



ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

Assessment of Community Participation in the Implementation of Primary

School Curriculum with Specific Reference to Wolayita Zone

Damot Woyde Woreda, SNNPRS

BY

Memhiru Kumalo

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

July, 2017

**Assessment of Community Participation in the Implementation of
Primary School Curriculum with Specific Reference to Wolayita
Zone Damot Woyde Woreda, SNNPRS**

BY

Memhiru Kumalo

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in Curriculum and Instruction**

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

July, 2017

Addis Ababa University

School of graduate studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by Memhiru Kumalo Menamo titled: “Assessment of community participation in the implementation of primary school curriculum with specific reference to Wolayita Zone Damot Woyde Woreda, SNNPRS” submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Curriculum and Instruction complies with the regulation of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the Examining Committee:

Advisor

Signature

Date

External Examiner

Signature

Date

Internal Examiner

Signature

Date

Chair of Department or Graduate Program

Signature

Date

Coordinator

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

At the outset, I would like to praise the Everlasting Father and the Prince of love and peace the Almighty God who always let the bulk of unfinished work to be completed at a moment. There are many people who made this study possible. Had there not been the support and inspiration of such generous people around me, the completion of this study would have been unthinkable. It is very difficult to mention all of them in this short document.

However, I can mention just a few. Likewise, I would like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Solomon Areaya, for his unreserved advice, guidance, and constructive criticism starting from the very commencement up to thesis completion. The completion of this study would have been difficult without his professional assistance.

In addition, I would like also to thank the Damot Woyde Woreda Education Office experts for providing valuable information and also I wish to express my heartfelt thanks to school teachers and students who responded to my numerous questions with patience. Finally, I would like to express my appreciation to my family for giving me moral and material support.

Table of Contents

Contents	Page
Acknowledgements.....	i
Table of Contents.....	ii
List of Tables.....	vi
List of Figures.....	vii
Abbreviation and Acronyms.....	viii
Abstract.....	ix
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.3. Objective of the Study.....	6
1.3.1. General Objective.....	6
1.3.2. Specific Objectives.....	6
1.4 Significance of the Study.....	6
1.5 Delimitation of the Study.....	7
1.6 Limitations of the Study.....	7
1.7 Definition of Key Terms.....	8
CHAPTER TWO.....	9
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	9

2.1. Definition of Community Participation	9
2.2 Definition of Curriculum Implementation	11
2.3 Rationale for the Community Participation in Curriculum Implementation	13
2.4 School and Community Relation	15
2.5 The Role and level of Communities in Curriculum Implementation	15
2.6 Community Representatives and their Roles in the School	20
2.6.1 Parent Teacher Student Association (PTSA).....	20
2.6.2 The School Education and Training Board (SETB)	21
2.7 The Attitudes and Perceptions of School Staff towards Community Participation in Curriculum Implementation	22
2.8 Barriers to Effective Community Participation in Curriculum Implementation	25
2.8.1 Lack of Interest	25
2.8.2 Lack of Training	26
2.8.3 Lack of Time	26
2.9 Alleviation of Challenges of Community Participation in Curriculum Implementation.	27
CHAPTER THREE	32
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AREA.....	32
3.1. Description of the Study Area.....	32
3.2. Research Design and Methods.....	33
3.3. Target Population and Sampling Techniques	34
3.4. Sources of Data	34

3.5. Sample Seize	34
3.6. Tools of Data Collection	36
3.7 Validity of the Instruments	40
3.8 Reliability of the Instruments.....	40
3.9 Procedures of Data Collection	40
3.10 Method of Data Analysis	41
3.11 Ethical Consideration.....	42
CHAPTER FOUR.....	43
DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	43
4.1 The Characteristics of the Respondents	43
4.2 The Attitudes of Community towards Primary Education	49
4.3 The Value of Primary Education as Perceived by the Community	55
4.4. The School-Community Relationship Vis-À-Vis the Implementation of Primary School Curriculum	60
4.5 The Community Involvement and Participation in the Implementation of Primary School Curriculum.....	68
4.6 Factors Influencing Community Involvement and Participation in the Implementation of Primary School Curriculum.....	76
CHAPTER FIVE	79
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS	79
5.1 Summary	79

5.2 Conclusions.....	82
5.3 Recommendations.....	83
References.....	85
Appendix A. Administrative Map of Wolayita Zone	
Appendix B. The Formula for Determining r (correlation coefficient)	
Appendix C. Tools	

List of Tables

Table	Page
3.1. Sample size summary	36
4.1. The characteristics of teacher respondents	44
4.2. The characteristics of student respondents	47
4.3. Teachers' response regarding to activities of school which make parents' having Positive attitude on primary education	50
4.4. Students' response regarding to the school activities which indicate parents' attitude on primary education	54
4.5. Teachers' response regarding school encouraging the community to give value for their primary education	56
4.6. Students' response regarding parent reward to their child based on their school activities	58
4.7. Teachers' response regarding to the extent of school-community relationship	61
4.8. Students' response regarding to the extent of school-community relationship	67
4.9. Teachers' response regarding to the level of community involvement in curriculum implementation	69
4.10. Students' response regarding to the level of community involvement in curriculum implementation	74

Abbreviations and Acronyms

DWWFEDD	Damot Woyde Woreda Finance and Economic Development Department
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
MoE	Ministry of Education
PTSA	Parent Teacher Student Association
SETB	School Education and Training Board
SIP	School Improvement Program
SPs	School Principals
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Sciences
TARSC	Training and Research Support Centre
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WEOs	Woreda Education Officers
WZFEDD	Wolaita Zone Finance and Economic Development Department

