators would argue with the premise that student motivation is an important influence on learning. Motivation is particular importance for those who work with young adolescents.

At the same time, emphasizing the importance of Motivation, Brown (1999:3) stated that:

Educators who know students names, recognize their efforts, and provide academic support encourage educational and student development. Those who do not care, fail to listen, and refuse to recognize individual differences in achievement potential contribute to the alienation of students.

Teachers who do have more contacts with individual student could easily solve the academic problem and other related educational problem. On the other hand, teachers who do not mind to know each of their students in names and in deeds, solve little of students academic problem. Therefore, recognizing individual students in name, and his/her academic problem has significant role in motivating students to better achievement.

2.3.2.2 Teacher's lesson Preparation

Any training activity, whether it be at the kindergarten or the college level, must be completely planned or prepared if it is to be effective. According to DANTES (1992:25) the following basic points are required at any lesson preparation:

1. Determination of overall objectives.
2. Identification of Blocks of Learning.
3. The syllabus.
4. The lesson plan

As the Dantes standardized test magazine indicates, before any instruction takes place the general objectives or goals to be reached has to be identified and stated. If the objectives to reach become ambiguous and unknown, Instruction will not achieve what it should achieve. Hence, the overall objectives and goals have to priory set by a teacher or an instructor.

The identification of blocks of learning becomes the next duty of an instructor or a teacher. The overall objectives or general objectives have to be broken down into different learning blocks, so as to achieve the set general objectives. Stating the importance of each learning segment towards the accomplishment of the general objectives, Dantes (1992:25) stated that:

Training is much like building a pyramid, each block is an identify in itself, but the pyramid is incomplete if any one is missing. The instructor and the student must both recognize the interrelationship of the blocks, and the place of each in the total objective of the lesson.

According to the above quotation, we can recognize that the pyramid wouldn't have been called "Pyramid", had it not been for the parts and the wholeness of the parts. The same is true that the general objectives of the lesson can be achieved through identifying and preparing each learning task which could reach us to the intended general objectives in unified ways.

The syllabus as one of the vital elements in the process lesson preparation, teachers or instructors must be provided to be guided in their teaching activities. In considering the flight instruction as an instance, the Dantes (1992:26) stated that:

Any practical flight training syllabus must be flexible, and should be used primarily as a guide. The order of training can find should be altered, when necessary, to suit the progress of the student and the exigencies of special circumstances. In departing from the order prescribed by the syllabus, however, it is the responsibility of the flight instructor to consider the relationships of the blocks of learning affected.

Syllabus and guides provided for teacher denote the scope and areas to be covered by the classroom teachers or instructors. They don't state the hard and fast rule as how to

flow the sequences. But, guides have to be provided to teachers as to determine the whole coverage's or areas to execute in a given academic period.

Lesson plan is another essential point that helps teacher to achieves the lesson at predetermined time effectively. Davies, (1981:78) stated the following advantages of having lesson plans:

- The aim of the lesson is identified and maintained.
- The lesson material is selected and arranged in a logical manner.
- An instructional method is selected appropriate to the learning task and the needs of the trainees.
- Appropriate trainee participation and experiences have been identified and arranged.
- Instructional time is managed so that the best use is made of it.

Connecting to these advantages of preparing lesson plan, Davies (1981:7) stated the importance of preparing lesson plans in resolving the problems that teachers encount during teaching as follow:

Many instructors and teachers have feelings of uneasiness about teaching. Sometimes it is because they do not know what to do, formatives it is because they lack confidence in their ability to do it. In both instances, the solution is careful planning.

As the above author said, teachers have been observed while they face problems of what to teach. They touch one topic and leave soon; and start the other. Such problem, of course, has been the result of poor preparation which could be resolved if they have lesson plan a head of the delivery.

Wilcox (19960:15) stated the importance of lesson plan in such a way:

A plan for teaching is a guide for action. It is entire teaching process in projection the goals sought, what will probably be done to reach them, what is needed to take the proposed steps, and why it is important to actually take action.

As the above author stated, lesson plan helps one to determine the end and find the means how to reach this end. It guides and searches options to reach the set goals. According to Dantes subject standardized tests, (1992:26-27), every lesson, however, must include at least the following items if it is to result in properly organized instruction:

- Lesson Objectives,
- A statement of the elements of knowledge and skills which will be necessary for the fulfillment of the lesson objectives (contents),
- Allocation of time available,
- Equipment and teaching aids to be used,
- Instructor's (teacher's) actions.
- Student's actions (activities),
- Evaluation.

The lesson plan may be carried by the instructor (teacher) to assist him as check list in the administration of the lesson, or he/she may study it, until he/she is confident that he/she can not be easily diverted from his/her planned procedure.

2.3.2.3 Length of Instructional programme and Time spent for Instruction

Allocated Instructional time is important. The time allocated for teaching should be used for teaching purposes. If students learn within allocated Instructional time properly, their achievement will increase accordingly. According to Bruce (1988:160), the following importance of using instructional time is stated.

It is the real number (rather than the paper number) of hours of instructional time that is important. There are many countries where officially there may be say, 240 school days per year, but in effect 30 are given free because of local public holy days, visiting dignitaries, and teacher absence, (for whatever cause, e.g., illness, death or marriage in the family, teacher attending courses, etc); thus the real number of days is much less. Teacher attendance at school is another important problem. In some countries measures have to be taken (involving, for example, the community or the parents in the management of school) so that teachers actually turn up in schools for the lessons they have to teach.

As the above study shows, the planned academic time is not often executed in schools. Due to various reasons which include teachers absenteeism, less number of days have been used for teaching. Teachers in many cases are involved in school management affairs and their principal duty has been forgotten, which in turn affects the learners academic achievement.

“More efficient use of classroom time is strongly related to pupil performance within industrialized nations”. (Bruce,1986:41). Considerable progress on this potential source of school efficiency could be made-by sharpening classroom management and teaching skills-within existing levels of material inputs.

According to Bruce (1986:20), a total of 13 studies (analyses) have been done regarding the effect of length of instructional program and time spent on student achievement, and hence 11 of them or (85% of the analyses) have shown positive correlation with student academic performance. “Finally, heyneman and Loxley’s reanalysis of the IEA data on science performance revealed achievement effects for different measures of instructional time.” (Bruce, 1986:44)

As the above author indicated, hours of instruction (per year) spent on general science was significantly associated with (science) achievement in India, Thailand, and Iran.

Generally, instructional time has significant effect on students' academic performance or achievement.

2.3.2.4 Home Work Frequency

Another aspect of time is 'time-on-task' – the amount of time within a class period that is actually devoted to the teaching/learning which should take place and the amount of time each pupil actually spends on learning (as opposed to, for example, day-dreaming). There is a growing body of research to indicate that, other things being equal, the more 'time-on-task- the more the pupils learn, much of this has to do with structuring of the time within the period and the tempo at which the teacher conducts the class. Both of these aspects should be dealt with in the teacher's pre-, in- and on-service training. Brue (1986:44) stated the importance of giving homework frequently as follow:

...Pupils doing homework learn more than those doing no homework even if it is not marked. If the homework is marked and gone through individually with each pupil, to help him/her see his shortcomings and how to improve them, then, the children learn much more.

The above quotation indicates that giving homework even without correcting is much better than without giving homework, this is, because that learners would at least make themselves busy with their lesson.

As Bruce (1986:20) indicated, a total of seven studies (analyses) have been done regarding the impact of homework frequency on student academic achievement, five of the analyses (studies) have shown positive correlation with students academic achievement.

Generally, from the various points taken from different authors, and studies conducted on homework frequency, we can conclude that homework frequency has significant effect on students performance.

2.3.2.5. Students active Learning

The purpose of all instruction (teaching) is to help students learn. Teachers work to see that learning occurs. The objective of all true learning is to effect behavioral changes.

Behavioral changes can best be acquired or gained if students are participated in the learning processes with interest. Recognizing the participation of students in learning process, Dantes in subject standardized test, (1992:3) stated that, “Receiving information, even accurately, does not insure that the student understands it.” Many students seem they understand the subject matter when they repeat what the teachers say, but have little understanding of the subject matter.

When active learning by students connected with students academic achievement, inconsistent results have been found from few researches conducted in developing countries.

As the world bank discussion paper number two indicates, Two studies have been conducted whether active learning by students has positive relationship with learners academic performance. Hence, both studies have shown negative relationship on this paper, Bruce (1986:44) stated, “self reports by teachers on the amount of time they spent explaining academic materials to students had no relationship to reading or Maths achievement within peruvian primary schools”. The report further stated that recent study conducted on 37 school of Botswana found no relationship between the frequency of classroom discussions reported by teachers and achievement on national reading and Maths exams

2.3.3. Teachers Quality as an influencing elements on students academic performance.

Teachers quality is the major Influencing element of students academic performance in general terms. Of course, these are several specific of teaches quality that are combined under teachers quality. As clark (1993:184) stated about the good teaching:

We cannot hope for good education; from preschool to graduate school, in the absence of good teaching. For better and for worse, the quality of teaching defines the quality of education. And the quality of education, in turn, limits or enables the good that the next generation of teachers is able to do so.

Quality teaching is the corner stone to define the quality of education. Quality education comprises all educational activity from preschool to graduate level. This long range educational activities becomes quality if teaching becomes quality.

Therefore, good teaching would contribute for good education, but what makes one to be good teacher has been remained question for long and various research approaches have stated quality in different ways. According to Clark (1993:184), there approaches have been used. These approaches are:

1. Process-product approach
2. Teachers thinking approach
3. Teacher knowledge approach

According to process-product approach research, the good teacher is one whose students, after receiving instruction, achieve the highest scores on tests of knowledge and skill. As Clark (1993:185) stated, is:

A good teacher is one who is an efficient director and manager of a three part instructional process that

involves lecture and demonstration, recitation with feed back, and supervised practice or seat work.

According to this approach, teacher plays the important role and leads students at work rather than making students do as they need. The global image of the good teacher supported by this research is of a business like person who is clearly in control of the flow of work in an orderly, efficient classroom. The process of rapid and cumulative coverage of academic content, with clear feedback and remedial instruction when necessary, leads to superior performance on tests of facts and skills. The culture of control, efficiency, and convergence of learning outcomes defines the world of the process-product teacher.

According to the teachers thinking approach, the teacher is considered as a diagnostician responsible for observing, categorizing and acting in response to a complex array of cues and situations that describe self, students and learning environment. The metaphor of teacher as decision maker is central to this work, along with the assumption that teachers behave rationally almost all the time.

On the other hand, the third approach called research on teacher knowledge takes the position that what is most important and most neglected in teaching is the teacher's knowledge of subject matter.

Generally, even if the three approaches of research gives three different recognition of teacher position, student performance (academic achievement) depends on teachers qualification, experience, verbal proficiency (clarity), punctuality, and low absenteeism.

2.3.3.1 Teachers Qualification

The qualification of teachers to the appropriate teaching level is essential and appropriate to make students show good academic performance. According to Bruce,

(1986:20) on world Bank discussion report, a total of 30 studies or analyses have been made about teachers years of tertiary education and training on students academic achievement and hence 21 of the studies have shown that positive correlation, and hence has strong impact on students performance.

Erikiyhun (2000:29) citing Fuller stated that the impact of various characteristics of teachers' such as, the level of previous schooling, pre service training, in service training, experiences, social class and salary are major factors that affect students' achievement.

2.3.3.2 Teachers Length of Services (Experiences)

Teachers experiences in influencing students achievement has shown inconsistent result in many studies. According to Bruce (1986:34), of the study consisting of 89 secondary schools in West Malaysia found a notable correlation between length of teacher training and student achievement ($r = .27$). This factor retained its significance when entered in to a multivariate model which controlled for the effects of pupils' family background and other elements of school quality. This research also discovered an achievement effect for the interaction of teacher training and length of teaching experience. Similarly, the IEA study found a modest bi-variant correlation for science achievement among 3,153 students from 124 schools in India ($r = .23$). In addition, the level of teachers' credentials was the strongest predictor of student achievement with in a sample of 463 primary school graduates in Uganda when tested against several other elements of school quality.

Fuller, (1986:36-37) further stated the following research funding made on various countries regarding the influence of teachers' teaching experiences have on student achievement. Accordingly, Heyneman and Loxely (1976) studied the science competence of EI Salvador (Primary), Iran, India, and Chile students through science teachers and hence the outcome has shown positive effect. On the other hand, on

study conducted Bycarnoy, Puerto Rico (Primary) students have show positive effect on reaching. Thias and Carnoy also studied that Kenya's National exam, and Malaysia's (Primary) comprehensive exam, and hence both have shown positive impact on student achievement.

In contrary studies conducted by Heyneman (1976) on National exam of Uganda (primary); Schiefelbein and Farrell (1973) on language and Maths of Chile secondary; Hartley and Swanson on literacy and numeracy of Egypt (primary); Youdi on language and Maths of Congo; Klees on language and Maths of Mexico; Rivarola and Corvalan on reading of Paraguay. Echart et. al. on reading of Argentina (primary and secondary) have shown no effect on students academic achievement.

Therefore, from the above studies in consistent findings have been observed. But, as one that requires study this paper would like to see the effect on students academic performance.

2.3.3.3 Teachers Verbal Proficiency

The verbal proficiency of teachers in determining student academic achievement has been strongly emphasized in relating with teacher's total effectiveness in teaching. According to process outcome Research that concentrates on Teacher effect research, Brophy (1992:188) stated by Citing (Biophy and Good 1986), teacher behaviors and patterns of teacher-student interaction associated with student achievement gains in the following three major conclusions:

1. Teachers make difference. Some teachers reliably elicit greater gains than others, because of differences in how they teach.
2. Differences in achievement gains occurring part because of differences in exposure to academic content and opportunity to learn.

3. Teachers who elicit greater achievement gains do not merely maximize “time on task”; in addition, they spend a great deal of time actively instructing their students.

From the above quotation, we can generalize that teachers who are hypothetically stated above should have a good verbal proficiency, because they often instruct in the class and students task performance is very limited to such research effect.

According to Fuller (1986:63) from the Review of school quality Research from industrial countries, the following general statement on teacher’s quality as influencing element on student academic achievement is indicated in the following ways:

“The quality of teachers more consistently influences achievement. The most marked effects are for teachers’ level of experience and verbal competence.” Fuller (1986:63)

These statements can clearly indicate that teachers who do have lot of experience in teaching show greater academic achievement of students. Mean while, the verbal competence or proficiency of teachers has also greater impact on student achievement. Fuller further stated that a total of two studies have done in Uganda (primary) and Iran, the effect of teachers verbal proficiency on National exam by Heyneman and Ryan, and hence both have should positive effect on student academic achievement.

2.3.3.4 Teacher’s absenteeism

Teachers absenteeism in teaching-learning process highly affect students academic performance. Contents to be covered during the given academic period will be left without being covered if teachers are constantly absent from school. According to fuller (1986:20), a total of 2 analysis or studies have been made regarding teachers

absenteeism and its impact on students academic performance. Hence, both analysis or studies have shown positive impact on students academic performances.

2.3.4. School Management and Structure as Influencing Element of Students Academic Performance

Beyond organization of the classroom, management of the entire school represents an important component of school quality. The school's organizational structure drives the efficiency with which inputs are managed. As Renchler (1992:3) stated by citing klug (1989):

School leaders can influence level of motivation by “shaping the school’s instructional climate”, which in turn shapes “the attitudes of teachers, students, parents, and the community at large toward education”. By effectively managing this aspects of school’s culture, principals can “increase both student and teacher motivation and indirectly impact learning gains.”

Teachers who are on operation highly motivated by principals or leaders of schools. Teachers who are motivated in turn make effective work and encourage students to gain from the lesson. This side by side effect in turn results in good academic performance by the learners.

Renchler (1992:3) further stated that school leader can create positive environment which motivate students through the following ways:

- Stress goal setting and self-regulation/management.
- Offer students choices in instructional settings
- Reward students for attaining “personal best” goals.
- Foster teamwork through group learning and problem-solving experiences.
- Teach time management skills

- Show students that success is important. Recognize the variety of ways that students can succeed. Reward success in all its forms.
- Involve parents in discussing the issue of motivation and give them guidance in fostering in their children.
- Analyze the ways that motivation operates on your own life and develop a clear way of communicating it to teachers and students.

The above points clearly indicate that school leaders can motivate students by rewarding students for their achievement, develop mechanism in which students can be motivated, show them how they effectively manage their time. As the whole, good school leaders consider students gains as part of their regular duties.

Research on management practices of headmasters is blossoming within industrialized nations. Unfortunately, very little is known about how headmaster in third world act to improve the school's instructional programs. However, according to the world Bank discussion paper reported by fuller (1986:46-47) the following school headmaster's quality in different countries as an influencing element of students academic performance.

In recent research study conducted in 60 primary schools in Egypt, students performed better in schools with principals that had attended more training courses and had longer teaching experience prior to becoming principal. This finding also appeared for science achievement among primary and secondary school students in Paraguay. In each case, the principal's level of training was significantly related to achievement.

Stronger findings come from Indonesian study of 124 secondary schools. Two characteristics of headmasters were among the strongest three inquiry found moderately high associations between pupil performance with both the headmaster's salary level ($r=.50$) and the headmaster's length of teaching experience ($r=.33$). Both factors remained strongly associated with pupil achievement within a large model

which estimated achievement from 13 students background factors and 17 other school factors.

In Bolivia, a study of 53 primary and secondary schools found a relationship between student achievement and headmaster's length of tertiary schooling. The magnitude of this factor was comparable to the influence of Expenditures per pupil in a simple model which included just seven other school quality factors. Each of these two significant predictors of achievement was stronger than the student's social class background (when comparing t-statistics).

Generally, the quality of school management has strong relationship with pupils performance. Hence, principals of the schools as leaders should be effective and competent in realizing the school goals objectively. As Stephen (1994:4) stated by citing Jane Arkes, a principal interviewed was stated the following: "work on team-building; put your agenda second; know that you don't have all the answers... everyone has limitations; learn from students and staff; put people before paper." The cooperative atmosphere and mutual assistance of principals, teachers and other staffs here should be practiced in schools rather than developing the attitude of bossy and avoiding self to learn from teachers and students. To this author, a good principal is the one who approaches teachers and students, and hence teach and learn to run the school effectively.

CHAPTER THREE

3. METHODS AND PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY

3.1. Method of the study

Since school based factors determining students' academic achievement have been investigated at both type of schools (high and low scorers) as to know whether there are differences, it is possible to say that study is a comparative study in its nature.

Although much of the findings were obtained through interviews and observations and hence seem qualitative, it also tried to make quantitative study particularly in its analysis of findings obtained from questionnaires.

3.2. Population of the Study

There are 25 government secondary schools in Addis Ababa which have 9-12 grades. These all schools make their students to take national exams at completion grade 12 and 10. But the academic performance of students in all these schools is some what vary. To study the school based factors, 6 schools' students who took national exam of grade 12 at 1994 E.C. i.e. 6285 students, 626 teachers who are teaching in all sample schools in the same year, 21 school principals working in 1994 in sample, and 5 educational officials (heads of educational programme in 5 zones) were considered as the population of the study.

3.3 Subjects

The respondents of this study are students who are going to take E.S.L.C.E. at the end of 1994 E.C. These students are purposely selected, because they have been almost attending in these sample schools for four years and are assumed they have more information and hints regarding the school strength and problems more than other grades.

Teachers who are teaching in the sample schools in grades 9 – 12 are included because all of them could have equal status to point out the strength and problems of school conditions where they are teaching.

School administrators, particularly deputy director of each sample school is included as the subject. This is because of the fact that, deputy director of each sample school who is particularly working on academic area knows very well about the teaching – learning process more than other principals who are working on non-academic affairs.

Zone educational officials, particularly officials working on educational programs are included as subjects. Since Regional Educational officials are a little bit far from the schools in hierarchy; and woreda educational officials are not supervising senior secondary schools, these two levels of educational officials are excluded and Zone educational officials are deliberately selected. Accordingly, the number of sample subjects stated by the following table.

Table 1. Population and Sample size of the subjects.

Sample subjects	Total population of sample schools	Sample size	Sample size in percent
Students	6285	628	10
Teachers	626	126	20
School Principals	21	6	28.6
Educational Programe Heads of Zones	5	3	60

3.4 Sampling procedure

Six government secondary schools which have been giving National Examination (E.S.L.C.E) since 1990 E.C. were selected. Three of them are from top scorers at E.S.L.C.E (1990 – 1993 E.C.) and grade ten national examination(E.G.S.S.C.E.) of 1993 E.C.

The other three low scorer schools were selected based on the (1990 – 1993 E.C.) E.S.L.C.E., and grade ten national examination (E.G.S.S.C.E) of 1993 E.C. purposly. As the whole, when we compute the percentage of sample schools in relation to the total 25 government secondary school is in A.A. it becomes more than 23%.

Ten percent (10%) of each sample school regular students who were expected to take E.S.L.C.E in the year 1994 E.C. are selected on accedental random sampling procedure from each school grade 12 sections. Twenty percent (20%) of each sample school higher secondary school teachers were selected by accedental random sampling bases from teachers teaching grade 9 – 12. Three deputy directors working on academic area and three educational officials from three Zones, i.e. Zone 3, 4 and 5 are included for this study. The number of sample distribution of teachers and students in each sample school is shown by the following table.

Table 2. Sample number of Teachers and Students in Sample Schools

No.	Name of the schools	Number of Teachers	Sample in percent	Sample in number	Number of student	Sample in percent	Number of Sample
1	Bole Senior S. S.	130	20	26	1457	10	145
2	Yekatit comp. S. S	112	20	23	1298	10	130
3	Wondirad S. S.	81	20	16	514	10	51
4	Higher 12 senior S. S.	88	20	18	721	10	73
5	Higher 7 senior S. S.	129	20	26	981	10	98
6	Kolfe Senior Sec.	86	20	17	1314	10	131
Total		626	20	126	6285	10	628

Sample number of teaches in each sample school is based on accendental random sampling bases and hence teachers teaching from grade nine to grade twelve are as a matter of chance mostly included as respondents of the study.

3.5. Data Collection Instruments

Questionnaires for students, teachers, and head teachers are used. Questionnaires for teachers and head teachers include both type of items, i.e., open and close ended. Interviews particularly structured are used to illicit information from principals and Zonal educational officials. Observation schedule is used to find data about class room teaching and learning process and school facilities. Document inspection as data gathering instrument is also used in this study. The focus of each instrument is shown by the following tables for clarity purpose.

Table 3. Distribution of items on Questionnaires

Subjects	Focus of the instruments	Total Items
Students	<u>Facility problem</u> (Equipment, Class size, laboratory, library and reference books)	28
Teachers	<u>Teaching – Learning process</u> (Teacher’s attitude, class participation, study habit, methods of teaching, subject clarity, medium of Instruction etc.)	
Head Teachers	School management (follow up, student absenteeism controlling system, provision of materials etc.)	10
	Teaching-Learning process (Teachers preparation, evaluation system, method of teaching etc.)	

Table 4. Distribution of Items for interview.

Subjects	Focus of the Instrument	Total Number
Principals	Facility – Laboratory, Equipment, finance source books etc, <u>Teaching-learning process</u> – Teachers evaluation; student discipline, class size etc.	10
Zonal Educational Officials	Motivation – Teachers appraisal system, working condition, teachers load, incentives provided etc.	6

Table 5. Areas of Observation (Check – list)

Facility	Teaching – Learning Process	Out of class observation
Existence of learning equipment	Class room interaction,	Group working
Laboratory Condition, library condition,	Teachers and students activities	Library & Equipment usage
School condition (existence of SPC), Class size, etc.,	Evaluation system etc.	Home work doing & studying activities

3.6 Research Variables

This study deals with two major variables, i.e, independent variables and dependent variables. The dependent variable is depicted by the level of students' academic performance while the independent variables are those school factors which could influence the academic performance of students in the schools. Accordingly, the independent variables on this study are categorized into four areas. These are:

1. School material inputs and condition

- Physical conditions of schools,
- Facilities (equipment, Laboratory library) etc.
- Instructional material provision (Text-books, teachers' guide, syllabuses etc.).
- Income resources and support,
- Class size etc.

2. Teachers quality and teaching practice

A. Teachers quality

- Qualification and experiences of teachers,
- Teachers working attitude, (Interest),
- Teachers initiatives (motivation) etc.

B. Teaching practice

- Lesson preparation habits of teachers,
- Assignments, Home works and Test provision habits of teachers.
- Teachers habits of using Teaching aids
- Teacher Absenteeism
- Work load of teachers
- Teaching Methods adapted by teachers

3. School management variables

- Qualification and Experience of directors
- Performance of directors on various activities
- Attitude of directors towards school programs,
- Absenteeism level of school directors.

4. Variables concerning students behavior

- Background of students,
- Classroom participation of students
- Students absenteeism etc.

3.7. Data Collection Procedures

3.7.1. Tryout Instruments

The prepared instruments were piloted in one comprehensive secondary school of Addis Ababa, namely Misrak Comprehensive Secondary School.

The purpose of piloting was to examine the quality or the appropriateness of the prepared instruments. Therefore, the clarity of the items to the respondents and the

adequacy of time to respond the items are evaluated. Based on the pilot results, student questionnaire which had 35 items are minimized into 28 items. Some items on teachers' questionnaire are also improved.

3.7.2 Data Collection periods

The data was collected from six sample schools. In each school more than a weekdays were used to distribute instruments and collect the necessary information. The first day of the week was used to introduce the purpose of the study to the directors and teachers. Two days of the week were used to inspect various documents related to the study with collaboration of the concerned personnel's of the school and distribution of questionnaires to concerned subject. Two other days were used to observe classroom while teachers were delivering the lesson. Grade 12 classes, particularly English, Maths and Biology classes were observed for about 25 minutes in each class. The three subjects were purposely selected so as to make them represent subjects appear on National examination. One of the week days was also used to make interview with the deputy director of the school concerning issues related to the study.

In addition to gathering data from sample schools, six days were used to collect data from three zones education offices. Even if instruments (particularly questionnaires) distributed to concerned subjects are not collected all in all, it could be said that more than 95% have been collected. Accordingly, from the 628 questionnaires distributed to students, 608 (95.2) have been returned. From 126 questionnaires distributed to teachers, 121 (97%) questionnaires have been returned. On the other hand, from 18 questionnaires distributed to head-teachers, 18 of them have been returned.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. Analysis and interpretation of the findings

This chapter deals with the presentation of the findings in various forms with their analyses in detail. In addition to this, the chapter consists of the interpretation of the analysis derived from the findings. To make the data obtained from the sample schools clear, this first presents a short description of the sample schools in the following way:

4.1 Description about sample schools

All sample schools are found under region 14 Education Bureau of A.A and directly supervised by Zone Education Offices. The following are brief descriptions of each school.

Yekatit 12 Comp. Secondary School. This school was mostly known by its former founder preness '*Etege Menen*' and hence it is often called *Menen*. It was established in 1924 E.C. It offers both Natural and Social Science Subjects. It has 9 -12 grades. The school buildings were mostly constructed by the then royal family and hence most of the floors of the classrooms are wooden. It has many buildings, some of which were constructed by 'Derge regime'. At present, it is directly supervised by Zone 4 Education Office. At the current academic year, the school has four directors, 4 unit leaders, 112 teachers and 5200 students. Based on four consecutive years (1990 E.C. to 1993 E.C.) of E.S.L.S.E results, it was taken as one of the high achiever schools.

Bole Secondary School. This school is relatively younger as compared to the establishment of the high achiever sample schools. The school was established in 1974 E.C. and offers both natural and social science subjects to grades 9 - 12. It has the highest number of student and teachers when compared to the other sample

schools. According to the 2000 annual statistical abstract of Addis Ababa Education Bureau, it has 130 teachers and 7398 students from grades 9 - 12. The school is directly supervised by Zone 3 Education office. It has many buildings that are constructed on ground plus zero status. The school is being led by four directors. Three of them are deputy directors. This school is considered as one of the high achiever schools based on 1990 - 1993 E.S.L.C.E results.

Wondirad Secondary School- This school is found at Woreda 28 near to Kotebe College of Teachers Education. The school is found in one big compound with the primary school. The high school, which is the sample of this paper, has three directors, of whom two are deputies. The high school section provides both natural and social science subjects from grades 9 - 12. The school has 81 teachers and 3434 students currently. Wondirad senior secondary school is also considered as one of the high scorer schools based on the four year E.S.L.C.E results as selection criteria.

Kolfe Comp. Secondary School: This is found at woreda 25 in Zone five. The school is far away from the center of A.A. and largely seems village school. It is free from noise and other teaching-learning destructive elements. The school has two types of buildings. All 'ground plus one' buildings are used for classroom purposes, while some villas are used for offices and other similar purposes. The school has four directors of whom three are deputy directors. It also has 5580 students and 86 teachers currently. The school offers both types of academic streams; natural and social science.

Higher 12 Senior Secondary School - This school is found in Wereda 12 of Zone 4. It was established in 1978 E.C. and its buildings were mostly constructed during 'Derge regime'. Most of the school buildings are ground plus-one types. The school has been offering natural and social science subjects from grades 9 - 12. It has 88 teachers, three directors and 5578 students currently. From 1994 E.C. onwards the school is turned to a technical and vocational school. Presently it rains students at 10

+ 1 and 10+2 level for various middle level occupations. It had 3648 students in 1993 E.C. before it became a technical and vocational school. The location of the school is conducive for teaching - learning process as long as it is free from the noise of vices and some others which disturb the smooth teaching-learning process.

Higher 7 Senior Secondary School - This school is found in Wereda 7 and is directly supervised by Zone 5 Education Office. The school has two types of buildings. Buildings that have one stair are used for classroom purposes, while others are used for office works. As in Higher 12 secondary school, the school has been turned to Vocational and Technical School since the beginning of 1994 E.C. The school has 6729 students 129 teachers, and 3 directors in 1994 E.C. The school was established in 1978 during the 'Derge Regime' and has almost 24 years of services. The location of the school is almost comfortable for teaching-learning process.

The Focus of the Study

Students' academic achievement is often influenced by socio-economic and school based factors. Considering or assuming the socio-economic factors of students attending the sample schools remain the same; this study tries to investigate school level factors which could bring in achievement differences among government schools that have equal status.

Therefore, the study focuses on four major areas of school level factors, ie, school conditions and its facilities; school management; teaching-learning process and teaching force qualities; and somehow the characteristics of the students.

Most of the findings are grouped in terms of the group characteristics of the schools, ie. low scorer and high scorer schools. Various tables are also organized to show the findings.

4.2. School Characteristics

Of the four major areas in which this study focuses, the characteristics of both types of schools should clearly be stated and indicated. Here, characteristics largely refer to the physical condition of the school, facility in terms of equipments, instructional materials, schools budget, and other similar conditions which facilitate the smooth learning and teaching process. The findings indicated under the characteristics of school are obtained from the students, teachers and department heads through questionnaires, observation, interview held with the various level of officials and document inspection or statistics found in the schools. The following table shows the physical condition of schools, year of establishment and class size of the sample schools.

Table 6. Physical Conditions of Schools Status and their in 1994 E.C.

Conditions	Low Scorer Schools			High Scorer Schools		
	Kolfe	Higher 7	Higher 12	Bole	Yekatit 12	Wondirad
Classrooms	32	41	25	46	39	23
Number of sections	61	82	50	92	78	48
Average number of students in class	80	82	68	85	86	74
Average number of students by a teacher	73	50	51	56	52	42

Low SCORER schools are Kolfe S.S.S, Higher 7 S.S.S, and Higher 12 S.S.S.

High SCORER r schools are Bole S.S.S, Yekatit 12 S.S.S, and Wondirad S.S.S.

Class size in both types of schools is higher than 40, which was intended as national standard for this level by Ministry of Education. But when both types of schools are compared, two of the low scorer schools have small class size than high scorer schools. However, Kolfe, from the low achievers, has the largest number of class size. At the same time, Wondirad from the high scorer schools has the least number of class size.

As long as the sample schools taken on this study are identified by E.S.L.C.E and one year E.G.S.E.C.E, the passing score rates of both types of schools on E.S.L.C.E and E.G.S.E.C.E are presented on the following tables.

Table 7. High and Low Passing Rate Scorer Schools at E.S.L.C.E and E.G.S.C.E

No	Name of schools	1990			\bar{X} ; percenta ge of all schools	1991			\bar{X} % of all schools	1992			\bar{X} % of all school	1993			\bar{X} % School
		Sat for. Exam	GPA ≥2	Percent age of passed		Took Exam	GPA ≥2	Passe d %		T. Exam	GPA ≥2	Passed		T. Exam	GPA ≥2	Passe d %	
1	Yekatit 12 comp	1156	639	55.3	50.8	1050	464	44.2	33.3	1126	433	38.5	36.9	1276	554	43.4	37
2	Bole Secondary	564	507	89.9	50.8	1001	531	53	33.3	1388	691	49.8	36.9	1411	707	50.1	37
3	Wondirad	294	157	53.4	50.8	364	129	35.4	33.3	410	188	45.9	36.9	507	245	48.3	37
4	Higher 7	649	239	36.8	50.8	1009	203	18.3	33.3	925	212	22.9	36.9	951	268	28.2	37
5	Higher 12	341	125	36.6	50.8	381	109	28.6	33.3	445	106	23.8	36.9	693	171	24.7	37
6	Kolfe S/School	504	235	46.6	50.8	605	136	22.5	33.3	608	184	30.3	36.9	1302	246	18.9	37
1	Bole S.S	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1242	454	36.5	
2	Yekatit 12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1167	455	38.9	
3	Wondirad	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	672	224	33.3	28.5
1	Higher 7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1520	336	22.1	285
2	-Higher 12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	515	144	27.9	28.5
3	Kolfe S.S.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	904	160	17.6	28.5

NOTE. \bar{X} of all schools is calculated by summing the total percentage of passed students (GPA≥2.00 percentage) in all 25 schools, i.e $\bar{X} \% =$

$$\frac{P_1 + P_2 + P_3 \dots P_{25}}{25}, \text{ where } P_1 \text{ is stands for percentage of students scored GPA } \geq 2 \text{ in school one; } P_2 \text{ is for school two, } P_3 \text{ school three and so on.}$$

As indicated on table 7 the three low scorer schools have been constantly exhibiting low passing score rate in both type of National Exams, while the three high scorer schools have been exhibiting satisfactory achievement score as compared to the low scorers.

Therefore, the existence of differences in academic achievement among these school becomes quit clear. To strengthen the evidence of documents found from National Organization for Examination whether the above schools are low and high scores, structured interview was held with the school principals and educational officials. Hence the following tables show the responses of both subjects accordingly.

Table 8. Principals response on their schools status

Items	Low Scorer Schools			High Scorer School		
	Higher7	Higher12	Kolfe	Boles	Yek. 12	Wondirad
- Current status of your school	Least	Average	Least	Top	Top	Top

Table 9. Zone Officials (Educational Program Heads) Response about School Status in their Zones.

Items	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5
- Top scorer schools in zone	- Bole S.S - Wondirad S.S	- Yekatit 12 - Entoto Tvt. S.	- Addis Ketema - Medhanialeam
- Least scorer schools in zone	- Ginbot 20 S.S. - Nefas Selik S.S.	Higher 12 S.S.	- Higher 7 S.S.S - Kolfe Com. S.S.

As we can see from the above tables 8 and 9, Higher 7 and Kolfe Senior Secondary Schools principals have recognized as the status of their schools academic performance become least scorer, while Higher 12 Secondary School principal has recognized as being average.

The other three top scorers school directors have almost recognized the status of their schools as being top scorers compared to others.

On the same issue, the Zones' Educational Officials have been interviewed about schools that are top and least scorers at their zones. Hence, the three zones educational officials have stated that Higher 7, Higher 12 and Kolfe Comp. Secondary Schools as least scorer schools and Bole, Yekatit 12 and Wondirad as top scorers.

Table 10. Availability and Functionality of Some School Facilities and Equipment at low Scorer Schools (Observation Results)

Facilities	Availability						Functionality					
	Higher 7		Higher 12		Kolfe		Higher 7		Higher 12		Kolfe	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
School pedagogic center	√	-	√	-	√	-	-	√	-	√	-	√
Laboratory	-	√*	√	√*	√	-	-	√	-	√	-	√
Library	√	-	*√	-	√	-	√	-	√	-	√	-
Staff room and lockers	√	-	√	-	√	-	√	-	√	-	√	-
Typewriters	√	-	√	-	√	-	√	-	√	-	√	-
Duplicators	√	-	√	-	√	-	√	-	√	-	√	-

*¹ - refer the non - existence of laboratories in the year 1994 E.C.

According to the observation made in low scorer schools, the above stated facilities are more or less existing, but Higher 7 and 12 senior secondary schools have almost ceased to use laboratory as the result of transfer of the rooms to workshops for technical and vocational demonstrations.

On the other hand, the school pedagogic centers of these low scorer schools have almost ceased to be functional and operational in the current academic year.

Table 11. Availability and Functionality of some School Facilities and Equipment at High Scorer Schools. (Observation Results)

Facilities	Availability			Functionality		
	Bole	Yekatit 12	Wondirad	Bole	Yekatit 12	Wondirad
School pedagogic center	√	√	√	√	√	√
Laboratory	√	√	√	√	*√	*√
Library	√	√	√	√	√	*√
Staff room and lockers	√	√	√	√	√	√
Typewriters	√	√	√	√	√	√
Duplicators	√	√	√	√	√	√

* √- refers the functionality of the stated facility but not satisfactorily working.

As the above table indicates, all high scorer schools have nearly the above stated facilities, particularly the size of the libraries (reading rooms) except the inconvenience of library (reading room) of Wondirad School. Staff room facilities in all three schools and operation of laboratories in all three top scorer schools, particularly Chemistry laboratories, are appreciable in these schools more than the low scorer schools.