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to assess how members of the community participate and contribute to the implementation of the primary school curriculum. The community is strategically partner in a variety of ways towards the provision and management of education as well as teaching learning and enforcement processes. However, based on school and woreda reports as well as the researcher's observation during his career the participation of the communities on schools regarding curriculum implementation in Damot Woyede Woreda was raised as one of the problems that needs improvement. The study was conducted in six primary schools in Wolayita Zone Damot Woyde Woreda, SNNPRS. A total of 270 respondents participated in the study comprising of 199 students, 23 teachers, 6 principals, 4 WEOs, 8 PTSA members, 10 SETB members and 20 parents. To select the participants the researcher used simple random, purposive and stratified sampling methods respectively. The data gathered through questionnaire was analyzed using SPSS software to find frequency, percentage and mean value and qualitative data were used as supplementary data presented under quantitative data. Descriptive survey design was used in this study and the data were collected by questionnaires, interviews, observations and document analysis. Primary school curriculum implementation needs a shared effort and responses from the community, teachers, principals, and students. In the study area community participation in curriculum implementation are limited because of the community awareness towards to it. The roles of the school community in the implementation of school curriculum like follow up their children's' learning, communicating with teachers about their childe's learning, supporting school by resources to facilitate teaching learning process and the others are below the expectation. It is recommended that partnership and interaction between community and school in implementing curriculum must be built to provide initiative, responsibility, sensitivity for participation in education and school governance designed to improve community participation in the implementation of the primary school curriculum.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Understanding the accountability of the community in educational matters has become essential, however, explicitly more problematic (Magstadt, 2009). Most educational institutions have demarcations that have protected the schools from being the admittance by communities as if they are an island. Schools are one of the basic institutions of a community, which are responsible for educating children. In addition to schools, the role of community in helping schools run their overall activities is considered to be of a great importance. Regarding the role of a community in the effective teaching-learning process, the World Bank (2001) notes that community involvement in education plays a determinant role in delivering quality education. According to De Katele and Cherif (1994), community participation in education matters is a grassroots approach emphasizing collective rather than individual abilities, adds value to the child's development processes, and its sustainability.

Communities have always demanded accountability to a process that they have never contributed to in respect of its efficiency and effectiveness (Swift-Morgan 2006; Rose 2003a; Lee & Smith 1996). To most communities, monitoring and contributing to curriculum implementation is a preserve of the supervisory authorities of which they are not part. Community engagement entails the bottom-up approach to curriculum implementation. It has merits in that it results in the community taking ownership of some of the school processes, from curriculum planning through curriculum implementation to evaluation. By marginalizing the communities, primary schools lose the opportunities for community contact in ways which integrate and complement curriculum implementation (Magazine for Alumni and Friends Connected, 2010). Community participation is the recognition that teaching and learning are not done in a vacuum, independent of the historical, political and cultural circumstances of the students (Miller 1995:5). The need to understand this in education is sustainable and developmental. A community is not a homogenous group of people with a common voice and shared the set of views (Rose, 2003b). It is categorized in a variety of ways, for example geographic, ethnic, racial, religious, school

development committee, and many others. Community contribution in curriculum implementation can widen the horizon of the pupils and also give impetus to the process.

The kind of interest the communities generate in the pupils' learning by means of offering skills, knowledge, and talents help the pupils to develop their potential, considered as the successes of the community contributions. The urge to see their initiatives and contributions, either through delegated responsibilities or voluntary service success, have a positive behavior-molding effect on the pupils' learning and achievement levels. The school-community partnership ensures that no school child 'falls through the cracks', as it were. The absence of such a partnership is an enemy of progress, as the teachers fail to tap into and build on the indigenous use and knowledge basis in the community (Prah, 2008). Community members can help students understand concepts, which teachers teach in classrooms by having the students coming into the community, interacting with community members who are knowledgeable about village history and certain issues faced by the community. Respected community members can become knowledgeable lecturers who can come to the classrooms, and teach students issues faced by the community. Within active participation of the community, the teacher can profit by facilitating children's learning. Community participation in education can also be a powerful incentive for teachers. Teachers' absenteeism and lack of punctuality to show up in classrooms on time are serious problems in many places. When teachers are monitored and supervised for their attendance and performance by communities, they tend to be more aware of what they do. Feedback from parents and the community about their teaching performance can be a strong tool to motivate teachers if schools are also collaborative. Involving communities in the education delivery requires facing and tackling a number of challenges.