The students and teachers of these schools were also asked about the existence and functionality of the facilities through questionnaires, and the following response were found:

**Table 12. Availability of some school facilities at low scorer schools
(Teachers' and students' response)**

Facilities	Higher 7				Higher 12				Kolfe				Total Resp.			
	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%
Library	48	59.3	33	40.7	71	97.3	2	2.7	121	92.4	10	7.6	240	84.2	45	15.7
Pedagogic Centers	12	49	13	51	7	43.7	9	56.3	16	94.1	1	5.9	35	60.3	23	39.7
Reading rooms for teachers	4	16	21	84	1	6.3	15	93.7	2	11.8	15	88.2	7	12.1	51	87.9
Staff rooms and lockers	25	100	-	-	15	93.7	1	6.3	15	88.2	2	11.8	55	94.8	3	5.2

**Table 13. Operation of some school facilities at low scorer schools
(Teachers' and students' responses)**

Facilities	Higher 7				Higher 12				Kolfe				Total Resp.			
	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%
Library	8	9.8	73	90.2	71	87.6	2	12.3	49	37.4	82	62.6	128	44.9	157	55.1
Laboratories	6	7.4	75	92.6	2	12.3	71	87.6	7	5.3	124	94.7	15	5.2	270	94.8
Pedagogic center	16	64	9	36	0	-	16	100	0	-	17	100	16	27.5	42	72.5

**Table 14. Availability of some school facilities at high scorer schools
(Teachers and students responses)**

Facilities	Bole S.S.				Yekatit 12				Wondirad				Total Resp.			
	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%
Library	137	94.4	8	5.5	116	89.2	14	10.8	45	88.2	6	11.8	298	91.4	28	8.6
Pedagogic centers	22	91.7	2	8.3	21	91.3	2	8.7	16	100	-	100	59	93.6	6.4	6.4
Reading rooms for teachers	8	33.3	16	66.7	21	91.3	2	8.7	1	6.3	15	93.7	30	47.6	33	52.4
Staff-rooms and lockers	22	91.7	2	8.3	22	95.6	1	4.3	15	93.7	1	6.3	59	93.6	4	6.4

**Table 15. Functionality of some school facilities at high scorer schools
(Teachers and students responses)**

Facilities	Bole S.S.				Yekatit 12				Wondirad				Total Resp.			
	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%
Library	85	58.6	60	41.4	37	28.5	93	71.5	20	39.2	31	60.8	142	43.5	184	56.5
Laboratories	8	33.3	16	66.7	22	95.6	1	4.3	6	37.5	10	62.5	36	57.1	27	42.9
Pedagogic centers	16	66.7	8	33.3	16	69.6	7	30.4	9	56.2	7	43.7	41	65.1	22	34.9

Tables 12 and 13 show, all the low scorer schools have necessary facilities such as library, pedagogic centers and staff rooms for teachers, except the absence of reading rooms for teachers either in the library or else were.

Information from observation and interview held with the three low scorer schools librarians indicate that, teachers have no separate reading rooms and hence they only borrow books and take to their homes. If few teachers want to refer dictionaries and some reference books, which cannot be borrowed, they would use the librarians' chairs and desks, so that librarians have such critical problem to entertain teachers in the library.

Regarding the functionality of some of the school facilities such as library, laboratories and pedagogic centers, sample students of low scorer schools were asked through questionnaires. Almost all, that is 94.8% have replied the non - functionality of these facilities. Higher 7 and 12 secondary schools have almost closed laboratory sections and turned to workshops for vocational and Technical training. Kolfe Comp. secondary school has never used laboratory sections for demonstration. As the interview held with the principal of the school on the reason why they have never used laboratories, he responded that they have problem of skilled manpower who could make laboratory experiment.

On the other hand, the high scorer schools do have all the above facilities, i.e., library, pedagogic centers, and staff rooms for teachers. Reading room for teachers is also available at Yekatit 12 comp. secondary school's library. As tables 14 and 15 indicate, eight teachers from 23 respondents have affirmatively responded the existence of reading rooms in Bole senior secondary schools; and only one teacher from 16 teachers at Wondirad senior secondary school responded affirmatively.

As the observation and interview held with the librarians of these high scorer schools indicated, Yekatit 12 has separate reading rooms for teachers, and Bole senior

Secondary School has large library where it could accommodate teachers who need to read though there is no separate reading rooms for teachers. The other high scorer school, Wondirad, has no adequate sized library which accommodates teachers and students or separate reading rooms for teachers. But as compared to low scorer schools, these schools are in a better position regarding facilities for teachers.

Regarding the provision of Education materials such as guide lines, stationery materials, reference books and others to teachers, some items have been forwarded to teachers themselves and the following responses were obtained.

Table 16. Status of Educational Materials Provision to Teachers

A) At high scorer schools

Facilities	Bole S.S.				Yekatit 12				Wondirad				Total Resp.			
	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%
- Sufficiency of reference books provision to teachers	6	2.5	18	7.5	4	17.4	19	82.6	4	25	12	75	14	22.2	49	77.8
- Stationery materials provision	2	8.3	22	91.7	3	13.4	20	86.9	0	-	16	100	5	7.9	58	92.1
- Provision of Teachers guide and supportive manual for teaching	15	62.5	9	37.5	18	78.2	5	21.7	14	87.5	2	12.5	47	74.6	16	25.4
- Provision of chemicals laboratory equipment	10	41.7	14	58.3	1	4.3	22	95.6	0	-	16	100	11	17.4	52	82.6
- Provision of readymade teaching aids (such as maps, globes)	9	37.5	15	62.5	12	52.2	11	47.8	4	25	12	75	25	39.9	38	60.1

B) At low scorer schools

Facilities	Higher 7				Higher 12				Kolfe				Total Resp.			
	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%
- Sufficiency of reference books provision to teachers	4	16	21	84	3	17.6	14	82.3	3	18.7	13	81.2	10	17.2	48	82.8
- Stationery materials provision	1	4	24	96	2	11.8	15	88.2	1	6.2	15	93.7	4	6.8	54	93.2
- Provision of Teachers guide and supportive manuals for teaching	13	52	12	48	9	52.9	18	47.5	9	56.2	7	43.7	31	53.4	27	46.6
- Provision of chemicals laboratory equipment	2	8	23	92	1	5.9	16	94.1	3	18.7	13	81.2	6	10.3	27	89.7
- Provision of readymade teaching aids (such as maps, globes)	7	28	18	72	3	17.6	14	82.3	3	18.7	13	81.2	13	22.4	45	77.6

As it can be observed in Table 18, both school types are not appreciable in terms of provision of reference books, stationery materials for teachers, chemicals for laboratory demonstration and some ready-made teaching aids. But when compared to each other, the high scorer schools are relatively better than the low of scorer in providing these materials to teachers. Particularly, the high scorer schools provide teachers guide and supportive manuals to teachers than low achiever schools.

In addition to questionnaires, observation was held in both types of schools' laboratories. Findings show that the high scorer schools, though they do not have sufficient chemicals to make exhaustive experiment, use the laboratory as much as possible and demonstrate few experiments. This situation has been observed in Chemistry class at Bole senior secondary school and on the same subject at Yekatit 12 Comp. Secondary School. On the contrary, the low scorer schools do not often use laboratories for demonstration and so they do not worry for chemicals provision.

In addition to this, the high scorer schools, particularly Wondirad secondary school, provides ready-made teaching aids such as different up to date African and world maps. Similarly, Bole and Yekatit 12 have some ready-made teaching aids in their pedagogic centers, though not as such appreciable. Beside to this, Wondirad secondary school has assigned a full-time worker, who once had been a geography teacher, as a pedagogic center co-coordinator and hence he devotes his full-time there. Yekatit 12 secondary school too, has such worker who is highly responsible for the activities of the center.

The low scorer schools seem that they do not give attention to these centers. Their centers have no ready-made teaching aids bought for teachers use. Let alone the purchase of ready made teaching aids, the centers were not opened and so I didn't observe either teachers or students using the centers in my duration for at three weeks to collect data from these schools.

In addition to the above facility provision, the status of the usual teaching materials (chalk-board) and the convenience of class size to make teaching and learning were responded by teachers and students through questionnaires. The following table shows the findings obtained.

Table 17. Status of Chalck -board, and Class Size

Items	Low Scorer Schools			Total	%	High Scorer Schools			Total	%
	Higher 7	Higher 12	Kolfe			Bole	Yekatit 12	Wondirad		
- The current status of chalck board										
A. Very good	-	2	2	4	6.8	2	1	2	5	7.9
B. Good	21	14	12	47	81	8	11	13	32	50.1
C. Poor	4	1	2	7	12.0	14	11	1	26	4
Total	25	17	16	58	100	24	23	16	63	100
- Notice, display and chalck boards condition in the school										
A. Old and worn to use	4	10	7	21	7.4	14	9	-	23	7.1
B. Though not worn, not good and convenient to use	5	4	13	22	7.8	28	36	12	76	23.3
C. Not old and as well-convenient and comfortable to use	70	59	108	237	84.1	103	85	39	227	69.6
Total	79	73	128	282	100	145	130	51	326	100
- Conduciveness of class size for teaching learning processes										
A. It is crowded & so difficult to attend class properly	26	26	41	93	32.6	33	60	16	109	33.4
B. It is not crowded and so not difficult to attend class	20	14	45	79	27.7	42	22	14	78	23.9
C. Though it is crowded not difficult to attend	35	33	45	113	39.6	70	47	21	138	42.3
Total	81	73	131	285	100	145	129	51	325	100

To know whether the status of the chalk-board and the size of the class are conducive or not for the teaching learning process, both teachers and students were asked to complete the questionnaires. The results in table 19 indicate that concerning the status of the chalk board, 12% of the low scorer teachers have responded as very poor, and only 6.8% of the respondents have responded that these teaching materials are found on very good position. Since 81% of these low scorer schools have responded as these teaching materials are found at good condition, teachers have little difficulty in using the chalk-board and writing notes for students.

In addition to the issues raised on teachers' questionnaire, similar issues were raised to students whether they have inconvenience on these teaching materials. Accordingly, only 7.3% of the total respondents of low scorer school students have responded that the chalk-boards are old, worn and difficult to copy texts written on. Of the total respondents, 84.1% of them have responded that the chalk boards are found in well and convenient conditions, and so not difficult to copy and write notes from them.

Similarly, 7.1% of the high scorer school students have responded that the chalk boards of the schools are old and worn so, it is difficult to copy whatever are written on. On the other hand, 69.6% of the high scorer school students have responded that the chalk-boards are not old and worn, so they are convenient and conducive to copy whatever teachers write on. Although significant percent of the responses have rated the chalk-board status as good, the low scorer schools' chalk-boards are found better than that of the high achievers.

In terms of the appropriateness and conduciveness of class size to teach and to learn, teachers and students have been asked questions through questionnaire.

As the responses of students from the low scorer school students show, 32.6% have evaluated the class size as crowded and so difficult to attend lessons, while 39.6% have evaluated as crowded but not as such difficult to learn. Nonetheless, the

responses of the students show that the class size is being crowded in these low scorer schools.

Similarly, 33.4% of the students' responses from the high scorer schools have shown that the class size is crowded and so difficult to attend lessons, while 42.3% of the respondents have also assured its crowdedness though the later respondents confirm the non-difficulty of attending class in such size. Generally, when one compares the situation of class size in both types of schools, the high achiever schools' class size are higher than the low scorer schools, and hence it might not contribute to differences observed in students' achievement among the high and low scorer schools.

In addition to the findings obtained from the questionnaire, the status of some facilities such as chalk-board, the size of the classrooms, doors, windows, teachers' tables and chairs etc., have been observed during the class observation. Therefore, the researcher would like to put the condition of class room observations made in all six schools by the following table for clarity purpose.

Table 18.

Conditions of Class rooms Facilities

Items	Higher 7		Higher 12		Kolfe		Total Resp.		Bole		Yekatit 12		Wondirad		Total Resp.	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
- The size and quality of the chalk-board																
A. V. good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	55.5	-	-	-	-	5	18.5
B. Good	5	55.5	8	88.8	6	66.6	19	70.3	3	33.3	4	44.4	5	55.6	12	44.4
C. Poor	4	44.5	1	11.2	3	33.4	8	29.6	1	11.1	5	55.6	4	44.4	10	37.03
Total	9	100	9	100	9	100	27	100	9	100	9	100	9	100	27	100
- Class room space in terms of its adequacy																
A. Very good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	33.3	3	11.1
B. Good	3	33.3	6	66.6	4	44.4	13	48.1	3	33.3	2	22.2	4	44.4	9	33.3
C. Poor	6	66.7	3	33.4	5	55.5	14	51.9	6	66.7	7	77.8	2	22.2	15	55.5
Total	9	100	9	100	9	100	27	100	9	100	9	100	9	100	27	100
- Brightness of the classroom																
A. Very good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	100	-	-	9	100	18	66.7
B. Good	9	100	9	100	-	-	18	66.6	-	-	9	100	-	-	9	33.4
C. Poor	-	-	-	-	9	100	9	33.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	9	100	9	100	100	100	27	100	9	100	9	100	9	100	27	100
- Adequacy and condition of students seat																
A. Very good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	100	9	33.3
B. Good	-	-	9	100	9	100	18	66.6	9	100	9	100	-	-	18	66.7
C. Poor	9	100	-	-	-	-	9	33.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	9	100	9	100	9	100	27	100	9	100	9	100	9	100	27	100
- Condition Notice/display board in the class																
A. Very good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
B. Good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
C. Poor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
D. Unavailable	9	100	9	100	9	100	27	100	9	100	9	100	9	100	27	100
Total	9	100	9	100	9	100	27	100	9	100	9	100	9	100	27	100

- Condition of doors	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
A. Very good	9	100	9	100	4	44.5	22	81.5	9	100	3	33.3	9	100	21	77.8
B. Good	-	-	-	-	5	55.5	5	18.5	-	-	6	66.7	-	-	6	22.2
C. Poor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	9	100	9	100	9	100	27	100	9	100	9	100	9	100	27	100
- Condition of windows	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
A. Very good	9	100	9	100	9	100	27	100	9	100	9	100	9	100	27	100
B. Good Continued	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
C. Poor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	9	100	9	100	9	100	27	100	9	100	9	100	100	100	27	-
- Condition of teachers tables & chairs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
A. Very good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
B. Good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	44.5	-	-	4	14.8
C. Poor	-	-	9	100	-	-	9	33.3	-	-	5	55.5	9	100	14	51.8
D. Unavailable	9	100	-	-	9	100	18	66.7	9	100	-	-	-	-	9	33.3
Total	9	100	9	100	9	100	27	100	9	100	9	100	9	100	27	100

Note: Number in columns indicates, total number of each condition stated by letter for each item out of nine class observations made in each school.

As we can observe in Table 20, three subjects namely English, Maths and Biology classes of grade 12 have been observed. To be able and generalize the different classrooms' interaction and to see whether classroom facilities status vary or not from class room to classroom, each of the above subject teacher of a given school has been observed three times in different sections. Hence, nine observation periods were made in each school. Thus, a total of 27 observations were made in each type of schools, following similar procedures at low and high scorer schools. During class observation periods the class rooms facilities and actual classrooms interaction were observed.

Therefore, based on the focus of observation, the status of chalk-board i.e. (its smoothness, comfort and size) in 19 sections of the low scorer schools were found good, while 8 sections or 29.6% of these schools' chalk-boards status were found poor.

On the other hand, at 10 (37.03%) of the 27 class observations of the higher scorer schools, the status of the chalk boards was found to be poor, while 12 and 5 sections, i.e (44.4% and 18.5%) have been found at good and very good status. Generally as observations made on both type of schools indicate, the low scorer schools are better in terms of the status of chalk-board than high scorer.

In the same way, of the 27 different classes where observations made, 14 (51.8%) of the low scorer school classes have proved to be crowded, while 15(55.5%) of the high scorer school classes were indicating this condition.

In both types of schools, class size is found on poor status (highly crowded) according the E.S.D.P plan to make the class size at 40 in each section at this level. However, we can observe that low scorer schools are better than high scorer schools as compared to each other for this study.

In terms of brightness of the classes the low scorer schools themselves vary from school to school. Nine (33.3%) of the 27 sections in low scorer schools (particularly Kolfe, as the windows of the classes are painted by yellow color) become dark in convenient and un comfortable for teaching and learning activities, whereas the high scorer schools are found at good conditions in such regards.

Regarding students' seats, one of the low scorer schools (Higher 7 S.S.S) is found at poor conditions, while two of them are good at such facilities. The high scorer schools are all at good status on adequacy and comforts of students seat. Generally, high scorer schools are better than low scorer school at students seats and their adequacy.

All low and high scorer schools sections where observations were made have no display boards. Although the color that is painted on the windows of the low and high scorer schools differ in making the classes bright, both type of schools have unbroken and well-formed windows.

Although one of the low scorer schools has chairs and tables for teachers in each class, they are not comfortable and well protected. Hence, it is possible to say that such facilities are not adequately available in low scorer schools. On the other hand, two of the high scorer schools do have such facilities. Therefore, high scorer schools do have such facilities. Therefore, high scorer schools are more or less better than low scorer schools in such regards.

In addition to questionnaires and observations made in both types of schools about the conditions of class size, the five years class size of each grade in each school i.e. (1990 E.C - 1994 E.C) has been inspected and stated averagely from documents and is indicated in the following table in average form.

Table 19. Class Size of both Types of Schools (1990 – 1994).

High Scorer Schools	Years	GRADES				Low Scorer Schools	GRADES			
		9	10	11	12		9	10	11	12
Bole Senior Secondary School	1990 E.C	77	70	76	69	Higher 12 Comp. Secondary School	76	59	57	46
	1991 E.C	76	70	72	59		75	71	68	50
	1992 E.C	75	77	71	75		79	79	74	53
	1993 E.C	79	110	102	75		64	69	79	60
	1994 E.C	76	72	65	75		94	68	-	71
Yekatit Comp. Secondary School	1990 E.C	79	79	73	73	Higher 7 Senior Secondary School	76	75	70	70
	1991 E.C	79	79	75	75		71	74	71	70
	1992 E.C	77	80	80	80		28	78	77	65
	1993 E.C	82	59	93	8		86	85	82	70
	1994 E.C	102	90	93	102		-	98	-	86
Wondirad Senior Secondary School	1990 E.C	72	75	70	65	Kolfe Secondary School	70	76	70	68
	1991 E.C	70	70	72	60		75	78	76	74
	1992 E.C	70	72	75	62		80	80	80	77
	1993 E.C	72	70	70	65		86	80	78	76
	1994 E.C	70	96	60	96		80	78	45	76

As we can observe from the findings obtained from document inspection, the high scorer school (Yekatit 12 comp. secondary school) had the highest number of students in grade 9 and 10, i.e. 79 students in 1990 E.C. The smallest number of students in a class during 1990 E.C. was registered by Wondirad secondary school grade 12 i.e, 65 students in a class.

On the same year, i.e., 1990 E.C, Higher 7 and Higher 12 S.S.S schools had the highest number of students in grade 9, i.e. 76 students in a class. The smallest number of students was 46 at Higher 12 Secondary School in 1990 E.C. Hence, when these numbers are compared, the high scorer schools had more students in a class in the year 1990 than the low scorer schools.

In the consecutive years, i.e. 1991, 1992, 1993 and 1994, the highest number of class size in high scorer schools was 79,80,110, and 102 respectively. In similar years, the

smallest number of student in a class at high scorer schools was 59,62,59 and 39 respectively.

On the other hand, the low scorer schools had 78,80,86 and has 98 students in a class in the year 1991,1992,1993, and 1994 E.C. respectively. These schools had 50,53,60 and 45 students as the smallest number in the years mentioned above.

Generally, when we take the highest and smallest number of students as parameter of class size, the high scorer schools have been entertaining many students in a class averagely. Therefore, according to this study (considering only the sample schools) students academic achievement is inversely related with class size.

Even though some school facilities have no as such great impact on the teaching-learning process, it is believed that they could have some impact and hence systematic observations were made on the following facilities.

Table 20. General School Facility

Items	Low scorer School			High scorer School		
	Higher 7	Higher 12	Kolfe	Bole	Yekatit 12	Wondirad
- Toilet rooms for students						
A. Available and Functional	-	√	-	√	√	√
B. Available but not properly functioning	√	-	√	-	-	-
C. Not available	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Toilet rooms for teachers						
A. Available and functional	-	√	-	√	√	√
B. Available not functional	√	-	√	-	-	-
C. Not available	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Water						
A. Available	√	√	√	√	√	√
B. Not available	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Students lounge						
A. Available	-	-	-	-	-	-
B. not available	√	√	√	√	√	√
- Teachers' lounge						

A. available and comfortable	-	-	√	√	√	√
B. available not comfortable	√	√	-	-	-	-
- Extra-curricular clubs						
A. available and functional	√	√	√	√	√	√
B. available but not functional	-	-	-	-	-	-
C. not available	-	-	-	-	-	-
- School fences						
A. Available and well built	-	√	-	√	√	√
B. Available but not well-built	√	-	√	-	-	-
C. Not available	-	-	-	-	-	-

The results in Table 22 show, although both types of schools have students' toilet rooms, except Higher 12 Secondary School, the low scorer schools have no well-protected and properly functioning toilets. On the other hand, high scorer schools do have such toilets that are well-protected and properly functioning.

Teachers of both schools have toilet rooms, but as compared to each other high scorer schools do have teachers toilet rooms that are well - protected and well-serving to that of the low scorer, excluding higher 12 secondary school.

Water and student lounges exist in both type of schools, student lounges are not comfortable in all schools where observations were undertaken.

In terms of teachers' lounge, high scorer schools do have well-facilitated and well-serving lounges. Even though the low scorer schools have lounges for teachers, they are not well-facilitated and attractive to teachers to spend their spare time there.

According to document inspection and interview held with deputy directors of both types of schools, all schools have more than 12 functional clubs. Particularly, higher 12 senior secondary schools has about 23 clubs.

Regarding school fences, high scorer schools do have well-constructed and well built fences, except Wondirad which has a problem on such matter. The low scorer schools except Higher 12 Secondary Schools have no well-constructed and well-built fences. As an eye witness, I observed while students of Kolfe and Higher 7 Senior Secondary

Schools were jumping over the fences to leave or to get into the campuses. Therefore, in terms of fences, the high scorer schools are far better than low scorer schools.

In addition to the above type of facilities, the sources of finance of each school have been investigated by interview held with vice directors of each school. Accordingly, the following results are obtained.

Table 21. Sources of School Finance

Sources	Low Scorer Schools			High Scorer Schools		
	Higher 7	Higher 12	Kolfe	Bole	Yekatit 12	Wondirad
- Government allocated finance						
A. adequate	-	-	-	-	-	-
B. not adequate	√	√	√	√	√	√
C. no budget all	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Income from sale of trees and grass						
A. Significant amount	-	-	-	-	-	-
B. Insignificant amount	√	√	√	√	√	√
C. No fund from such sources	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Subsidy from night school						
A. much/sizable	-	-	-	√	√	√
B. little	√	√	-	-	-	-
C. unavailable	-	-	√	-	-	-
- Issuance of transcript and I.D.						
A. Yes	√	√	√	√	√	√
B. No	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Students registration fee						
A. Yes	√	√	√	√	√	√
B. No	-	-	-	-	-	-

The results reveal that both types of schools have fixed amount of budget assigned to schools from government. Although the amount is not as such significant, both types of schools get finance either from the sale of trees or grass, issuance of transcripts and I.D. cards, and registration fees collected from students of senior classes at the beginning of the year.

On the other hand, differences have been concluded from the interview held with school directors that higher scorer schools have sizable and significant amount of finance that flows from night school share to run the school activities. Since the low scorer schools do have few students as compared to high scorer schools in the night division, the share that goes to school is very limited and little. Surprisingly enough one of the low scorer school, i.e, (Kolfe) has no finance that goes to school use from night section as it doesn't give night lesson in its own school compound as the result of the school's distance from the center.

Therefore, since the high scorer schools are at better position in getting income from the extension division programme, they are found at good conditions in providing some facilities for school teaching-learning purposes as compared to the low scorer schools.

Table 22. Text-books Provision Ratio at 1:1 and 1:2 by Subjects at both type of schools. (Students respons)

Subject	Higher 7		Higher 12		Kolfe		Total		Bole		Yekatit 12		Wondirad		Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Amharic	15	18.5	67	91.8	54	41.2	136	47.7	85	58.6	70	53.8	51	100	216	66.2
English	15	18.5	67	91.8	54	41.2	136	47.7	85	58.6	70	53.8	51	100	216	66.2
Maths	15	18.5	52	64.2	39	29.8	106	37.2	92	63.4	70	53.8	40	78.4	202	61.9
Biology	12	14.8	55	67.9	27	20.6	94	32.9	95	65.5	70	53.8	45	88.2	210	64.4
Chemistry	12	14.8	55	67.9	27	20.6	94	32.9	95	65.5	70	53.8	45	88.2	210	64.4
Physics	12	14.8	55	67.9	27	20.6	94	32.9	95	65.5	70	53.8	45	88.2	210	64.4

As in Table 22, indicates text-book provision ratio at 1:1 and 1:2 for the above subjects are not appreciable at low scorer schools as that high scorers. Of the total 285 respondents of low scorer schools, only 136 responses have indicated that they got Amharic and English by 1:1 and 1:2 ratio. While this situation is observed at high achiever schools, a total of 216 responses (66.2%) have pointed out that they got by 1:1 and 1:2 ratio in the above subjects.

In essence, when we investigate the text book ratio in above subjects', the high scorer schools are at better condition than the lower scorer schools, and hence students learning

at high scorer schools have more opportunity to use text-books than the low scorer schools.

Table 23. Text-books provision ratio at 1:3 and above at both type of schools
(Students response)

Subjects	Higher 7		Higher 12		Kolfe		Total		Bole		Yekatit 12		Wondirad		Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Amharic	66	81.5	6	8.2	77	58.8	149	52.2	60	41.3	60	46.1	-	-	120	36.8
English	66	81.5	6	8.2	77	58.8	149	52.2	60	41.3	60	46.1	-	-	120	36.8
Maths	66	81.5	21	28.8	92	70.2	179	62.8	53	36.5	60	46.1	11	21.6	124	38.0
Biology	69	85.2	18	24.6	104	79.4	191	67.0	50	34.4	60	46.1	6	11.8	116	35.5
Chemistry	69	85.2	18	24.6	104	79.4	191	67.0	50	34.4	60	46.1	6	11.8	116	35.5
Physics	69	85.2	18	24.6	104	79.4	191	67.0	50	34.4	60	46.1	6	11.8	116	35.5

In addition to the above 1:1 and 1:2 text-book provision ratio, items have been raised on students' questionnaires to know text-book provision ratio distributed for 1:3 and above. Accordingly, a total of students ranging from 149-191 from the total of 285 respondents have reacted that they got a book on any of the above subjects 1:3 and above. While a total of students ranging from 116 - 124 from the total of 326 respondents are responded as they got a book on any of the above subjects 1:3 and above.

Generally, when we conclude the text-books provision ratio system based on students' questionnaire, the high scorer schools are better than the low- scorer schools and students do have better opportunity to read and do exercises at high scorer schools than the low scorer which in turn might be reflected on academic achievement of students.

To know whether the text provision ratio that has been indicated by students is also currently observed at both schools, document inspection was made at all the three low scorer and at two of the high scorer schools. Since the store-keeper of Bole Secondary School was sick and his son was substituting him till the person comes, the son of the store keeper refused to show documents and, therefore; text-books provision ratio of this school for the last four years could not be found. On the other hand, the five schools text-provision ratio's is indicated on the following ways from documents.

Table 24. Books Distribution Ratio of Both Type of Schools
(1990 - 1994 E.C)

Low Scorer Schools	Years	English			Maths			Bio.									
		English	Maths	Bio.	English	Maths	Bio.	English	Maths	Bio.							

Higher 7 Senior Secondary School	1990	1:3	1:3	1:3	Yekatit 12 Comp. Secondary School	1990	1:3	1:3	1:3
	1991	1:3	1:3	1:3		1991	1:2	1:2	1:2
	1992	1:3	1:3	1:3		1992	1:2	1:2	1:2
	1993	1:2	1:3	1:3		1993	1:2	1:3	1:1
	1994	1:3	1:3	1:1		1994	1:1	1:1	1:1
Higher 12 Secondary School	1990	1:2	1:2	1:3	Wondirad Secondary School	1990	1:1	1:2	1:3
	1991	1:2	1:3	1:3		1991	1:1	1:2	1:1
	1992	1:2	1:1	1:2		1992	1:1	1:1	1:1
	1993	1:2	1:2	1:1		1993	1:1	1:1	1:1
	1994	1:2	1:1	1:1		1994	1:1	1:1	1:1
Kolfe Comp. Secondary School	1990	1:3	1:3	1:3	Bole Secondary School	1990	-	-	-
	1991	1:2	1:2	1:2		1991	-	-	-
	1992	1:3	1:3	1:3		1992	-	-	-
	1993	1:2	1:3	1:2		1993	-	-	-
	1994	1:2	1:2	1:3		1994	-	-	-

As we can observe from the above table 26, five years documents have been seen on 3 subjects English, Maths and Biology. Two of the three subjects were selected purposely, English is taken as it represents language, Biology is taken as it represents Science; and finally Maths is taken by selecting randomly from the remaining subjects. Accordingly, at low scorer schools books have been mostly given at 1:3, particularly Higher 7 and Kolfe demonstrate this reality. On the other hand, Wondirad from high scorer schools has been providing books mostly on 1:1 bases. Therefore, high scorer schools seem better than low scorer schools in terms of books distribution ratio. Hopefully, this situation could bring differences in academic achievement among both type of schools.

In addition to the investigation made to know about the various school facilities through teachers and students questionnaires, this paper tried to investigate the responses of 6 school principals (i.e. 3 from low scorers and 3 from high scorer, and three education programme heads (i.e. head of education programme of Zone 3, Zone 4 and Zone 5). At the same time, the high and low scorer principals have been interviewed the existence, adequacy and timely distribution of some school facilities in their schools. Accordingly, the responses obtained from the principals have been kept on the following ways.

Table 25. Principal Responses about Some School Facilities

Items	Low scorer			High scorer		
	Higher 7	Higher 12	Kolfe	Bole	Yekatit 12	Wondirad

	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
- Availability of budget assigned to schools	√	–	√	–	√	–	√	–	√	–	√	–
- Sufficiency of the budget	–	√	√	–	–	√	–	√	–	√	–	√
- Sufficiency of reading materials for teachers	–	√	–	√	√	–	√	–	*√	–	*√	–
- Do students get text on time?	–	√	√	–	–	√	√	–	√	–	√	–

As we can observe from the above table 25, all government schools have fixed budget assigned from Education Office, but almost all schools except Higher 12 principal have pointed the inadequacy of the budget. Therefore, both type of schools are not as such vary in terms of budget allocation from Education Offices. The zones educational officials were interviewed regarding this issue and, hence they affirmatively pointed the existence of fixed budget, and they also stated the inadequacy, but schools they said, "should generate internal income sources to fill the gaps".

Regarding the existence of reading materials, two low scorer principals stated as they do have insufficient reading materials, while the three high scorer schools positively stated the existence of reading materials for teachers and students, however, these materials are few. Hence, the high scorer schools are found at better position in terms of reading materials and references than low scorer. Therefore, it is possible to say that high scorer school students could have boosted their academic performance more than the low scorer school students due to such gaps between the schools.

Table 26. Distribution of Text-books and Library Borrowing System

Items	Higher 7		Higher 12		Kolfe		Total		Bole		Yekatit 12		Wondirad		Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Time of books distribution by schools																
A. Often on time	33	40.7	11	15.1	3	2.3	47	16.4	45	31.0	25	19.2	10	19.6	80	24.5
B. Some times they delay	33	40.7	52	71.2	44	33.6	129	45.2	76	52.4	81	62.3	39	76.4	196	60.1
C. Never distribute on time	12	14.8	10	13.7	84	64.1	106	37.1	14	9.6	24	18.5	2	3.9	40	12.3
Length of books borrowing system by library																
A. One day only	4	4.9	19	26.0	6	4.6	29	10.2	25	17.2	5	3.8	5	9.8	35	10.7
B. Two days one	12	14.8	9	12.3	11.7	89.3	138	48.4	95	65.5	7	5.4	35	68.6	137	42.0
C. More than a week	5	6.2	2	2.7	3	2.3	10	3.5	6	4.1	8	6.2	5	9.8	19	5.8
D. Never borrows	57	70.4	43	58.9	5	3.8	105	36.8	19	13.1	106	73.1	6	11.8	131	40.2

As we can see from the responses of the students, low scorer schools often do not distribute books on time. They either delay or never distribute, but as the high scorer schools students responses indicate, these schools distribute either on time or delay. Hence, the fast actions of the high scorer schools in terms of letting students get books in time is better than the low scorer schools. But, Higher 7 S.S. in such regards is appreciable separately to that of others.

Although a limited variation exists on length of time in borrowing books among high and low scorer schools, both type of schools mostly borrow books for two days duration. Hence, this limited variation of response among low and high scorer schools does not as such bring achievement differences among both type of schools. On the other hand, an interview was held with each school's librarians to know the system of borrowing reference books for students. Accordingly, almost both type (high and low) scorer schools borrow books for two days, except Yekatit 12 Comp. Secondary Schools which borrows books for a week for a twelfth grade students.

4.3 Characteristics of School Management Bodies

Any planned activity can not be accomplished without a body or an organ which coordinate, plan, organize and direct the activity concerned. The same is true that, teaching-learning process can not reach it goal without school management bodies who are responsible for leading the school affairs.

Therefore, qualities of principals such as qualification, areas (subjects) of qualification, experiences, human-relationship (cooperativeness to teachers' request, discussion with teachers and school personnel about school affairs etc) are investigated through questionnaires distributed to teachers and interviews held with the principals themselves .

Table 27. Background of Booth types of Schools Principals and Schools Conditions

Items	Low Scorer School			High Scorer School		
	Higher 7	Higher 12	Kolfe	Bole	Yekatit 12	Wondirad
- Number of Students in 1994 E.C	*6324	*5578	5580	7398	5200	3434
- Number of teachers in the school	125	90	86	138	11	81
- Number of directors	3	3	4	4	4	3
- Educational Background						
1. Director	1st Degree	1st Degree	1st Degree	1st Degree	1st Degree	1st Degree
2. Deputy Director	1st Degree	1st Degree	1st Degree	1st Degree	1st Degree	1st Degree
3. Deputy Director	1st Degree	1st Degree	1st Degree	1st Degree	1st Degree	1st Degree
4. Deputy Director	-	-	1st Degree	1st Degree	2nd Degree	-
- Subjects of qualification						
1. Director	Biology	Ed. Adm	Maths	Amharic	Sociology	Chemistry
2. Deputy Director	English	Ed. Adm	English	Amharic	Ed. adm.	Pedagogics
3. Deputy director	Geography	Ed. Adm	Ed. Adm.	Geography	Ed. Adm.	Amharic
4. Deputy Director	-	-	Ed. Adm.	Maths	Maths	-

* indicates the total number of students who are enrolled as TVT trainers at 10+1 and 10+2, including the grade 10 and 12 who took national exams.

As we can observe from the above table, three of the low scorer schools have large number of students as compared to the high scorer schools except Bole Secondary School. Hence, when we calculate student principal ratio, we get 2108, 1859, and 1395 for low scorer schools, while the high scorers ratio would be 1849, 1300, and 1144. When we consider the burden of work each principal of the school has, leaving other technical aspects of management, the low scorer schools' principals have the greater ratio than high scorer schools'. Therefore, it has an impact in following school activities due to the size of the school which in turn have brought low achievement by the schools. As the interview held with both type of schools academic areas director, the low scorer school's directors were highly stressing the workload existing in the schools more than the high scorers' principals' stress.

Regarding Educational qualification of both type of school principals, almost all directors are graduates which first degree. Therefore, there is no difference between the two type of schools in this matter.

It has been pointed by the teachers for the cause of low achievement of students as the results of inappropriate type of qualification of the principals to the job. Hence, many teachers have the beliefs that principals who are graduates from Educational Administration and similar areas should take the position. But when we observe from the above table, five of the low scorer schools' principals are graduates of school administration, while only two of the high scorer schools principals are graduates of school administration. Hence, principals areas qualification (fields) of do not influence students academic performance.

Though the background, i.e. educational qualification, experiences and others pertinent to the principals qualities are thought as some of the factors which affect the managerial performance of the directors, there could be different factors which affect principals managerial efforts. Therefore, unstructured interview was held with each

school deputy directors who are in charge of academic areas to know the problems they faced in running the schools. So, the following problem areas indicated by the principals with various degree of emphasis.

Table 28. Principals Response about Problems Affecting their Managerial Functions.

Problems	Low Scorer School			High Scorer Schools		
	Higher 7	Higher 12	Kolfe	Bole	Yekatit 12	Wondirad
- Work load as result of students population	High	High	High	High	Average	Average
- Students disciplinary problems	High	High	*High	Low	Low	Low
- Wastage of instructional time as result of not assigning teachers on time by zone Edu. Offices	High	Average	*High	Low	Low	Low
- Lack of co-operation from community regarding school activities	High	Average	*High	Low	Low	Low

* Indicates the seriousness of the problem more than other schools that are indicated by the same word.

As we can see from table 28, the two low scorer schools, particularly Higher 7 and Higher 12 are led by three directors hence they blame for the workload existing more than the high scorer schools principals blame for. On the same issue, the low scorer school principals blame for students disciplinary problems existing in the schools more than high scorer school principals. As the researcher made unsystematic observation regarding the students disciplinary problems in both type of schools while the data collection process was going on, Kolfe Comp. Secondary school principals, guards of the schools, and policemen from near Woreda were watching the schools from some students who made serious trouble on the school teaching-learning processes before the researcher had arrived the school for data collection. As the interview held with the principal of the school, he stated that as they had serious students disciplinary problems and further pointed that as there were students who

smoke "Asheshe", so, the school was facing serious problem in running the smooth teaching-learning process.

The Higher 7 school principal also stressed the students disciplinary problems as one of the biggest factors which have made the school to be found in low scorer groups.