The school–community partnership should be considered as a valuable force for children's social and emotional learning process, helping them develop and apply the skills necessary to succeed both academically and emotionally at schools and in their actual life. The recognition of the importance of community participation in the effective implementation of the school curriculum, and in an effort to improve educational performance, the Government of Ethiopia has introduced a new Education and Training Policy in 1994, whereby the executive power of school administrations was decentralized from top to bottom levels. Basically MOE introduced, several community participation mechanisms including the establishment of Parent-Teacher-Student

Association (PTSA) and School Education and Training Board (SETB) in the schools (MOE, 1994). These community representatives are expected to contribute to the increase of enrollment, reduction of drop-out and improve the academic performance of students. According to Ethiopian context, different previous scholars explain that community participation needs the cooperative endeavor of the school, the staff, the parents and the community. There is a policy imperative which is conducive to the high participation of the community in their children education in many respects. The question is to what extent the community involves school activities as outlined in the education and training policy and other related guidelines (MOE, 2002). There are some evidences that the level of community participation and hence the implementation of the above mentioned educational policy varies across different schools. In 1994, the Ethiopian government established the first ever sector specific education and training policy document to redress the educational needs in the country, focusing on four pillars – access, equity, relevance and quality (MOE, 1994a). Educational efforts in Ethiopia in the last decades had, therefore, aimed at expanding primary education access for all children in a way that ensures learning. Therefore, during the first decade of this century, schooling opportunity expanded more than ever in Damot Woyde Woreda, as it is true in the whole country. Large numbers of children have been enrolled at primary level, with increased student population at all levels (primary, secondary and tertiary). From their extensive literature research, Heneveld and Craig (1996), community participation can contribute to preparing and improving home environment, by encouraging parents to understand the benefits of their children’s schools. It also shows that students from families that encourage children’s schooling, by allocating time at home for study, encouraging reading, and supporting their children’s educational aspirations, scored significantly higher on tests of learning achievement. Heneveld and Craig (1996), argue that the parent and the community are one of the key factors to determine school effectiveness because they can prepare children’s readiness to come to school and their cognitive development, by ensuring children’s well-balanced nutrition, health, and their overall well-being. There for, in the study area the community participation in the curriculum implementation limited because of this the students’ academic achievement and other school activities are not significant. Based on this background, the study wants to see how the community, as an integral part of the school system, can be involved in curriculum implementation. The study again may provide an in-depth

look at one aspect of community involvement in academic activities of their children and academic achievement of primary school students.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

According to the MOE (2005), the provision of access to primary education for all school age can't be achievable by the government alone. Community participation is of high importance. The community participation on the way to achieve the goal of education for all can be reflected in several aspects, including school management, the contribution of money, labor and local material for classroom construction, curriculum implementation and evaluation (MOE, 2005). Perhaps, there are some intersectional issues, which the school and the communities can share. Marking boundaries among the roles of the partners has no help to either of the parties (i.e. community and school) given the fact that separating them breeds doubt and it is then the children who suffer. If the communities think they have a stake in curriculum implementation, they, however, do not know how they can access that opportunity and how far they should go if it benefits itself.

As a primary school supervisor, the researcher saw primary school teachers in their teaching in various schools when the teachers were doing their day to day activities. At that time, the researcher observed that most primary schools were not approaching the community to engage them in various curriculum implementation issues, such as inviting resourceful persons from the community to present on certain issues in their subjects like Social Studies. If the schools had done these, some community members could have explained relevant issues to the learner in a more understandable manner than the teachers did.

The school fees, construction of classrooms, attending SETB meetings, among others, are what teachers and school heads consider to be community involvement areas in the education system. The two parties (the schools and the communities), however, engaged each other in the curriculum implementation issues to a little extent, and, therefore, the ways how the community members could be effectively engaged in curriculum implementation has become a less researched area in different areas in general, and in the wordas the researcher is interested in carrying out this study in particular.

The guidelines developed to implement the education and training policy have provided vividly the duties and responsibilities of PTSA and SETB members, which are part of the community out of the school. Following these legal frameworks, the structures like the PTSA and SETB are established in all primary and secondary schools in the country with the aim of enhancing community participation in the school affairs and it is also the same in the study area.

However, the stage of implementation of the guidelines and the effectiveness of community participation in the teaching and learning process in the primary schools of Damot Woyde Woreda in Wolayita Zone, SNNPRS is under question. As observed by the researcher during his career and presented in the reports of the school principals, the woreda education office and other evaluation reports, the roles of the communities at the grassroots levels are misconceived to a great extent. Even though there is the community involvement with regard to the curriculum implementation, the efforts were haphazard and below the expectation, which in turn resulted in the failure of the school system in general.

This study, therefore, assesses the extent to which the community participates in the implementation of primary school curriculum in Damot Woyde Woreda. Besides, the researcher tries to analyze the practices and problems that inflame school-community collaboration and community participation during the implementation of primary school curriculum in selected primary schools in the woreda. In line with this, this research answers the following research questions:

1. What are the attitudes of the community towards primary education and how does the community value primary education?
2. How is the extent of the school-community relationship and its contribution to the implementation of the primary school curriculum?
3. What is the level of community involvement and participation in the implementation process of the primary school curriculum?
4. What are the factors influencing community participation in the process of the primary school curriculum?

1.3. Objectives of the Study

1.3.1. General Objective

The main objective of this study was to assess the participation and contribution of the community in curriculum implementation of government primary schools in Damot Woyde Woreda in Wolayita Zone.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of the study were the following:

1. To investigate the attitudes of the community towards primary education in their locality and how they value it.
2. To examine the extent of the school-community relationship and its contribution to the implementation of the primary school curriculum.
3. To identify the level of community involvement and participation in the implementation process of the primary school curriculum.
4. To find out the factors influencing community participation in the process of primary school curriculum implementation.

1.4 Significance of the Study

This study was expected to have the following significances for different stakeholders such as parents, community, teachers, students, administrative bodies, government, and non- government organization. Hence, it;

1. suggest ways of improving community participation in primary school of Damot Weyde Woreda, Wolayita Zone;
2. recommends possible solutions to problems related to community involvement in primary school enhancing curriculum implementation in the selected sample schools;

3. provides useful finding for government to maximize the community participation and support learners; and,
4. serves as an input for researchers who wish to conduct further study.