On the other hand, such serious problems are not found at high scorer schools. The principals stated that as the students' good behavior could have made them high scorer schools. Surprisingly , Wondirad secondary school principals said that they were proud of the good behavior of their students, in spite of the non-existence of one side fence at the back of the school, but still the school is being grouped as one of the high scorer schools of the region.

Wastage of instructional time as the result of not assigning teachers in substituting those who are transferred or leave the profession is a serious problem in low scorer schools more than high scorer. As the deputy director of each low scorer schools, particularly Kolfe and Higher 7 Secondary Schools stated, many teachers particularly who do have a lot of teaching experiences do not want to stay at the peripheral schools, and hence they often apply to zone education offices and get transfer. Zone education offices often do not substitute to teachers transferred on time. If they do, teachers do not immediately come as the result of the school's distance from the center and low night school income as compared to other schools found at the centers. According principals statements, even if they decide to come they do at last after loosing all possibilities of being working at the center. Kolfe Secondary school principals have said that in 1993 academic year, grade nine students were not learnt Chemistry due to such problem; and, therefore, forced to teach them at grade 10 through make-up classes and other compensation meanses.

On the other hand, the high scorer schools have very little problem regarding this issue and they are at better position, (even best) as compared to low scorer school. Hence,

this situation has greater impact on academic achievement of students, and then managerial activities of the principals.

Community co-operation of low scorer schools to school affairs are less than that of high scorer as the principals stated. Since the communities around (particularly Kolfe and Higher 7 S. Schools) are mostly giving attention to business activities rather than social activities, these schools lack community co-operation more than the high scorer schools. Therefore, directors have responded that such lack of co-operation affects the effort of the school principals to lead the schools and then it is finally reflected on students academic achievement.

In addition to the principals interview and personal observation, items that extract information /data/regarding the cooperativeness of the principals to teaching-learning process have been forwarded to teachers and students through questionnaires. Accordingly, the following table 28, shows the responses of teachers regarding the cooperativeness of the principals on various issues.

Table 29. Principals Responsiveness to Teachers' Requests

Items	Higher 7		Higher 12		Kolfe		Total		Bole		Yekatit 12		Wondirad		Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
-Cooperativeness in providing teaching materials.																
A. Yes	10	40	9	56.2	9	52.9	28	51.8	8	33.3	8	34.8	10	62.5	32	50.8
B. No	15	60	7	43.8	8	47.1	26	48.1	15	66.7	15	65.2	6	37.5	31	49.2
- Cooperativeness in arranging classes for make-up for teacher																
A. Usually	11	44	8	50	9	56.3	28	49.1	4	16.7	13	56.6	10	62.5	27	45
B. Sometimes	10	40	7	43.7	7	43.7	24	42.1	12	50	10	43.5	6	37.5	28	46.7
C. Not co-operative	4	16	1	6.3	-	-	5	8.8	5	20.8	-	-	-	-	3	8.3
- Cooperativeness in providing stationary materials to distribute hand outs and --- notes.																
A. usually	3	22	1	6.3	4	2.5	8	14.3	9	37.5	4	17.4	-	-	6	9.5
B. sometimes	11	44	5	31.2	6	37.5	22	39.2	8	33.3	9	39.1	6	37.5	23	36.5
C. never cooperate	11	44	10	62.5	5	31.2	36	46.4	4	16.7	10	43.5	10	62.5	34	53.9
- Cooperativeness in ----- students disciplene																
A. Very cooperative	5	20	5	31.5	7	43.7	17	28.8	9	37.5	5	21.7	10	62.5	24	38.1
B. Not cooperative	2	8	1	6.25	-	-	3	5.2	1	4.2	3	13.4	-	-	4	6.3
C. Not satisfactory	18	72	10	62.5	9	56.3	37	64.9	14	58.3	15	65.2	6	37.5	35	55.5
- Discussion with teachers on teaching-learning affairs																
A. Usually	5	20	3	18.8	7	43.7	15	26.3	6	25	5	21.7	5	31.2	16	25.4
B. Never	16	64	6	37.5	5	31.2	27	47.4	13	54.2	18	78.3	9	56.3	40	63.5
C. Sometimes	4	16	7	43.7	4	25	15	26.3	5	20.8	-	-	2	12.5	7	11.1

As shown on Table 29, the principals of low scorer schools seem more co-operative than the high scorer school principals in providing teaching materials on teacher request, even if the difference between the two schools, i.e. (51.8% and 50.8%) seem insignificant to say fully that low scorer school principals more co-operative than the high scorer schools.

Regarding the cooperativeness of the school administrators in arranging classes when teachers need to give make-up classes, both schools principals are almost co-operative and responsive.

In terms of material and equipment provision to distribute hand outs (notes) to students, the low scorer school principals have been found more co-operative than the high scorer schools. Therefore, academic achievement differences among both type of schools are not the result of such principal differences.

On the other hand, high scorer school principals are more co-operative than low scorer school principals in terms of maintaining students discipline in the schools. As table 29 shows, 38.1% of the high scorer teachers have responded as the school principals are very co-operative in such issue, while only 28.8% of the low scorer school principals responded as very co-operative.

Regarding discussion on teaching and learning affairs, i.e. about preparing lesson plans, arranging classes for make up when needed, and arranging time tables etc., the high scorer school principals are found better than low scorer school principals. As table 29 shows, a total of 73.7% low scorer school teachers (who responded principals often make and sometimes make discussion on Teaching-learning affairs) are less than that of 88.9% of high scorer school teachers (who responded principals often make and sometimes make discussion on teaching-learning affairs). Therefore, such responsiveness of the principals could have brought academic achievement differences among both type of schools.

Table 30. Cooperativeness and encouragements of students by principals of schools

Items	Higher 7		Higher 12		Kolfe		Total		Bole		Yekatit 12		Wondirad		Total		
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
- Cooperativeness of school administrators in arranging enrichment class on Saturdays and Sundays																	
A. arranges every year	30	37.0	39	53.4	30	22.9	99	36	89	61.4	75	57.7	35	68.6	199	61.8	
B. never arranges	35	43.2	27	36.9	62	47.3	124	45.1	36	24.8	29	22.3	3	5.9	68	21.1	
C. sometimes	11	13.6	6	8.2	35	26.7	52	18.9	20	13.8	22	16.9	13	25.5	55	17.1	
- The practice of providing incentives for students																	
A. It provides every year	3	3.7	7	9.6													
B. It provides sometimes	55	67.9	66	90.4	9	6.8	19	6.7	29	20	10	7.7	20	39.2	59	18	
C. Never provides	22	27.2	-	-	73	56.2	194	68.7	71	48.9	84	64.6	15	29.4	170	52.2	
					47	35.8	69	24.6	45	31.0	36	27.7	16	31.3	97	39	

As we can observe from table 30, the high scorer school administrators arrange classes for students at Saturday and Sunday to enrich students who are taking national exam. 61.8% of students responses of the high scorer schools indicate that the school administration are cooperative at arranging classes on Saturday and Sunday when the need arises. On the other hand, only 36% of low scorer schools students have responded as the schools arrange classes on the above dates.

The principals of the school were also interviewed whether they arrange enrichment classes for students on Saturday and Sunday. They replied that when the need arises and teachers raise request, because of inability of covering the grade syllabuses, the schools arrange classes. Besides to this, Wondirad Secondary School principal said that the school gates are often opened on Saturday and Sunday for students who need to use the classrooms and study in groups.

The low scorer school principals, on the other hand, stated that as they had never arranged classes on Saturday and Sunday because of the beliefs that students enrolled

in these schools give little attention to their lessons, and teachers themselves had never raised requests to cover curriculum on these days.

Zones educational officials were also interviewed what school factors have contributed to achievement differences among government secondary schools of the region. Two of the three zones educational officials have stated that giving enrichment classes by some school and not giving such additional classes by others could bring differences in students academic achievement among schools.

Table 31. School Principals Involvement in Academic Affairs

Items	Low scorer			Total Resp.	%	High scorer			Total Resp.	%
	H.7	H.12	Kolfe			Bole	Yek 12	Wo n.		
- Frequence of class observation by school administrators and head teachers										
A. usually	-	4	4	8	14.0	13	8	3	24	38.1
B. sometimes	16	12	11	39	68.4	11	12	12	35	55.5
C. not at all	9	-	1	10	17.5	-	3	1	4	6.3
- The existence of habits on discussing over what has been observed										
A. There is a habit	16	8	11	35	62.5	16	13	12	41	65.1
B. There is no habit	9	8	4	21	37.5	8	10	4	22	34.9
- Frequence of teachers and administrators discussion on - planning the lesson										
A. always	10	6	7	23	40.3	15	7	8	30	47.6
B. sometimes	7	5	6	18	31.6	4	6	6	16	25.4
C. never	8	5	3	16	28	5	10	2	17	26.9
- Students disciplinary problem										
A. Many times	7	5	5	17	29.8	10	13	11	38	60.3
B. Sometimes	16	10	8	34	59.6	10	7	5	22	34.9
C. Never	2	1	3	6	10.5	4	3	-	3	4.7
- Time table/ programme										
A. always	7	2	3	12	21.1	10	4	6	20	31.7
B. sometimes	11	11	11	33	57.9	10	11	10	31	49.2
C. never	7	3	2	12	21.0	4	8	-	12	19.0
- Extra-curricular activities										
A. always	1	1	2	4	7	3	2	5	10	15.8
B. sometimes	16	12	4	32	56.1	17	15	10	42	66.7
C. never	8	3	10	21	36.8	4	6	1	11	17.5

As we can observe from table 31, the high scorer schools principals frequently observe teachers while they teach to that of the low scorer schools principals do. When we add the responses of teachers who responded "usually" and "sometimes" the high scorer schools teachers responses would be 93.6% while the low scorer would be

82.4%. Therefore, such follow up of principals as whether proper classes are going on or not would hopefully encourage teachers and students, which in turn could be reflected on academic achievement differences of students among schools.

Regarding principals and Teachers discussion, the high scorer schools are found at better condition than low scorer 65.1% of the respondents have responded affirmatively for the item raised to know whether they make discussion with principals on what they have observed during class observation. The same is true that 62.5% of the low scorer school teacher have responded that as they make discussion with the principals regarding what principals have observed, if they conduct observation. Though, both schools teachers have the practice of discussing the observation result with principals, the high scorer schools practice seems more strong which in turn has a sort of influence to bring differences in academic achievement of students among schools.

The high scorer schools teacher are often make discussion with school principals about planning the lesson. 47.6% of teachers have responded that as they discuss over this issue. While only 40.3% low scorer school teachers have responded as they usually discuss on such affairs. Generally, when we add the affirmative answer of the high scorer schools, (i.e. 47.6% plus 25.4%) it would become 73%; while the affirmative answer of the low scorer schools would be 71.9%.

When we see issues regarding the disciplinary problem, the high scorer school principals and teachers discuss more than low scorers. 60.3 and 34.9 percents of high scorer school teachers have responded that as they always and sometimes discuss over this issue. As the whole when we add both percents, 95.2% have affirmatively responded as they discuss over issues regarding students disciplinary problem.

On the other hand, 29.8% and 59.6% of the low scorer school respondents have affirmatively responded as they discuss over disciplinary problem of students. Hence

the findings show us that, high scorer school principals give attention and are collaborative with teachers to maintain school discipline, which is believed to have impact on bringing academic differences among high and low scorer schools.

Regarding time table/programme and extra curricular activities, high scorer school principals have been found more strong than the low scorer in discussing with principals.

In addition to the above responses of teachers and students through questionnaires, principals themselves were interviewed about their regular duties. Hence, the following table shows the data extracted from the structured interview.

Table 32. Principals Responses about the School Practice and their Duties

Items	Low Scorers									High Scorers								
	Higher 7			Higher 12			Kolfe			Bole			Yekatit 12			Wondirad		
	Yes	No	%	Yes	No	%	Yes	No	%	Yes	No	%	Yes	No	%	Yes	No	%
- Do you often report what the school accomplished and its problems to zone educational office	6	-	100	6	-	100	6	-	100	6	-	100	6	-	100	6	-	100
- Do Zone Educational Officials react to school problem?	6	-	100	6	-	100	6	-	100	6	-	100	6	-	100	6	-	100
- The existence of norms in giving incentive for teachers exhibiting good results at their subjects	6	-	100	6	-	100	6	-	100	6	-	100	6	-	100	6	-	100
- The existence of norms in providing incentives for success for students each year	6	-	100	6	-	100	6	-	100	6	-	100	6	-	100	6	-	100

As shown on table 32, all schools (low and high scorer) often report what they have accomplished and the problem they have encountered to Zone Education Office, but the responsiveness of Zone Education Offices vary among schools. Zone 3, which supervises two of the high scorer schools, i.e. Bole and Wondirad is always react to school request on time, however, one of the high scorer schools, i.e. Yekatit 12 Comp. Secondary School has almost the same attention from Zone 4 Education Office as of the low scorer schools.

In terms of providing incentives for subject teachers who are exhibited good result at their subjects on national exams, both schools have never done so far. The same is true that both type of schools give incentive for students who show good achievement, except Yekatit 12.

4.4 Student Characteristics and School Background

Academic achievement could also be affected by the characteristics of students such as discipline, interest to learn and academic background leaving other economic and social factors in tact. Therefore, considering the class size of the government junior secondary schools high and in turn teaching-learning process of these schools are ineffective as compared to private, mission and some what public schools of the same status; the non-existence of sufficient facilities in government schools as compared to the above schools, and finally considering student teacher ratio is high at government junior schools, and the teacher-student individual help is less in government school, the entry background of the students have been assessed, thinking that they might be influence students academic achievement in some schools. Hence, the following feeder schoolsentry sources of each of the high and low scorer schools found from the Zone's Examination Division under Education Programme and presented in the Table 35.

Table 33. Feeder Schools of Both Type (High and Low Scorer) Schools.

Feeder Schools	Low Scorer			Feeder Schools	High Scorer		
	Higher 7	Higher 12	Kolfe		Bole	Yekatit 12	Wondirad
- Umer Semeter - Yekatit 23 J.S.S - Sefre-Selam - Keste Damena	Public Govt. Public Public	- - - -	- - - -	Bole Community Gedame Setawayan Fana J.S.S. Brehaneh Zare Ne	Public Mission Private Govt.	- - - -	- - - -
- Mazia 23 J.S.S - Mekane Hiwot J.S. - Hebret Frew J.S - Belay Zeleke J.S	- - - -	Govt. Govt. Govt. Public	- - - -	Betelehem J.S New Era J.S.S Nakute Abe	- - - -	Public Public Public Public	- - - -
- Kolfe J.S.S - Selam Bere - Yekatit 23 J.S - Ewekete Bewegne	- - - -	- - - -	Govt. Govt. Govt. Publi c	Wondirad J.S.S Karalo J.S.S Kotebe Kidane Meheret Brehane Hiwot	- - - -	- - - -	Govt. Govt. Private Private

As we can see from table 33, many of the low scorer school students are assigned from Government schools. Even though there are students who are assigned from public schools to these low scorer schools, they are not many as of the number of students assigned to high scorer schools from such type. As indicated above, from the 12 schools taken as feeders, 7 of them are government schools.

On the other hand, the high scorer schools get their students to grade nine mostly from public, private and some what from mission schools. Even if they take some students from government schools, they take less number. As the above table indicates, from the total of 11 schools indicated only 3 schools are government schools. As the interview held with zone 3,4 and 5 examination section heads, the academic achievement of students learning in the feeder schools of high scorer is much greater than the academic achievement of students learning in the feeder schools of low scorer schools, particularly at grade 8 National examination.

According to the interview held with heads of education programme of the three zones on issue what makes government secondary schools of Addis Ababa that have equal

status to be different in academic achievement of students, all the three heads emphasized that the existence of differences in feeder schools or the type of the schools students were learning before they assigned to each secondary school even if all students assigned to high and low scorer schools are students passed grade eight national exam.

Likewise as the interview held with the school principals, the low scorer principals are highly stressed the non-equivalence of students assigned to their schools and to the high scorer schools. The principals of these schools blame for academic performance of students assigned to them from government schools. According to the principals statement, 90% of their students are coming from government schools and hence their students could not have scored better achievement as compared to the high scorer in exams.

The same is true that the high scorer school principals have admitted as they get most of their students from public and private schools. Hence, they said that though not exaggerated they often get good students in terms of their academic performance and behaviors as compared to students assigned to low scorer schools.

Therefore, since the high scorer schools in take their students from schools that have good status so, difference in academic achievement of students could be observed among low and high scorer schools.

Table 34. Student Characteristics of the Sample Schools

Items	Low Scorer						Total Res.		High Scorer						Total Res.	
	Higher 7		Higher 12		Kolfe				Bole		Yek.12		Wondirad			
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Age of students																
A. Less than 15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
B. 15 - 20	77	95.1	70	95.8	129	98.5	276	96.8	142	97.9	127	97.7	49	96.2	318	97.5
C. Above 21	4	4.9	1	1.4	2	1.5	7	2.4	3	2.1	3	2.3	1	1.9	7	2.1
D. No Response	-	-	2	2.7	-	-	2	0.7	-	-	-	-	1	1.9	-	0.3
Sex																
A. Male							51.								172	52.8
B. Female	34	41.9	48	65.7	65	49.6	147	6	83	57.2	70	53.8	19	37.2	150	46
C. No Response	43	53.1	24	32.9	66	50.4	133	46.	62	42.7	56	43.1	32	62.7	4	1.2
	4	4.9	1	1.4	-	-	5	6	-	-	4	3.1	-	-		
							1.5									
Total Years of learning in the school																
A. Less than 2 years	-	-	1	1.4	-	-	1	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
B. 2-4 years	77	95.1	72	98.6	131	100	280	98.2	145	100	127	97.7	51	100	382	99.1
C. Above 4 years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
D. No Response	4	4.9	-	-	-	-	4	1.4	-	-	3	2.3	-	-	3	0.9

As we observe from table 34, 96.8% of the low scorer schools students are found between the age of 15-20. Since this age category is very near to each other, there seems no difference at age among students of the low scorer schools. On the same issue 97.5% of the high scorer schools are found at this age category. As the whole when we generalize from table 34, students both types of schools are found at similar age category.

When we also observe the sex of students at both type of schools, 51.6% of the low scorer schools and 52.8% of the high scorer schools are males. Therefore, it is possible to say that both type of schools have almost the same proportion of sex category.

In addition to the above background data of students, both type of schools have learnt (sample students taken for this study) more than two years and the total duration in the schools as students is almost equal. As the whole students' duration (Learning Years) in both types of schools are either four years or more. Hence, both types of schools could be criticized for the academic performance of the students equally.

Table 35. Students Responses About their Class Participation on Subjects often they Feel Difficult.