1.5 Delimitation of the Study

This study was conducted by focusing on the community participation in the implementation of primary school curriculum in Damot Woyde Woreda, Wolayita Zone, SNNPR. It also focused on some selected government primary schools in the woreda administration. All the areas of interaction between the community and the schools will not be treated in this study but the scope of this study was delimited to the community participation in academic matters concerning implementation of primary schools' curriculum issues such as provision of educational expenditure, supervision, and evaluation of student's academic performance in the selected primary schools.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

This research was not totally free from limitations. One of the limitations of this research was the unwillingness of some teachers and students to fill out and turn back the questionnaires on time. One teacher and three students refused to return the questionnaires. The other difficulty was to get WEOs for the interview and to organize participants for FGD due to meetings and participants were from different occupations. Concerning appointed time was another challenge the researcher encountered, especially when some of the appointments were canceled on the researcher arrival, hence stretching the expected time for data-collection. 'Patience' and 'tolerance' were the catch words so as to gain access to the sources of data. Furthermore, especially in focus-group discussions, the tendency existed to digress, to talk about issues outside the topic under discussion. It was, therefore, the researcher responsibility to constantly and skillfully remind the participants of the demands and the focus of the discussion at hand without necessarily telling them that they were off the mark. The above problems like time constraints and knowledge gap to the discussion that can affect the final findings but the researcher managed these limitations with continuous follow-up and negotiations and the final result became good.

1.7 Definition of Key Terms

Parents: refers to the people who have children in their local schools.

Community: to the people who live in the surrounding area of the school and who are stakeholders on the activities of the school.

Community participation: is the involvement of parents and community members in supporting educational activities that contribute to the improvement of school performance in the teaching learning process.

Primary school curriculum: refers to the curriculum designed for grade 1-8.

Curriculum implementation: To put a planned curriculum to use through teaching learning processes in the school. It is the process of the school facilitating the interaction between the learner and the curriculum (Ndawi & Maravanyika, 2011).

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The review of the related literature examines the literatures that are related to the study objectives and basic questions indicated in Chapter One. This chapter considers the concept of community participation in curriculum implementation at primary school level. Letting curriculum implementation and community participation face and better still meet is crucial for both the development of the child and for creating a wider knowledge base for primary school teachers. The review is organized to indicate how the communities and classroom life in the primary school can interface and leave a permanent footprint in education today.

2.1. Definition of Community participation

The word community participation has been defined in various ways by different authorities and organizations depending on their understandings and the contexts used. According to Shea and Bauer (1997), community participation is a collaborative support for the school programs that requires increased activity and commitment on the part of the family members. Shea and Bauer (1997), also noted that community participation is a collaboration that may include information giving and information sharing activities, and is a home – school interference in which family members work together with the school. It is further explained that in the school- community collaboration, family members serve as paraprofessionals, instructors of mini-courses, voluntaries, committee members, tutors and curriculum planners. According to USAID/CSPP (2008), community participation is defined as ‘a social process whereby specific groups with shared needs often living in defined geographic area pursue identification of their needs, make the decision and establish the mechanism to meet their needs’. Community participation is the optimistic relationship between the full-time school Staff and local inhabitants to improve the student’s performance.

For Olsen (1954), community participation is the constructive involvement of people other than adults involved as students and part-time employees in school policy program planning and evaluation. Schaefer (2005), defined community as a special or a political unit of social organizations, that gives to the people a sense of belongingness. Community participation is the collaboration between the school and the community with the aim of improving students’

achievement. It is working together with the community for the improvement of education. To obtain the participation of the community in school activities, the school has to build a two way of communications in which the school reaches and interacts with the community and vice versa. Based on the above idea, we can see that the definitions of community participation in schools' activities revolve around certain key points. These are the fact that the community and the school cooperate, collaborate and interact among themselves in various ways and that the ultimate purpose of the interaction between the school and the community is to improve the quality of education and performance of the students.

As we know education takes place in schools, families, communities, and society the degrees of responsibilities taken by each group are different, none can be the sole agent to take 100 percent responsibility for educating children. Parents and families cannot be the only group of people for children's education as long as their children interact with and learn from the world outside their families. Communities and society must support parents and families in the upbringing, socializing, and educating of their children. Schools are institutions that can prepare children to contribute to the betterment of the society in which they operate, by equipping them with skills important in society. Since each group plays a different role in contributing to children's education, there must be efforts to make a bridge between them in order to maximize the contributions. Education takes place most efficiently and effectively when these different groups of people collaborate. Accordingly, it is important to establish and continuously attempt to develop partnerships between schools, parents, and communities.

According to Epstein (1995, 1997) ways to help children succeed in school and later life, and focuses on partnerships with schools, families, and communities that attempt to: (a) improve school programs and school climate; (b) provide family services and support; (c) increase parents' skills and leadership; (d) connect families with others in the school and in the community; and (e) help teachers with their work. Epstein summarizes various types of involvement to explain how schools, families, and communities can work productively together:

- (1) Parenting – to help all families to establish home environments that support children's learning at schools;

- (2) Communicating – to design effective forms of school-to-home and home-to-school communication that enable parents to learn about school programs and their children’s progress in schools as well as teachers to learn about how children do at home;
- (3) Volunteering – to recruit and organize parent help and support;
- (4) Learning at home – to provide information and ideas to families about how to help students at home with homework and other curriculum-related activities, decisions, and planning;
- (5) Decision making – to include families in school decisions, to have parent leaders and representatives in school meetings; and
- (6) Collaborating with the community – to identify and integrate resources as well as services from the community in order to strengthen school programs, family practices, and student learning.

As mentioned the six models of parent involvement by Epstein are the important points which used to encourage parent involvement and students’ academic achievement. Both schools and Woreda educational office in Damot Woyde Woreda, Wolayta Zone must have seen their education (curriculum implementation) according to these six points. But now a day the implementation of models are under the question. Based on this background the researcher takes these points as a motivation and preparing the questionnaire in the direction of these models.

2.2 Definition of Curriculum Implementation

The word “curriculum” comes from the Latin word “currere” which means “a course to be run”. By this definition, curriculum signifies a course of studies followed by students in a teaching institution. It refers to a course or courses through which learning takes place. In formal education, a curriculum is the set of courses, coursework, and content offered at an educational establishment. A curriculum is a “plan or program of all experiences which the learner encounters under the direction of a school” (Tanner & Tanner, 1995).

According to Gatawa (1990), it is “the totality of the experiences of children for which schools are responsible”. A curriculum is a tool that describes the teaching, learning, and assessment materials available for each specific course of study. It usually defines the learning that is

expected to take place during a course or program of study in terms of knowledge, skills, and attitudes. It also specifies the main teaching, learning and assessment methods and provides an indication of the learning resources required to support the effective implementation of the course. It includes a consideration of the purposes of education, the content of teaching, teaching approaches with the focus being on the product as well as the process and a program of evaluation of the outcomes. This implies that one of the functions of a curriculum is to provide a template or design which enables learning to take place. Through the curriculum, the citizens of a nation are made to ultimately develop an understanding and appreciation of knowledge, learning, and interaction with education. The curriculum thus affects, effects and is affected somehow by the purposes, structures, and contents of the wider society. It provides the education system with an opportunity to respond to the contextual requirements of the times, to address a number of major problems in the present education system, and to ensure that current conceptions of learning, progression, and knowledge are built into education.

As Burgess, Robertson and Patterson (2010) say, curriculum implementation begins with multiple decision-making points when the individual teacher decides to put a curriculum into use through the practical processes. Curriculum implementation suggests a high investment of time and effort in important decisions on topics and concepts or content deemed necessary, and on methods, and monitoring and evaluating the teachers' and students' performance (Alonsabe, 2009; Verspoor, 2006; Lauridsen, 2003). According to Ndawi and Maravanyika(2011) curriculum implementation as the process of the school facilitating the interaction between the learner and the curriculum. The most fundamental agent of this interaction is the teacher. As Ornstein and Hunkins (1988) say that curriculum implementation is the understanding of the relationship between curricula and the social-institutional contexts into which they are to be introduced. Besides, Lim, (2007), sees curriculum implementation as the integration of instructional content, arrangement, interventions, management, and monitoring in the classroom.

Curriculum implementation is the activities of putting the designed curriculum on the blackboard by teachers. It is the activities given to the teachers to teach students the designed curriculum in the classroom. Curriculum implementation practices in Damot Woyde Woreda, Wolayta Zone are solely depends on the teacher in terms of knowledge and skills. Related to this idea Sternberg (2000), stated that, its practices being unresponsive to the students' and the community's needs.

Seriously important, though, is what Sternberg (2000) calls the quality of the total experiences to which pupils are exposed in the classroom. The classroom must prepare the learner to play significant roles in life by exercising their intellectual, physical, social and emotional abilities. Solely because of the teacher in terms of knowledge and skills has seen most schools' curriculum practices being unresponsive to the students' and the community's needs (Sternberg, 2000). Voices are increasingly being raised towards opening up the classroom life to a pool of players who have the knowledge, experiences, and expertise (Caro-Bruce et al. 2007; Lee & Smith 1996). Whereas teachers seek professional independence in the classroom and want to manage all the classroom activities, community involvement reduces a heavy burden on them by promoting curriculum access from different implementation sites (Elliot, 2006). The curriculum implementation can be achieved by strengthening the existing partnerships and challenging the status of standardized classroom teaching and learning by realizing that the local communities are valued academic resources to both the teachers and the learners. The plan is to widen, enhance and energize the learners' learning experiences and has become an educational imperative (Wilson et al. 2008). The study appreciates that creating this state of readiness by preparing the minds of both the teachers and the members of the communities to meet in curriculum implementation can be of a high order.

2.3 Rationale for the Community Participation in Curriculum Implementation

Based on the above definition community participation in the education system is accompanied with the decentralization of education management. Devolution of education management and community participation are closely related entities. Regarding this, World Bank review (1995), notes that 'fully autonomous institutions have authorities to allocate their resources and are able to create an educational environment adapted to local conditions inside and outside the school'. On the same page, the World Bank also stated that quality of education can benefit when schools have the autonomy to use instructional inputs according to the local school and community conditions and are accountable to parents and communities.

Concerning the importance of community participation in the school program, Dodd and Konzal (2002), stated that 'parents are both teachers of their children and mediators of the school'. They have the right and obligation to make sure that children are well served by the schools they attended. In relation to this, World Bank (1995) has also noted that educational institutions may

be accountable for their performance when households are more closely involved in the activities of the institutions. When parents involved in the relationships of a school, the students will more likely be satisfied and more importantly, this will help the education process to be more effective.