Items	Low Scorers			Total Resp.	%	High Scorers			Total Res.	%
	H. 7	H. 12	Kolfe			Bole	Yek. 12	Wond .		
- Participation of students at English and Mathematics class										
A. High	5	5	6	16	5.6	46	23	7	76	23.3
B. Average	31	50	61	142	49.8	59	53	11	123	37.7
C. Low	40	17	67	124	43.5	40	54	33	127	38.9
D. No response	6	1	-	7	2.5	-	-	-	-	-
- If reasons for average or low students participation in Maths and English classes										
A. Teachers do not encourage students for participation										
B. Students themselves have no confidence	4	2	14	20	16.1	4	8	9	21	16.5
C. The subjects are very difficult and beyond students capacity	8	4	12	24	19.3	9	14	7	30	23.6
D. Students themselves have low interest for education	10	3	10	23	18.5	17	12	8	37	29.1
E. No response	12	6	21	39	31.5	4	7	9	20	15.7
	6	2	10	18	14.5	6	13	-	19	14.9

As we can observe from table 35, 38.9% of the students of low scorer schools have responded as students participation on English and Maths subject is low. 5.6% of these students only responded as high, and 49.8% have responded as average. When we add the affirmative answers of the students who are responded as high and average at low scorer schools, it becomes 55.5%. On the other hand, the high scorer schools' students have responded as students participation on these subjects becomes 23.3%, 37.7%, and 38.9% as high, average and low respectively. Therefore, the high scorer schools students participate in English and Maths classes more than the low scorer school students, which in turn could have an impact on academic achievement of students between the two types of schools.

At the same time, when we analyze the responses of students who have responded as low, the low scorer school students have mostly stated the reason for low students participation as the results of lack of interests. 31.5% of the respondents stated lack of students interest as the major factor where as 19.3% stated lack of confidence from the students side. Hence, when we add the factor that go to students whether it is lack of confidence or lack of interest, it becomes 50.8% which is the highest percent as compared to others.

More over, when we analyze the responses of the high scorer students who have responded as low, most of them indicated as the subjects are difficult. The share (blame) that goes to students either for the lack of confidence or lack of interest from students sides is 39.3% which is less than the blame that goes to students by low scorer schools. Hence, lack of interest and confidence from students from low scorer schools have impact on students academic achievement differences observed between the two types of schools.

Condition of classroom interaction was also observed in each type of schools. Therefore, the following table 36 shows the classroom interaction of the low and high scorer schools.

Table 36. Students Behaviors Observed in the Class

Students Traits	Low Scorers			High Scorers		
	Higher 7	Higher 12	Kolfe	Bole	Yekatit12	Wondirad
- Write note on exercises	√	-	√	√	√	√
A. Satisfactory	-	√	-	-	-	-
B. Not satisfactory	-	-	-	-	-	-
C. Not observed	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Listen to teachers explanation properly						
A. Satisfactory	-	-	√	√	√	√
B. Not satisfactory	√	√	-	-	-	-
C. Not observed	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Work exercise given in the class individually						
A. Satisfactory	-	-	√	√	√	√
B. Not satisfactory	√	√	-	-	-	-
C. Not observed	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Help each other to make the lesson understandable						
A. Satisfactory	-	-	-	-	-	-
B. Not satisfactory	√	√	-	-	-	-
C. Not observed	-	-	√	√	√	√

As we can see from table 36, nine observations were undertaken on each subject, namely English, Maths and Biology while grade 12 teachers were teaching. Even if students behaviors in each class for each subject a little bit differ, the researcher tried to present the above table on the frequency of behaviors observed. For instance, in a given school from the nine observations (i.e, 3 observations for English, 3 for Maths and 3 for Biology), if the researcher found students writing note on their exercises at five and above classes, the tick '√' is kept in column corresponding to 'satisfactory'. On the other hand, if less than five class students are observed while writing note, the tick mark is kept in column corresponding to 'Not satisfactory'. At same time if behavior related to the main item is not observed even at one class from the nine classes, the tick mark is kept in column corresponding to 'Not observed'.

Based on the above value determination, high and low scorer school students write note on their exercises, even if higher 7 senior secondary school students do not

satisfactory write note on their exercises. Therefore, not major differences have been observed among high and low scorer schools on this matter.

On the other hand, students of the high scorer schools' listen teachers explanations and illustration properly more than the low scorer schools students. The low scorer schools students were observed while they were discussing their personal affairs. These behaviors were not actually observed in all high scorer schools. Therefore, both schools have some variations in this regard.

In English and Maths classes, the high scorer school students were repeatedly observed while they do class works individually. Whereas, this situations were never observed in low scorer schools except Kolfe students were doing class works individually. Generally, the low scorer schools students were repeatedly observed while they were sitting without working on exercises given.

Data regarding students related behaviors were not only gathered through students questionnaire and classroom observation. Items related to students behaviors (traits) also forwarded to teachers through questionnaire and the responses are indicated on the following table 37.

IV. Table 37. Teachers Responses Regarding Students Related Behaviors

Items	Low scorer						Total Resp.		High scorer						Total Res	
	Higher 7		Higher 12		Kolfe				Bole		Yekatit 12		Wondirad			
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
- Participate in the class																
A. All	-	-	3	18.7	1	6.25	4	7	6	25	5	21.7	6	37.5	17	26.9
B. Some	7	28	3	18.7	5	31.25	15	26.3	7	29.2	10	43.4	6	37.5	23	36.5
C. Few	18	72	10	62.5	10	62.5	38	66.7	11	45.8	8	34.8	4	25	23	36.5
D. No response	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Do home work timely																
A. All	-	-	3	13.0	-	-	3	5.3	8	33.3	7	30	7	43.7	22	34.9
B. Some	8	32	5	21.7	11	68.7	24	42.1	6	2.5	10	43.5	3	18.8	19	30.1
C. Few	17	68	8	34.8	5	31.2	30	52.6	10	41.7	6	26.1	6	37.5	22	34.9
D. No response	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Attend class regularly																
A. All	-	-	6	37.5	10	62.5	16	28	6	25	10	43.5	5	31.2	21	33.3
B. Some	14	54	5	31.2	6	37.5	25	43.8	15	62.5	8	34.8	9	56.2	32	50.8
C. Few	11	44	5	31.3	-	-	16	28	3	12.5	5	21.8	2	12.5	10	15.9
D. No response	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Create new ideas																
A. All	-	-	1	6.25	-	-	1	1.7	2	8.3	1	4.3	1	6.25	4	6.3
B. Some	4	16	1	6.25	10	62.5	15	26.3	8	33.3	7	30.4	3	18.75	18	28.6
C. Few	21	84	14	87.5	6	37.5	41	71.9	14	58.3	15	65.3	12	75	41	65.0
D. No response	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Show good discipline in the class																
A. All	-	-	4	25	-	43.8	4	7	9	37.5	4	17.4	6	37.5	19	30.1
B. Some	9	36	6	37.5	7	56.2	32	56.1	7	29.2	12	52.2	4	25	23	36.5
C. Few	16	64	6	37.5	9	-	31	54.4	8	33.3	7	30.4	6	37.5	21	33.3
D. No response	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Have interest to learn																
A. All	-	-	3	18.7	-	-	3	5.3	10	41.7	3	13.0	5	31.2	18	28.6
B. Some	7	28	10	62.5	11	68.7	28	49.1	7	29.2	14	68.9	4	25.0	25	39.7
C. Few	18	72	3	18.7	5	31.2	26	45.6	7	29.2	6	26.0	7	43.8	20	31.7
D. No response	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Work or study very hard																

A. All	-	-	3	18.7	-	-	3	5.3	8	33.3	-	-	4	25	12	19.0
B. Some	6	24	9	56.2	3	18.75	18	31.6	7	29.2	10	43.4	2	12.5	19	30.1
C. Few	19	76	4	25	13	81.2	36	63.1	9	37.5	13	56.6	10	62.5	32	50.8
D. No response	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Respect teachers																
A. All	-	-	2	8	-	-	2	3.5	6	25	3	13.0	6	37.5	15	23.8
B. Some	6	24	19	76	8	50	24	42.1	11	45.8	14	60.9	4	25	29	46.0
C. Few	19	76	4	16	8	50	31	54.4	7	29.2	6	26.1	6	37.5	19	30.1
D. No response	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Bring texts to use in classes																
A. All	-	-	3	18.7	-	-	3	5.3	4	16.7	3	13.0	3	18.75	10	15.9
B. Some	6	24	9	56.2	4	25	19	33.3	6	25	10	43.5	4	25	20	31.7
C. Few	19	76	4	25	12	75	35	61.4	14	58.3	10	43.5	9	56.25	33	52.4
D. No response	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

As we can see from table 37, the participation of students in a class is more appreciable in high scorer schools than the low scorer schools. As the responses of the teachers indicate 26.9% of high scorer schools teachers responded as all students are participate in a class, where as only 7% of the low scorer schools teachers responded as all students participate in a class. Therefore, such differences among students in low and high scorer schools could bring differences in academic achievement.

The behavior of students in performing home works given to them were asked through questionnaire. 34.9% of the high scorer school teachers responded as all students do home works given them, whereas only 5.3% of the low scorer school teachers responded as all of the them do home works given. The regular class attendance of students was also asked from teachers in a general view, instead of observing the large volume of attendance sheet of (seven) months. Accordingly, 33.3% of high scorer school teachers responded as all students attend class regularly, while only 28% of low scorer school teachers responded as all students attend regularly. Therefore, differences such as doing home works regularly and timely, attending classes regularly have impact on students, academic achievement differences among both type of schools.

In terms of discipline, the high scorer school students show better discipline than, the low scorer schools. According to teachers response 30.1% of high scorer school teachers have responded as all students show good discipline, where as only 7% of the low scorer school teachers responded as all students show good discipline . Therefore major differences are observable among these schools. These major differences could also be factor for differences in students academic achievement among high and low scorer schools.

The interest of students in a class to attend their lesson was also asked, and 28.6% of high scorer school teachers have responded as all students have interest to attend and

learn. On the other hand, only 5.3% of low scorer school teachers have responded as all students do have interest. These differences could also bring differences in students' academic achievement between high and low scorer schools.

Although appreciable differences are not observed among high and low scorer schools regarding students working and study habits, the high scorer school teachers responses still show greater percentage than the low scorer teachers responses. Therefore, such differences could also be factor for differences in students academic achievement between both type of schools.

In respecting teachers and bringing their texts to be used in classes, the high scorer students are found better than the low scorer students according to teachers responses of both type of schools. Therefore, such differences could also bring differences in academic achievement of students between the two schools.

4.5 Teachers Characteristics and Teaching Practices

Considering or investigating school factors which could bring differences achievement among schools becomes worthless without investigating the characteristics (qualification, experiences) of teachers, and the teaching practices prevailed in these low and high scorer schools.

Therefore, the characteristics of teachers teaching in both type of schools in terms of qualification and experiences and career structure have been kept on the following table 38.

Table 38. Characteristics of the Teaching Forces

Items	Low Scorer						Total Resp.		High Scorer						Total Res	
	Higher 7		Higher 12		Kolfe				Bole		Yekatit 12		Wondirad			
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
- Sex																
A. Male	20	80	16	94.1	15	93.7	51	87.9	24	100	23	100	15	93.8	62	98.4
B. Female	5	20	1	5.8	1	6.2	7	12.1	-	-	-	-	1	6.2	1	1.6
- Qualification																
A. Degree (BA/BSc)	14	60.9	13	76.5	12	75	39	69.8	18	75	16	69.6	10	62.5	44	76.9
B. Diploma	2	8.7	-	-	-	-	2	3.6	4	16.7	-	-	-	-	4	64
C. MA/MSc	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	26.1	2	12.5	8	12.8
D. 12+3	7	30.4	4	23.5	4	25	15	26.6	2	8.3	-	-	4	25	6	9.9
E. TTI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Experiences																
A. 1-5 years	-	-	1	5.9	4	25	5	8.6	5	20.8	-	-	1	6.2	6	9.5
B. 6-10 years	3	12	1	5.9	7	43.7	11	19.1	3	12.5	1	4.3	1	6.2	5	8.3
C. 11 - 15 years	1	4	3	17.6	1	6.2	5	8.6	1	4.2	3	13.0	-	-	4	6.3
D. 16 - 20 years	5	20	6	35.3	1	6.2	12	20.7	6	25.0	6	26.1	4	25	16	25.3
E. Above 21 years	16	64	6	35.3	3	18.7	25	43	9	37.5	13	56.5	10	62.5	32	50.6
- Teaching position (at career structure)																
A. Beginner teacher	1	4	2	11.8	3	18.7	6	10.4	5	20.8	4	16	2	12.5	11	17.8
B. Teacher	3	12	6	35.3	9	56.2	18	31.1	7	29.2	4	16	5	31.2	16	25.3
C. Higher teacher	9	36	3	17.6	3	18.8	15	25.8	3	12.5	9	36	-	-	12	19.0
D. Lead teacher	12	48	6	35.3	1	6.2	19	32.7	9	37.5	6	24	9	56.2	24	38.0

As we observe from table 38, 87.9% of the low scorer school respondents are male, while only 12.1% of the respondents are female. On the same issue, 98.4% of the high scorer respondents are male teachers while only 1.6% are female teachers. Though it is difficult to say that better students academic achievement is observed where large number of male teachers are found, it is obvious to conclude from the data that high scorer schools are dominated by male teachers.

When we see the qualification of teachers at both type of schools, the high scorer school teachers are found at better qualification. 70.9% of sample respondents are BA or BSc holders and 69.8% of low scorer school teachers are BA/Bsc. holders. While the high scorer schools have 12.8% of teachers who are qualified at MA/Msc level, the low scorer schools have no teachers qualified at such level. While 26.6% of low scorer schools have the least qualified teachers at 12+3 level, the high scorer schools have only 9.9% of teachers who are qualified at this level. Therefore, it is possible to say that there is a sort of differences in teachers qualification among both type of schools which could have bring differences in students academic achievement.

In terms of years of services, the high scorer school teachers seem to have more experiences than the low scorer school teachers. While 50.6% of the high scorer school teachers have services that range above 21 years, the low scorer school have only 43% of teachers who do have such experiences. At the same time, while 25.5% high scorer school teachers have services that range between 16-20 years, 20.7% the low scorer school teachers have only such services. As the whole, significant number of teachers in high scorer schools have services more than 16 years than the low scorer schools. Since, the more experienced teachers know how to prepare students for achievement tests than the least experienced teachers, particularly at national exam, such differences in experiences might have scorer for differences in students academic achievement between high and low scorer schools.

In terms of teachers career position, different situations are being observed between the high and low scorer schools. While the high scorer schools have more teachers (38%) who have reached to lead level, the low scorer schools in turn have more teachers who have reached to higher level position. Therefore, since it is impossible to state high or low scorer school teachers are at better career position, teachers' career positions as for this study have no any influence on students' academic achievement observed in both type of schools.

In addition to the above questionnaire items forwarded to teachers, the Zones' Educational Officials were interviewed about the experiences and qualification of teachers to be assigned in low and high scorer schools. According to the officials response, due to various additional income such as night income, experienced and well-qualified teachers are often assigned where they have chosen by comparing their services.

Besides to the items raised to teachers on questionnaire and interview raised to Zone Educational Officials, interview was also raised to principals of each type of schools. Almost all principals have stated as the more experienced and qualified teachers are assigned where they have chosen. Mostly their choices rest at schools where high night income share available, and so, these schools are mostly high scorer schools. Generally, the experiences and qualification of teachers have impacts upon students academic achievement in both types of schools.

Regarding teachers experiences in the schools where they are teaching now, and any upgrading training they have acquired, is indicated on table 39 below.

Table39. Teachers Responses about Upgrading Training and Other School Services

Items	Low scorer			Total Res.	%	High Scorer			Total Res.	%
	H. 7	H.12	Kolfe			Bole	Yek.12	Wond.		
- Years of services in teaching at this school										
A. 1-5 years	8	8	10	26	45	13	11	6	30	47.6
B. 6-10 years	8	6	4	18	31	6	6	3	15	23.8
C. 11-15 years	6	1	-	7	12.1	5	3	5	13	20.7
D. 16-20 years	3	2	1	6	10.3	-	3	2	5	7.9
E. Above 21 years	-	-	1	1	1.7	-	-	-	-	-
- Any upgrading training taken since the last four years										
A. Yes	3	3	2	8	13.8	5	5	-	10	15.9
B. No	22	14	14	50	86.2	19	18	16	53	84.1

As we can observe from table 39, teachers who have 1-5 years of experiences in particular school seem less in low scorer schools than high scorer schools. But according principals of low scorer schools the 45% of teachers who have served 1-5 years in low scorer schools are actually fresh teachers who are assigned from Region 14 Education Office since the last five years. On the other hand, the 47.6% of high achiever school teachers who seem to have 1-5 years is only refers to that school alone; these teachers have long years of services at peripheral schools in the region. Therefore, according to the principals responses on interview, the 45% of teachers who do have 1-5 years of services at low achiever schools and the 47.6% of teachers who seem to have 1-5 years of services at high achiever schools have different nature. Those who serve at high scorer schools are experienced teachers. Therefore, it could bring differences in students' academic achievement due to the accumulated and developed experiences in directing students to deserve better students academic achievement.

As the above table show, most of both school type teachers have responded that as they never got any upgrading training since the last four years.

In addition to the above characteristics of sample school teachers, the actual teaching practices being conducted in classrooms have been investigated through questionnaires raised to students, teachers themselves, class observation, document inspection and interview made with principals.

Therefore, the following table 40 shows, the responses of students on the actual activities of teachers being performed in the class.

Table 40. The use of Laboratories and Teaching Aids by Teachers (Students Response)

Items	Low Scorer			Total Res.	%	High Scorer			Total Res.	%
	H.7	H.12	Kolfe			Bole	Y.12	Won.		
- Teachers laboratories using habits										
A. they usually use	6	2	7	15		22	8	6	36	
B. they do not totally use	52	68	89	209		82	49	22	153	
C. they use few days in a year	20	3	34	57		41	72	21	134	
- Reasons for using not laboratories repeatedly										
A. Lack of laboratories chemicals	13	19	37	69	25	35	42	17	94	32.4
B. The non-functionality of laboratories instruments	11	15	22	48	17.4	31	25	6	62	21.3
C. Unwillingness of teachers	11	14	12	37	13.4	8	5	7	20	6.9
D. All the above stated problems	37	23	62	122	44.2	49	49	16	114	39.3

According to table 40, although most of the respondents who have responded teachers do not or rarely use laboratory indicate the reason to lack of chemicals, non-functionality of instruments and lack of teachers interest; significant number of low scorer respondents have also responded as there is unwillingness of teachers to use laboratories more than the high scorer school respondents. Hence, such differences in

teachers willingness in both type of schools could bring in differences in students academic achievement.

In addition to students responses, teachers have been asked whether they prepare and use teaching aids?

Table 41. Teachers' Responses Regarding Teaching Aids

Items	Low scorers			Total	%	High scorers			Total Res.	%
	H. 7	H.12	Kolfe			Bole	Yek.1 2	Won.		
- Frequence of preparing and using teaching aids										
A. usually	3	1	2	6	10.3	4	4	3	11	17.5
B. not at all	6	3	2	11	18.9	2	6	3	11	17.5
C. sometimes	16	13	12	41	70.7	18	14	10	42	66.7

According the above responses of teachers, both school teachers do not often prepare and use teaching aids to teach their subjects. Only 17.5% of high scorer school teachers have responded as they usually prepare; where as only 10.3% of low scorer schools prepare teaching aids usually. When we see teachers who have responded as sometimes, the difference between the two type of schools is not considerable size.