As Karen (2004), stated that there is a positive and convincing relationship between family involvement and benefits for students, including improved academic achievement. This relationship holds across families of all economic, racial or ethnic, and educational backgrounds and for students at all ages. Community participation on schooling programs has an undisputed positive impact on students' performance on the following areas: such as earn higher grades and test scores, enroll in higher level programs, be promoted and earn credits, adapt well to school and attend regularly, have better social skills and behavior and graduate and go on to higher education. According to Fahrman and Reimers (1987), students whose parents are actively involved in their education have better grades, test scores, and long-term academic achievement. Students also attend schools more regularly, complete more homework and demonstrate more positive attitudes and behaviors than those with less involved parents. Similarly, Eby (1997), also argued that parents are the child's first teachers and children respond better when they know their parents are behind them, and children are viewed as continuously learning both in school and in the family.

To facilitate a healthy relationship between the school and the community, the school has to inform parents on the important activities of the school, especially on the positive achievements of the school and their children. Such acceptance of positive achievements will be most effective when the exchange of information is specific and frequent. It is also imperative that the school seeks opinions from the community members on areas such as possible improvements ideas. Such close interaction between the school and the community help to increase the ownership of the school by the community. As Davis and Julia (2007), stated that 'to build trust, it is to do what we say or let people know why we have been unable to do so'. One of the targets of participation the community in schools' activities is then to develop a sense of ownership among the people on the school programs. Other strong sides noted on community participation in the curriculum implementation are: Avoid conflicts with education bureaucracy on tasks done in

isolation, Reduce the burden of state duties, Develop a curriculum that covers a wider scope, and Collaborate through financial and other initiatives (Tett, 2003).

2.4 School and Community Relation

School-community relation is the interaction between the school and its surrounding community which helps the community to encourage actively participates in the management of schools and it strengthens the partnership between the school and community (Dejenozka, 1983). The fundamental reasons for creating close and intimate relations between the school and community are economic, educational and psychological, that is, economic which is to make efficient use of resources of both the school and the community. Educational to which that improve the academic achievements of the learner by the use of the environment and benefit adults from the school making it a community learning center. The other important reason is psychological in which use to facilitate the socialization of the learner into the community through socialization the child or youth learns to conduct himself/herself according to the ideals of the community and to acknowledge the conventions of the community. In general, as it is understood that school and community relation help to increase student achievement by establishing conducive school climate and encourage community and create awareness and understanding of community, which leads them to actively participate in the school affairs.

2.5 The Role and Level of Communities in Curriculum Implementation

As we see Learning it is comprehensive by itself. Though, the dimensions border on which decisions must be made Barnhardt (2006), especially on whom to consult, when and how during teaching and learning. To look at the teacher from a holier-than-thou position Barnhardt, (2006), as the sole gatekeeper of knowledge and approaches, and with the notion that learning occurs within the walls of an educational premise Burkill & Eaton (2011), is to demean and steal the value communities and other stakeholders are capable of adding to the complex and fluid curriculum implementation. Community participation has been loosely conceived, defined and implemented. It remains unclear especially in educational terms, to mean monetary contribution, the support of the construction of the school, and anything outside the classroom (Chindanya 2011; Aref 2010; Bull 2011; Laurence 2010, Swift-Morgan 2006; Rose 2003b). This establishment and support of schools by communities, according to Rose (2003b), has always

been evident in many countries. It is often seen as a response to the failure of the government's provision.

Communities have played a relatively passive and isolated supporting role, especially in curriculum implementation matters. The school and its teachers were seen as experts (Barnhardt, 2006; Swift-Morgan, 2006; Ciaccio, 1999). Many educational innovations today are anchored on the strong foundation that communities are part of an existing learning landscape (Burkill & Eaton 2011; Laurence, 2010). Agneessens (2006) and Wilson et al. (2008) assert that it is becoming increasingly difficult for a teacher to possess all the necessary knowledge and competencies in the classroom at all times. The need for increased division of expertise, skills, and information cannot be overemphasized. Schools do not exist in vacuums, independent of influences beyond the teaching-learning context Burkill & Eaton (2011), be they political, social, cultural or economic (Lauridsen, 2003; Miller, 1995). The participation of communities in the classrooms needs to be boosted through carefully crafted engagement practices (De Katele & Cherif 1994). There is need to exploit interactive aspects of learning which sit alongside traditional didactic methods Burkill & Eaton (2011) which have established classroom monotony with little pedagogical renewal (ADEA, 2005). The need for increased emphasis on communities to participate in general school activities, and more specifically in curriculum implementation through pedagogy and classroom support Swift-Morgan (2006), indicates the need for consensus on how, when and what to contribute. There is the need to create alliances premised on the realization that expertise does not solely reside in the school and its teachers (Russell et al. 2012; Marsh, 2009; Mathbor, 2008) but also in its vicinity. The building of dialogue with communities, developing partnerships and getting them on board Burkill & Eaton (2011) in curriculum implementation enriches the primary school curriculum.

Engaging communities is not about creating a revolution in the nature of teaching and learning (Laurence, 2010). It is not a 'handover' of the responsibilities of teaching and learning to the communities (Burkill & Eaton 2011). When schools engage communities they unlock the richness of the community's potential. Further, it expands the pupils' horizons and evolving connections with existing learning to develop new learning (Burkill & Eaton 2011; De Katele & Cherif 1994) and using the best of both worlds (Barnhardt, 2006). Through communities

engaged, what is learned in the classroom derives its meaning from the community context. Sources of knowledge, skills, and values should be seamless.