Table 42. Students Responses about Teachers' Classroom Activities

Items	Low scorers			Total	%	High scorers			Total Res.	%
	H. 7	H.12	Kolfe			Bole	Yek.1 2	Won.		
- The frequency of provisions home works and assignments										
A. Daily	26	40	21	87	30.5	55	64	16	135	41.4
B. Weekly	30	25	47	102	37.8	47	36	20	103	31.6
C. Monthly	8	3	28	39	13.7	47	19	11	77	23.6
D. Never given	16	5	35	56	19.6	-	11	4	15	4.6
E. No response	1	-	-	1	0.3	-	-	-	-	-
- Frequency of correcting home works										
A. they usually correct	2	7	11	20	7	12	19	1	32	9.8
B. they sometimes correct	56	12	72	140	49.1	63	101	29	193	59.2
C. they never correct	22	53	55	130	45.6	8	10	21	39	11.9
D. response	1	1	2	4	1.4	4	-	-	4	1.2
- Teachers praising habits for students trial in answering questions										
A. they usually do	20	30	34	84	29.4	41	60	18	119	36.5
B. they don't	15	7	24	46	16.1	22	18	9	49	15.0
C. they sometimes do	45	35	71	151	46.3	82	52	24	158	48.5
D. No response	1	1	2	4	1.2	-	-	-	-	-
- Clarity and simplicity of teachers language										
A. High	20	24	14	58	20.3	52	31	8	91	27.9
B. Low	25	4	34	63	22.1	26	16	15	57	17.5
C. Average	34	44	79	157	55.1	67	82	28	177	54.3
D. No response	2	1	4	7	2.4	-	1	-	1	0.3
- Degree of counseling officers advice of students at their academic studies.										
A. High	6	6	19	31	10.9	24	25	24	73	24.4
B. Low	43	28	68	139	48.7	79	71	7	157	48.2
C. Average	31	38	41	110	38.6	42	31	20	93	28.5
D. No response	1	1	3	5	1.7	-	3	-	3	0.9

As we can observe from the table 42, 56.8% of the low scorer school students have responded as their teachers are mostly using lecture in the class. These school students have responded that only 22.8% and 10.5% of teachers use questions and answer and discussion methods in their regular teaching respectively. On the other

hand, 45.1% of high scorer school teachers use lecture, 23.3% and 15% of teachers use questions and answer; and discussion respectively. Teachers who are encouraging individual work is about 8.4% in low scorer schools; while it is about 15.6% at high scorer schools.

When we interpret this situation, the high scorer school teachers seem to follow a participatory approach of teaching more than a teacher-dominated approach. Therefore, the high scorer school teachers make the learner to be part of the teaching-learning process. Such fundamental differences of teaching method could be factor for differences in students academic achievement between both type of schools.

30.5% of low scorer school students and 41.4% of high scorer school students responded that teachers give home works and class works daily. At the same time, while 19.6% of low scorer school students responded as teachers don't give home and class works; only 4.6% of high scorer school students responded this fact. Therefore, when we interpret this situation, the high scorer school teachers make their students do. Hence, it could become one of the factors that bring differences in students academic achievement between both type of schools.

At the same time, when we see the frequency that teachers correct students' work, 7%, 49% and 45.6% of the low scorer school students have responded as teachers usually, sometimes and never correct exercises consecutively. On the other hand, 98.%, 59.2% and 11.9% of the high scorer school students have responded as teachers correct their exercises usually, sometimes and never consecutively. Therefore, when we interpret these responses, the high scorer school teachers see the works of students more than the low scorer school teachers do. Hence, such difference could also bring differences in students academic achievement both type of schools.

Praising or motivating students for their academic performance would hopefully bring success for students. In this manner, only 29.4% and 46.3% of low scorer school

students have responded as their teachers praise them usually and sometimes respectively for attempts they show to answer questions being raised in the class by teachers. On the other hand, 36.5% and 48.5% of high scorer school students have responded as their teachers praise them for attempts they show to answer questions being raised in the class by teachers. Therefore, when one interprets this situation, the high scorer school teachers do their best to attract students at their lessons more than the low scorer school teachers do. Hence this situation would hopefully result in differences in students academic achievement high and low scorer schools.

Item was raised to students through questionnaire to know language clarity and its simplicity, while teachers are teaching subjects. Accordingly, 20.3% an, 22.1%, and 55.1% low scorer school students have responded as high, low and average; while 27.9%, 17.5% and 54.3% of the high, scorer school students responded as high, low and average. Therefore, when we interpret such differences in terms of understanding and being encouraged to do a lot by students, the high scorer school teachers are found at better position than the low scorer school teachers. Therefore, such teachers' quality have impact to bring differences in students' achievement between high and low scorer schools.

Considering the guidance and counseling officers of the school as teachers rather than administrators, because of the fact that most of them are teaching English; the degree of scorer they provide for students in counseling and guiding how to study and become successful in academic achievement was asked through questionnaire and their responses are interpreted. Accordingly, 10.9%, 38.6% and 48.7% of low scorer school teachers have responded as these officers give counseling or guidance how to study usually, sometimes and never consecutively. Where as 22.4% 28.5% and 48.2% of high scorer school students responded as they give them help usually, sometimes and never consecutively. Although number of students who responded 'usually' seems significant between the two type of schools, the responses of both type of schools who

responded "never" seem equivalent. Therefore, such academic achievement differences of students between the two type of schools seem not as the result of such differences.

In addition to students questionnaire, 27 class observations were also made to know which teaching methods were dominant in each type of schools. So, the following situation was observed at both type of schools.

Table 43. Methods of Teaching in the Class

Type	Low Scorers			High Scorers		
	Higher 7	Higher12	Kolfe	Bole	Yekatit 12	Wondirad
- Individual work						
A. High	√	√	√	√	√	√
B. Medium	-	-	-	-	-	-
C. Low	-	-	-	-	-	-
D. Not observed	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Group discussion						
A. High	-	-	-	-	-	-
B. Medium	-	-	-	-	-	-
C. Low	-	-	-	√	-	-
D. Not observed	√	√	√	-	√	√
- Question & answer						
A. High	-	-	-	√	√	√
B. Medium	-	-	-	-	-	-
C. Low	-	-	-	-	-	-
D. Not observed	√	√	√	-	-	-
- Lecture only						
A. High	√	√	√	-	-	-
B. Medium	-	-	-	√	√	√
C. Low	-	-	-	-	-	-
D. Not observes	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Whiting note only						
A. High	-	√	-	-	-	-
B. Medium	√	-	√	√	√	√
C. Low	-	-	-	-	-	-
D. Not observes	-	-	-	-	-	-

As we observe from table 43, both school type teachers make students to do individually and hence group works and discussions are not observable in both type of schools.

On the other hand, high scorer school teachers highly utilize, question and answer method of teaching, even if what were coming from students were limited in the form of questions. Low scorer school teachers highly utilize lecture in the classes. Therefore, such differences could result in academic differences between both type of schools.

Table 44. Background of the Department Heads

Items	Low scorers			Total Res.	%	High scorers			Total Res.	%
	H.7	H.12	Kolfe			Bole	Y.12	Won.		
Sex										
A. Male	3	3	3	9	100	3	2	3	8	88.9
B. Female	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	11.1
Qualification										
A. BA/BSc degree	1	3	3	7	77.8	3	3	3	9	100
B. MA/MSc. degree	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
C. Diploma	2	-	-	2	22.2	-	-	-	-	-
D. TTI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Years of services as teacher										
A. 1 - 10 years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
B. 11 - 20 years	3	2	-	5	55.6	-	-	2	2	22.2
C. 21 - 30 years	-	1	3	4	44.4	3	3	1	7	77.8
D. Above 30 years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Years of services as dept.head										
A. 1 -5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
B. 6-10 years	3	3	3	100	-	3	3	2	8	88.9
C. 11-15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	11.1
D. 16 - 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E. Above 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

As we observe from table 44, almost both school department heads are males. In terms of their qualification, the low scorer schools, particularly Higher 7's department heads have not yet got their first degree even if they do have long years of experiences. On the other hand, the high scorer school department heads are all in all first degree holders. In terms of providing suggestion for teachers on specific academic matters which they teach to students, schools that have degree holder department heads would better to smoothly discuss on academic affairs with teachers than from those who may not obtain degree. As long as all teachers (as stated on their background table) are mostly degree holders in both schools, there could be a sort of inferiority and superiority complex that could arise among teachers and department

heads, where especially the latter lag behind one or two levels from the former. Hence, this situation in turn may affect the free movement of ideas in improving teaching activities between the two parties, which again might be reflected on students academic achievement.

Regarding experiences of department heads, both school heads have served more than 10 years as teachers, and more than six years as department heads. Since major differences are not as such observable between the two schools, it is believed that both schools department heads could have the capacity to evaluate the lesson preparation of their subordinate teachers during class observations.

After items obtaining background of the department heads were raised on the questionnaire, specific items relating to teachers performance were also raised and so their responses summarized on table 45 below.

Table 45. Department Heads Responses about Teachers Teaching Performance

Items	Low scorer			Total Res.	%	High scorer			Total Res.	%
	H.7	H.12	Kolfe			Bole	Y.12	Won.		
1. Existence of class room observation periodically										
A. Yes	3	3	3	9	100	3	3	3	9	100
B. No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Plan the lesson appropriately										
A. Most of them	2	3	2	7	77.8	3	3	3	9	100
B. Some of them	1	-	1	2	22.2	-	-	-	-	-
C. Few of them	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Teach students effectively										
A. Most of them	1	1	1	3	33.3	3	3	3	9	100
B. Some of them	2	2	2	6	66.7	-	-	-	-	-
C. Few of them	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Responsive to students problem										
A. Most of them	1	-	1	2	22.2	1	3	3	7	77.7
B. Some of them	2	3	2	7	77.8	2	-	-	2	22.2
C. Few of them	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Use variety of teaching aids										
A. Most	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	3	5	55.6
B. Some	3	1	3	7	77.8	2	-	-	2	22.2
C. Few	-	2	-	2	22.2	1	1	-	2	22.2

- Give exercises and tests frequently										
A. Most	2	1	1	4	44.4	2	2	1	5	55.6
B. Some	1	2	1	4	44.4	1	1	1	3	33.3
C. Few	-	1	1	1	11.1	-	-	1	1	11.1
- Respect school time and present at work										
A. Most	3	2	-	5	55.6	2	3	3	8	88.9
B. Some	-	1	1	2	22.2	-	-	-	-	-
C. Few	-	-	2	2	22.2	1	-	-	1	11.1
- Motivate students for learning										
A. Most	1	1	1	3	33.3	2	2	1	5	55.6
B. Some	2	1	2	5	55.5	1	1	2	4	44.4
C. Few	-	1	-	1	11.1	-	-	-	-	-
3. Do you give comments to teacher after you have supervised them?										
A. Yes, usually	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	4	44.4
B. No, not at all	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
C. Yes, sometimes	3	3	3	9	100	1	1	3	5	55.6

As we observe from the above table 47, all department heads of both schools visit classrooms while teachers are teaching. No differences are observed on such issue among the schools. But, based on class observation conducted by department heads of both schools, major differences are observed among the schools.

In terms of preparing plans properly, 77.8% of the low achiever schools have responded as most of the teachers prepare lessons properly, while 100% of the high achiever school respondents confirm as most of them prepare proper lesson plans.

At the same time, only 33.3% of the low scorer school department heads have responded as most of the teachers teach their subjects effectively, while 100% of the high scorer respondents have responded as most of them teach effectively.

Regarding the responsiveness of teachers to students problem, 22.2% of the low scorer department heads have responded as most of the teachers are responsive for students problem, while 77.7% of the high scorer school heads have responded that most of them are responsive.

Though the use of variety of teaching aids by both schools are not appreciable, according to department heads responses of the high scorer schools, 55.6% have responded that most of them use variety of teaching aids. But, the low scorer school department heads, i.e 77.17% have only responded as some of them only use variety of teaching aids rather than saying most of them.

In terms of providing exercises and tests frequently, the high scorer schools. i.e, 55.6% respondents have responded as most teachers give to students, while only 44.4% of the low scorer schools have responded as most of them do this actively.

The responses of head teachers of both schools also vary in terms of teachers' time respect for work. While only 55.6% of low scorer school heads responded as most teachers respect time, 88.9% of the high scorer school heads responded as most of them respect time for work.

Regarding teachers motivation of students for learning, 55.6% of the respondents of high scorer schools have responded as most teachers motivate students, while only 33.3% of the low scorer school respondents have responded as most of them motivate students.

In general, according the responses obtained from department heads, differences between the high and low scorer schools are observed in terms preparing lesson plans properly, teaching students effectively, being responsive to students problem, giving exercises and tests, respecting school time, and motivating students for learning. Therefore, such major differences between both type of schools could result in differences in academic achievement of students.

In addition to department heads responses, 27 class observations were made at each type of school regarding teachers' class rooms traits.

Table 46. Teachers' Teaching Behaviors in the Classrooms.

Type	Low scorers			High scorers		
	Higher 7	Higher12	Kolfe	Bole	Yekatit 12	Wondirad
- Explains the lesson orderly						
A. Satisfactory	√	√	√	√	√	√
B. Not satisfactory	-	-	-	-	-	-
C. Not observed	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Writes the lesson on the board						
A. Satisfactory	-	√	√	√	√	√
B. Not satisfactory	√	-	-	-	-	-
C. Not observed	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Give opportunity to students to take notes						
A. Satisfactory	-	-	-	√	√	√
B. Not Satisfactory	√	√	√	-	-	-
C. Not observed	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Give opportunity to students to ask:						
A. Satisfactory	-	-	-	-	√	-
B. Not satisfactory	√	√	√	√	-	√
C. Not observed	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Give opportunity to students to ask						
A. Satisfactory	-	-	-	-	√	-
B. Not satisfactory	√	√	√	√	-	√
C. Not observed	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Give class works and home works						
A. Satisfactory	-	-	√	√	√	√
B. Not satisfactory	-	-	-	-	-	-
C. Not observed	√	√	-	-	-	-
- Corrects class works						
A. Satisfactory	-	-	-	√	√	√
B. Not satisfactory	-	-	√	-	-	-
C. Not observed	√	√	-	-	-	-
- Refer teaching materials /Guides and texts/						
A. Satisfactory	-	-	-	-	-	-
B. Not satisfactory	-	√	-	-	-	-
C. Not observed	√	-	√	√	√	√
- Speak clearly in understandable way						
A. Satisfactory	-	√	-	√	√	√
B. Not satisfactory	√	-	√	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-

C. Not observed						
- Encourage everyone to participate						
A. Satisfactory	-	-	-	√	√	√
B. Not Satisfactory	√	√	√	-	-	-
C. Not observed	-	-	-	-	-	-
Continued						
- Praises pupils effort on the participation						
A. Satisfactory	-	-	-	√	√	√
B. Not satisfactory	√	√	√	-	-	-
C. Not observed	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Manage the classroom properly						
A. Satisfactory	-	-	-	√	√	√
B. Not satisfactory	√	√	√	-	-	-
C. Not observed	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Use appropriate teaching aids						
A. Satisfactory	-	-	-	-	-	-
B. Not satisfactory	-	-	-	-	-	√
C. Not observed	√	√	√	√	√	-

As we observe from table 48, teachers of both schools' explain subjects they teach clearly. Although a sort of difference could be observed among three teachers regarding this behavior, the tick mark is kept in the column corresponding to "**satisfactory**" if more than five satisfactory behaviors are observed from the nine observations in a given school. At the same time, the word tick mark is kept in the column corresponding to "**not satisfactory**" if less than 5 non-satisfactory behaviors are observed from the nine observations. The word tick mark is also kept in the column corresponding to "**not-observed**" if no activities are observed regarding issues raised in teachers traits column.

Although one of the low achiever schools is found at not-satisfactory level in writing lessons on board in meaningful way, both type of school teachers are found at satisfactory level in explaining subjects they teach.

In terms of giving assignments for students, the high achiever school teachers are found at satisfactory level, while as the low scorer schools are found at not-

satisfactory level. Therefore, such differences among teachers could result in differences between high and low scorer school students in term of their academic performance.

High scorer school teacher give opportunity to students in taking notes they have written. The low achiever school teachers do not keep the capacity of students in taking note, and many students have been found when they were simply sitting without taking note. This situation could also the cause for differences in academic achievement between the two schools.

Teachers of both schools often don't give chance for students to ask questions except Yekatit 12 comp. secondary school teachers where students were found while making questions in many classes where observations took place. This situation as long as resembles in both type of schools, it is believed that would not result in differences in academic achievement.

As the observations made, teachers of high scorer schools correct students exercises satisfactory. Whereas the low scorer schools teachers often do not correct exercises. This situation could result in differences in academic achievement between the two schools.

Both schools teachers are not observed while they use texts and guides in classes. But they have been observed when they use their note books.

Regarding the clarity and simplicity of the language teachers use the high scorer school teachers are found at better position than the low scorer school teachers. Particularly, Bole Secondary school's English teacher and Maths grade 12 teacher of Wondirad Secondary School teachers are appreciable in such regards.

On the other hand, most of low school teachers were not found clear and simple in terms of the language they use. But, Higher 12 Secondary School's grade 12 Biology teacher is appreciable as of the high scorer school teachers. Therefore, different conditions are observed in this regard and so it could result in differences in academic achievement between the two type of schools.

In terms of motivating students for participation in the class, praising students for their trial to answer questions, and class management, the high scorer school teachers are found at better position than the low scorer school teachers.

On the other hand, though some high scorer school teachers are found while using teaching aids more than the low scorer school teachers, the researcher did not observe variety of teaching aids used by both type of schools.

Finally, structured interview was made with the three zones education programme heads to state the reasons which make some government secondary schools top scorers, and others to become least scorer. The following table is summarized based on the responses of the officials.

Table 47. Zones Educational Program Heads Responses on Students' Achievement at low and high scorers schools.

Items	Responses of Heads of Education Program		
	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5
- What school factors do you cite that have made some schools in your zone least scorer?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of sufficient experiences and qualification of teachers - Lack of facilities - The non-conduciveness of the schools' environment - Lack of interest from students - Poor family background of students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Poor family back ground - Lack of interest from students - Incompetent type of students assigned to least achievers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Instability of teachers in least scorer schools - Lack of income in addition to salary - Remoteness of the schools - Poor administration. - Poor educational background of students assigned to least achievers
- What school factors do you cite that have made some government school's of your zone high (top) scorers)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Good Teachers qualification and sufficient experiences - School facilities (availability) -School norms (long 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good school management - Availability of facilities - School cite, conduciveness for learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Sufficient experience of teachers. -Location of school (environment conducive) -Good management of school administrators.

	established good name and norms) - Good students interest - Good students family back ground etc.	- Students high interest, - Teachers' commitment - Good entry back ground of students in addition to office assignment	- Availability of facilities - Good teachers life (in terms of income) - Students motivation.
--	---	--	---

As we can observe from table 47, lack of sufficient experiences, lack of appropriate qualification teachers as compared to high scorer school teachers and lack of students interests are worth mentioning that have made schools least scorers according the officials. On the other hand, the fulfillment of the above problems of least scorer schools at high scorer schools could result in to become top or high scorer for the school.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

Data gathered from different subjects, i.e. from teachers, students, school principals, zone education officials and various school personnel through questionnaires, interview (structured and unstructured), observation and document inspection have been presented in different tables and discussed thoroughly in Chapter Four as much as possible. The main objective of presenting the gathered data either in tables or paraphrased form was to describe the characteristics of some samples of high and low scorer government secondary schools of Addis Ababa, to know the differences between the two types of schools which could result in differences in academic achievement of students learning in these schools.