Rural primary schools, according to Naidu et al. (2012), are fortunately situated in the middle of abundant potential resource persons. These can be used in efforts to improve classroom learning and general academic achievements of learners. Miserably, communities remain inactive resources. Yet the teachers struggle to 'make ends face' in the four walls of the classroom in the midst of plenty (Wilson et al. 2008). While it should be appreciated that most members of the community may have the least training and education Kerry (2001) they can make the significant contribution to curriculum implementation in many and varied ways. According to Bull (2011), the role of communities is: facilitating home-school alignment; building relationships between teachers, families, and organizations; giving their input in the relevant teaching contexts for their children; improving the learners' academic and social contexts; and being a resource. Therefore, the role of the community is to support the schools materially and financially, but more specifically, collaborate with the teachers to produce new knowledge and ideas Bull (2011) and further strengthen existing partnerships.

Community participation in the relationships of schools can greatly vary across diverse geographical areas. Community participation is one way of generating an opportunity to all members of a community to engage in the monitoring of schooling. As stated previously, the term participation is an experience felt differently by different people in different situations. Even in the similar situation the form and level of participation are not the same for all. By understanding this, different scholars categorized the level of community participation in different ways. For instance, scholars like Nayaran and Katrika (1997), described that community participation is a meaningful and active involvement of the community starting from the planning all the way to the implementation of a program. Community members may also participate in the election process of community representatives such as Parent Teacher Student Association (PTSA) at schools or they may participate at higher level responsibilities such as working as community representatives. Parents can also have other responsibilities in improving the teaching-learning process such as creating the conducive learning environment, encouraging students and helping them with their studies at home. Concerning this, Davis and Julia (2007), noted that parents can play positive roles, such as parents can reward their children with extra

attention at home for receiving positive notes; parents can advise their children to behave better and let school staff know what their children are thinking and feeling; however some parents fail to do so when they limit themselves to only listening to meetings and signing forms. This is because they cannot see themselves as valued team members. In this connection, UNESCO (2006), Stated that access and the provision of quality education are realized through the appropriate level of community participation.

Schaeffer (1994), proposed three relatively passive practices and four higher levels of practices on the degree of community participation levels. The three low levels of Schaeffer's areas of community participation are:

1. The provision of resources
2. Involvement at home with motivating children and helping them with home works.
3. Involvements as the audience on passive supports of school run meetings or assemblies.

The higher levels of Schaeffer's community participation are:

1. Consultants on school issues,
2. Partner in teaching learning process
3. Implementers as delegated powers and
4. In control of the school.

These are levels of participation which increase from passive parent and community involvements such as manipulation and the mere use of service to increasingly participatory activities where participants are consulted, then they share decision-making in activities initiated by others, and finally, they decide on and direct activities initiated by themselves. Similar to this MOE (2006), mentioned the stages of community participation in school activities as Diagnosing and defining problems; Collecting and analyzing information; Articulating priorities and setting goals; Assessing available resources; Deciding on and planning programs; Implementing strategies and assigning responsibilities among participants; Managing programs; Monitoring progress; Evaluating results and impact; and Redefining problems generated for further action.

In addition to the direct involvement of the community in the academic activities of schools, there are also indirect ways that the community and community members can involve in enhancing the educational performance of students through creating conducive environment regarding the psychological, emotional and nutritional readiness of the students for the teaching-learning process. Concerning this, the World Bank (1995), states that students' capacity and motivation to learn are determined by the quality of home and school environments' health and nutrition status and their prior learning experiences including the degree of parental stimulation. The main source of children's capacity and motivation to learn is the family through the direct provision of nutrients and health care. The World Bank (1995) also stated that communities can participate in school fundraising in different forms.

When we think about community participation in education, it is important to have a general idea of whom and at what level of the educational system involvement should be required. Since the sophistication of the tasks that require community participation has great variations, the capacity of the participants needs to be considered when seeking support from the community. Individuals with higher capacity can be involved in the decision-making process of the school affairs.

Community participation is not the same in all the schools in Ethiopia even at very nearby schools. The idea is true for the study areas. This is because the school principals and teachers would not give the same emphasis on community participation in the teaching learning process. The cognitive and affective achievements of student improved relations between teachers and parents, and increased coherence between what is taught at home and at school, (MOE, 2006). Furthermore, Parents can be introduced in a general way to what is taught in the school, including why and how certain subjects and topics are taught. This can help to bring parents closer to the school and the school closer to the parents' felt need" (MOE, 2006).

Regarding Ethiopian context in the different period, therefore, there is the different level of community participation in education. During the Derg period, there was a limited level of community participation through the election of community representatives. After the downfall of the Derg regime, the transitional government of Ethiopia (TGE) issued a new education and training policy (ETP) and education sector strategy in 1994 on which the community was endowed with an increased level of autonomy in the administration of school and in the design and implementation of education and training programs. Thus, the participation of the

community is encouraged through decentralization approach to empower the community members in decision-making and to develop the sense of belongingness on the parts of the community pertaining to the school system. The community participation in school management and decision making can be ensured through the establishment of representative committees. Such community education committees include PTSA, SETB, School Improvement Program (SIP) and the like.