The major areas of comparison between the two types of schools were: the school condition (facilities, in terms of instructional materials, class size, financial condition, physical condition of the school conditions and school practices in utilizing school facilities), efficiency of school management, characteristics of teaching forces and teaching practices, and students characteristics. Although attempts were made to put the collected data in table forms as to make the study quantitative, much of the data is collected through interview which, of course, make this study qualitative, too.

During the collection of data, a lot of problems have been faced. Among these were unwillingness of teachers to respond the questionnaire in some schools, the non-cooperativeness of school's store keepers to give some data, the non-existence of school principals in their offices in the name of meeting, and the unwillingness of teachers to be observed while they teach.

Despite all these constraints, efforts were put to extend the data collection period more than expected period, and so collected the necessary data as much as possible. The collected data, accordingly, show some differences of high and low scorer schools. The high scorer schools are found on better condition than the low scorer schools in some cases, and on the contrary, the low scorers also found better than the high scorers in some others.

Generally, the variations of the two schools are presented in summary forms for each of the four areas the study focuses.

5.1 Summary

5.1.1 General Conditions of Schools

The variation of school conditions was investigated in terms of years of establishment of the schools, school level, number of sections, average number of students by a teacher.

In addition to assessing the actual facts and existing conditions of schools, achievement status of the schools in four years E.S.L.C.E and one year E.G.S.E.C.E results, availability of some school facilities and operation of school equipment and school financial sources and others were investigated from the collected data.

Regarding school age, the high scorer schools have long years of services as compared to the low scorers, except Kolfe Secondary School, which has long years of services as of the high scorer schools.

Although both school types are located in urban, the high scorer schools are located in conducive areas compared to that of low scorer schools. Besides to their distance from the center, two of the low scorer schools are found in areas where majority of the peoples give emphasis to business activities than that of education. Therefore, the location of these low scorer schools is not conducive as that of the high scorer schools.

Class size in both types of schools is higher than 40 students which was intended by MOE for this level. But, when we compare the situation both schools in only, the low scorer schools have less size as compared to high scorer schools.

According to the E.S.L.C.E results of four years, i.e. 1990 - 1993 and E.G.S.E.C.E result of 1993, the high scorer schools are found at best position than that of low scorers in obtaining students who have registered passing grade (GPA).

The laboratories and pedagogical centers of the low scorer schools have been found to be non-functional and hence are not used by teachers and students for the teaching-learning process.

On the other hand, although the above facilities are not appreciable at high scorer schools, they are functional and used by teachers and students.

The high scorer schools as compared to the low scorer schools have teachers' reading rooms where they could use during their work time in the day. The low scorer schools lack such facility for teachers. In terms of staff rooms and lounges, still the high scorer r schools are found at better condition than the low scorer schools.

Though not appreciable, according to the various data obtained from the tools, the high scorer schools are found at better position than the low scorer schools in terms of providing teaching materials (guides, supportive manuals, laboratory chemicals, and some ready made teaching aids).

On the other hand, as the responses of students and teachers' and observation results indicate, the low scorer schools are found at better position in terms of having large and conducive chalk-boards, and less class size than the high scorer schools.

According to the information from observation, the high scorer schools are found better than the low scorer schools in terms of students' seats, their comforts and adequacy for the large class they do have in each section.

Display-boards in all classes, where observation was made, are not available at both types of schools. It could be said that chairs and tables for teachers are not available in low scorer schools, except Higher 12, where their existence is not appreciable in terms of their conditions. The high scorer schools are also found better on providing chairs and tables for teachers as compared to the low scorers.

Though students toilet rooms are found in over the schools, the low scorer schools have no well-protected and functional toilet rooms (except higher 12 S.S.) as compared to high scorer schools.

Both types of schools have no as such organized and functional lounges to students. Low and high scorer schools have many clubs dealing with extra-curricular activities. Higher 12 Secondary School, which has 23 clubs, is appreciable in this regard from the low scorer schools.

The high scorer schools have good and well-constructed fences as compared to the low scorer schools except Wondirad from high achiever schools, which lacks one side fence to the west.

Both types of schools do have various income sources which are almost similar in their kinds, but the high scorer schools do have significant amount flowing from night section to schools use than that of the low scorers.

Text book ratio according to students response is better at high scorer schools than the low scorer schools.

5.1.2 General Characteristics of School Management

Since schools are educational institutions, where coordinated human efforts are required to achieve educational goals, the coordinators of these activities, i.e. the role of the school management bodies in this regard is not neglectable. Therefore, the qualification of school principals, their experiences, their human relation (cooperativeness) and other points have been investigated through questionnaires and interviews from students, teachers, zone educational officials and the principals themselves. Thus, the results of the analysis made in Chapter Four are summarized as in the following.

The principals of the low scorer schools have greater burden of work when compared to the high scorer. This is so because, as the findings indicate, although they have almost the same number of students in the schools, each low scorer school is managed by three principals (except, of course, Kolfe S.S.), where as each high scorer school is managed by four principals.

The principals of both school types are at least first degree holders and significant qualification differences are not observed among the principals of both schools.

Since the principals of the low scorer schools seem better and appropriate to manage due to the type of qualification (school administration) rather than the principals of the high scorers, areas of qualification of principals seems to have contributed little significance to bring achievement differences.

The principals of the low scorer schools blame for the disciplinary problems exhibited in their schools, which in turn affect their effective and efficient management, more than the principals of the low scorer schools.

The principals of the low scorer schools complain the low participation of the community in schools, which in turn brought their activities inefficient, more than the high scorers do.

According to the responses obtained from teachers, the principals of the low achiever schools are more responsive to requests of teachers request in providing materials even if there is lack of finance than the high scorer principals. Both school principals are found good at arranging classes for make up when request raised from teachers.

The high scorer school principals are found to be better than the low scorer school principals in maintaining problems of discipline caused by students in schools.

Principals of high scorer schools are found at better condition in discussing issues related to teaching learning processes with teachers than the low scorer principals do.

As the responses of students show, the principals of low scorer school are not cooperative to facilitate enrichment classes on Saturdays and Sundays as the high scorer schools do for students taking national exams each year.

Teachers' responses indicate that the principals of high scorer school follow attentively to teachers teaching performance and hence often make class observations, while the low scorer principals deal most of their time with administrative affairs.

Even if the principals low scorer schools do not conduct class observations many times, the principals of both schools discuss what they have observed with teachers.

In terms of discussions about time table /programme/, extra-curricular activity affairs, the high scorer school principals are found better than the low scorer, as teachers responses indicate.

Both types of schools give incentives at the end of the semesters for students who have shown good academic result, except Yekatit 12 S.S.S. which has never done so far. On the other hand, the management of both schools do not give incentives for subject teachers who have been exhibiting good results on national exams in their particular subjects.

5.1.3 Students Characteristics and Background

School facilities, conducive environment, good management and efforts and qualities of teachers would have no significant value without being assisted by good students' behavior and interest for lessons. It is the sound combination of these situations that make learners successful in their academic achievement. Hence, students background, interest for their lessons and school behaviors investigated from teachers, principals and other concerned bodies and the analysis which was stated on chapter four is summarized below.

According to the documents inspected at zone education offices examination sections, the low achiever school students are assigned to these low scorer schools mostly from

government junior secondary schools, whereas the high scorer schools mostly take their students from private mission and public schools mostly.

As the responses of students indicate, the students in the low scorer schools do not participate in class, particularly in English and Maths. Whereas the students in the high scorer schools have responded that they participate in class.

Low participation of students is mostly the result of lack of confidence and interest as the responses of the students from the low scorer schools indicate. On the other hand, low participation of students, if any, is mostly the result of the difficulty of the subjects according to the responses of the high scorer students. Therefore, high scorer schools have students who do have better confidence and interest than the low scorer schools have.

High achiever school students are often observed while they listen teachers attentively and orderly. This situation is completely contrary in the other schools. Students of high scorers are also observed while they try to do class works and assignments given them individually to that of low scorer school students.

Since both school students are found at similar age category, there is no as such significant variation among these schools.

The duration of students in both types of schools is mostly more than two years. Therefore, significant variation is not observed on students' years of learning in both schools and so both school types are equally responsible for academic performance of students.

According to the data from class observation, the students of the high scorer school often answer questions, though they do not take initiatives to ask more than the low

scorer students do. As the observation results indicate, both school students do not make class discussion, even if teachers in some schools encourage them to do so.

As the responses of the teachers indicate, the high scorer school students mostly attend classes and absenteeism problem exhibited in these schools are lower than that of low scorer schools. As teachers responses again indicate, the high scorer school students have interest to learn, while as the responses of low scorer school teachers indicate, interests of students is low in low scorer schools. Further, teachers are more respected in high scorer schools than low achiever schools as teachers' responses indicate.

5.1.4 Teachers Characteristics and Teaching Practices

Teachers are the very essential components of teaching and learning process that make schools effective through their work. Therefore, the qualification, experiences and teaching practices that operate in the schools are investigated through the different instruments used in this study. The whole data gathered through the various instruments is analyzed in Chapter Four. This section presents the summary of the findings.

In terms of qualification, the high achiever school teachers are found in better condition than the low scorer school teachers. Regarding the teachers' positions in the career structure, a sort of variation exists among these schools. When one type of career position dominates in high scorer schools, the other career position dominates in low scorer schools. But most of the teachers in both types of schools are found either as teacher or higher teacher level. It could be said that in this issue, not major differences are observed between the two types of schools.

As the document inspection and teachers response show, the high scorer school teachers have more experience than the low scorer school teachers.

Both school teachers have never got upgrading training for a long period of time. As the responses of students indicate, the low scorer school teachers never use laboratories and even, have no interest to use them as compared to teachers of high scorers.

Although little variation exists regarding preparing and using teaching aids by both types of schools, most teachers of both schools do not prepare and use variety of teaching aids while they teach their subjects.

Regarding the teaching methods, the low scorer school students have responded that their teachers use lectures more than the high scorer school teachers.

The high achiever school teachers often provide class works, home works and other class activities more than the low scorer school teachers do. At the same time, high scorer school teachers have been observed while they correct (see) students class works more than the low scorer teachers.

Still, teachers of the high scorer schools motivate and praise their students more than the low scorer school teachers. Hence, significant differences are observed in such cases.

As observation and students response show, there is a sort of variation among both type of school teachers in their clarity and simplicity of the language they use for students.

Both school guidance and counseling officers, who often teach subjects, have done little for students in both types of schools, and hence no differences are observed in such matters.

Some of the Department heads of low scorer schools are not degree holders while those of the high scorer schools' are fully degree holders.

As the responses of the department heads of both schools show, the low scorer school teachers do not often prepare lesson plans, they are not often responsive to students problem, are not as such respect time for work as compared to that of the department heads of high scorer school put for the above teachers-related behaviors.

5.2 Conclusion

As stated in Chapter One, the purpose of this study is to investigate the school factors that contribute in bringing achievement differences among government secondary schools of Addis Ababa that have equal status.

To restate at the objectives set, five basic questions were set through out the study. The first research question that focused on school conditions and school facilities showed different variations between the two types of schools in various cases, and the same situation in few cases.

High scorer schools have been constantly showing high percentage of students who have been scoring a GPA of two and above, particularly in national exams and so they are definitely categorized as top scorer. On the contrary, the low scorers schools have been exhibiting less percentage of students who have been scoring $GPA \geq 2.00$ in national exams, and so they are definitely categorized as low scorer.

Since high scorer schools have less class size than the high scorer, class size has no impact on bringing achievement differences between the two types of schools.

As long as laboratories and pedagogic centers concerned, the low scorer schools are mostly non-functional when compared to high scorer schools.

Lack of reading rooms, inconvenient facilities such as lounges and staff-rooms for teachers are observed in low scorer schools.

In terms of providing adequate students' s seats, brightness of the classrooms, provision of tables and chairs for teachers, and provision proper and neat toilets for teachers and students, the high scorer schools are found at better conditions than the low scorer schools. Therefore, such comforts could bring differences between the two schools at students academic achievement.

Lack of sufficient finance (income) due to small night income sources is more acute problem in low scorer schools than high scorers.

In terms of answering the fourth basic question put in Chapter One, the characteristics of school managing bodies, qualification, experiences and their cooperativeness were assessed. Accordingly, the principals of the low scorer schools have more burden of work than the high scorers. In terms of maintaining disciplinarily problems exhibited in schools, the principals high achiever school principals have been found better than the low scorers.

At the same time, in frequency of observing classes while teachers are teaching, in facilitating enrichment classes on Saturdays and Sundays, in terms of discussing issues related to academic affairs with teachers, principals of the high scorer schools are found at better conditions than the principals of low scorer schools. Therefore, such differences could directly or indirectly result in differences in academic achievement of students.

On the other hand, in terms of arranging make up classes upon teachers' request, discussions of observation results with teachers, and in terms of giving incentives for students who have been exhibiting good academic performance, both school types are doing the same endeavors, and so differences in academic achievement could not be resulted in as the result of such factors in the schools.

Both school types do not give any incentive for teachers exhibiting good grades in national exams.

The high scorer schools often take students for grade nine from public, private, mission and some few from government schools, whereas the low scorer schools take mostly from government school. As experiences show, feeder school students such as private, mission and public, often perform better in academics than the government schools. Therefore, high scorer schools taking their students from private, mission and public schools exhibit good academic achievement to that of low scorer schools taking students from government schools.

As the results of the study show, low participation students in class that comes from lack of confidence and lack of interest makes students of low scorer schools not to boost their academic achievement.

Students class discipline while teachers teach, doing class works and assignments provided by teachers, the regular attendance of class have made students of high scorer schools to deserve good academic performance.

In terms of qualification, teachers of high achiever schools are found more qualified than the low scorer schools. At the same time, teachers high scorer schools have more experience than the low achievers. These differences in teachers' characteristics could result in differences in academic achievement between the two types of schools.

Lack of teachers' interest in using laboratories is more acute problem in low scorer schools than high scorer schools.

Using a single type of teaching method, mostly as exhibited by low scorer schools, would result in less understanding of subject matter by students and become one factor for poor academic achievement of students.

Problems of not preparing lesson plans, being non-responsive to students' problems, not being present at work punctually and showing absenteeism repeatedly from work by teachers are also serious problems in low scorer schools to that of the high scorer schools.

Praising efforts of students in class and explaining the subjects in simple and understandable ways for the learners in the class are found at good condition in high scorer schools.

5.3 Recommendation

As stated on summary part of this chapter, both school types have the same school status on a few cases, and also have different school status on some others. As the study results show, the low scorer schools are found better on a very few cases while the high scorer schools lack such qualities. On the other hand, the high scorer schools are found on better conditions than the low scorer schools in significant number of school cases.

Therefore, since this study concentrated with detecting school factors which could result in differences in academic achievement of students between the two schools, the recommendations of this study largely focus on what the low scorer schools lack while the high scorer schools are found better in terms of points stated on the recommendations. Hence, the following recommendations are given:

1. Students can learn a lot and understand better if they see and do what they learn in class at school's pedagogic center and laboratories. Though pedagogic centers and laboratories are available at low scorer schools, they are non-functional. Therefore, Zone Educational Officials and school principals have to be collaboratively detect the problems and have to find ways how these learning centers could at least become functional as of the high scorer schools.

2. The low achiever schools have no reading rooms and facilities such as appropriate staff-rooms and lounges for teachers. Therefore, school principals have to set some amount of their annual budget to improve such facilities which could boost the moral of teachers which in turn could motivate them to do a lot.
3. Teaching materials such as guides, texts and manuals of teaching are essential part of teaching materials. Though low scorer schools have few materials on such areas, they are not sufficient as the findings indicate. Therefore, school principals have to device mechanisms of how to form a good relationship with high scorer schools to borrow or copy such materials to be used by their schools. At same time, they must strictly follow and make request from education offices to fulfill what has been done for high scorer schools.
4. Among the many factors that could hampered on the academic achievement of students: inconvenience of learning situations, such as discomfort arises from students seats, large class size in small class rooms, non functionality of toilet rooms are a few points to be mentioned. Since the low scorer schools have such problems, the school administrations have to be set fixed budget at each academic year and must purchase facilities like students seats and build additional classes with in their capacity level gradually. It is also possible to over come the problem of classes by building additional classes by asking the co-operation of NGOs for financial donation.
5. Almost all low scorer schools have no significant income sources, particularly they have no promising night income that could enrich the schools with facilities due to the distance of the schools from the centers. Therefore, these schools have to find junior and elementary schools that do not conduct night classes but found at centers. In doing this, they can rent these schools at night sessions and conduct classes to raise their income from such sources.

6. The low scorer schools have almost equal number of students as of the high achievers, but they are managed by three directors who often complain the burden of work they do have. Therefore; though it difficult to conclude that efficiency could arise as the result of many administrators, zones have to assign additional one principal for the two low scorer schools and try to minimize the work load of the principals as much as possible.
7. The low scorer schools since they are at peripheral areas they have high disciplinary problems of students. The school principals have to call the parents and the community around for meetings repeatedly and discuss over the issue to alleviate or minimize the problems.
8. Enrichment classes on Saturdays and Sundays have to be tried by low scorer schools, particularly for these who are taking national examination by reasonable amount of tuition fees.
9. Low scorer school principals as the finding results indicate, do not often discuss issues related teaching-learning process with teachers as the high scorers do. Therefore, the principals should give more emphasis on such regards than the administrative issue, so that teachers moral may be boosted to do a lot.
10. The high achievers schools mostly take their students from best feeder schools whereas the low scorer take from government junior schools only. Concedering the distances of each school into account, zones have to find and reconsider the way how feeder school types could equally be assigned to both high and low scorer. In addition to this, the practice that each high scorer schools agitate high performing students of low scorer schools to learn at their schools would lead to inappropriate competition and hence becomes illegal which has to be stopped.

11. Students of low scorer schools mostly do not participate in the class. This situation has to be changed and teachers have to motivate them. Different teaching methods also have to be developed by teachers: school principals have to make a general meeting on such issue and teachers have to share their experience how to develop good teaching practices.
12. Absenteeism from classes observed in low scorer schools more than the high scorer schools. Principals and teachers must collaborate and have to make students to call their parents to discuss why students repeatedly absent from classes. In doing this, they could at least minimize absenteeism problem.
13. Zone education offices have to find mechanism such as how to rotate teachers in the schools. As observed in both type of schools, less experienced teachers often assigned at low scorer schools. To boost the achievement of students in both schools equally, teachers assignment in the schools must be reconsidered by offices.
14. Department heads of low scorer schools must at least be BA/BSc holders. Since the complex that could arise in either side could at least be minimized in such away principals have to consider this issues.
15. School principals and department heads should strictly follow whether teachers of low scorer schools prepare lesson plans, give assignments and conduct tests regularly as the high scorer school teachers mostly doing.