2.6 Community Representatives and Their Roles in the School

According to MOE Parent Teacher Student Association (PTSA) and school education and training board (SETB) are the major ones which are established to ensure real participation of the community in school management. The position and roles of these bodies are discussed below.

2.6.1 Parent Teacher Student Association (PTSA)

This association is a voluntary school organization whose members consist of the two teachers and five parents' representatives selected in the parent- teacher conference. The chairperson of the PTSA is selected out of the five parents' representatives. According to Burrup (1972), the central principle of the parent –teacher organization is that the welfare of children is best served by close cooperation between the two groups most intimately and deeply concerned with children. Therefore, teachers and parents are expected partners in the child's development. Burrup (1972), also noted the following four relevant reasons why PTSA is established in school:

1. To promote the welfare of children and youth at home, school and the community;
2. To secure adequate laws for the care and protection of children and youth;
3. To bring into closer relation, the home, and the school, the parents and teachers may cooperate intelligently in the training of the child;
4. To develop the relationship between educators and the general public and create a united effort as will secure for every child the highest advantages in physical, mental and social education.

According to MOE (2002), some of the functions of PTSA being currently practiced are: Approving the yearly plan developed by the school principal; Public sanctions the school yearly

budget; Monitoring the performance of the school; Evaluating the achievements of the school performance with regard to the plan; It serves the role of disciplining students and solving urgent problems within the school.

Regarding the functions and responsibilities of PTSA at school level, MOE (2006), has also outlined directions as follows: Evaluate the efficiency of teachers and appropriate attendance of students, and extend the necessary support in this regard; Ensure that teachers are offering the lessons after undergoing the necessary preparation, make available themselves at their respected workplaces regularly and extend the necessary academic support to students; Offer awards to those students with academic excellence and exemplary discipline; Construct additional classes to avoid congestion; Fulfill the educational materials that are in short supply; Take the necessary measures against those teachers and educational professionals who do not discharge their duties properly and set a bad example.

Schools obtain resources such as money, materials and free labor by mobilizing the community. If there is no clear and transparent system in handling and administering these resources, Parents and communities may retreat and would never contribute anything necessary for the school. Regarding this, MOE (2006), also elaborates that ‘in handling financial system of schools, PTSA members and others who are responsible for handling this system, because financial abuse brings about conflict and divisions. PTSA members should also participate in planning decision- make, and monitor the financial expenditure.

2.6.2 The School Education and Training Board (SETB)

The school education and training board is the top school governing body which comprises representatives from the local administration, school principal, one female teacher representative, teachers’ association leader of the school, student’s representative, the PTSA chairperson, and two additional members of the community. Since as described in the preceding section, the chairperson of the PTSA is selected from parents’ representatives, and hence the community is represented through the PTSA chairperson in the SETB, and the school principal as the secretary of the school board (MOE, 2002). The board is accountable and has the responsibility to approve school plan budgets, monitoring and evaluating school performance and getting dropouts back into the school (MOE, 1994). The main purpose of the school board is to enhance community

participation so that quality education could be provided to the citizens. Therefore school education and training board are responsible for mobilizing the entire community within the school surrounding area. Concerning this MOE (1994), indicated that the responsibilities of SETB are planning, maintenance, finance, staffing, supervision, monitoring and evaluation of the school performances as per the education guidelines and school plans. Communities with the higher level of participation in school management are more willing to assist in the financing of schools. Fundraising is one of the functions of the SETB. Regarding this, the World Bank review (1995), described responsibilities to be performed by school committee as: Improvement of academic curricula and modes of teaching, Co-curricular or extracurricular activities, Promotion of culture and moral activities, Infrastructure development, Organizing library and educational equipment, Welfare and community relations, Interaction with Media, Control of finance utilization and payment of school funds and Student personality development.

According to the World Bank (1995), effective involvement in school governance does not come easily. Exhaustive training is necessary for newly elected committee members. Training can be instrumental for both the literate as well as the illiterate community members. All important segments of the community need to be represented in the community education committees by electing them democratically (UNESCO, 2006). The roles and responsibilities of the committee have to be clearly defined and communicated to them. Democratically elected representatives could bring strong and meaningful interaction between the school and the community.

2.7 The Attitudes and Perceptions of School Staff towards Community Participation in

Curriculum Implementation

The achievement of any effort to involve the communities in curriculum implementation heavily depends on the attitudes and perceptions of both the teachers and the community members (Swift-Morgan, 2006). The diversity of situational and professional conditions prevailing between the teachers and the communities has created high levels of doubt and a lack of respect for each other. This leads to dysfunction and a failure to pursue the avenue of interest (Barnhardt, 2006), by both parties. To engage communities in productive educational interaction, teachers think, is to 'sell their profession' to 'non-believers'. They would rather survive alone in the classroom 'wilderness' (Hargreaves, 1996; Barnhardt, 2006).

A community sees the classroom as a teacher professional area preferring to evaluate teachers' performance through examination results (Swift-Morgan, 2006). However, communities may previously have had these feelings, but today there is a growing desire to make an imprint on teaching and learning rather than to being relegated to the fringes of effective involvement. Elliot (2006), laments that today's classroom teaching and learning has become a one directional rather than a flexible situation permitting other players to make a contribution. The challenge is to connect inherent community strength, skills, knowledge and abilities by means of engagement strategies is challenge but it bearing on communities' involvement in educational matters.

There are many factors shaping teacher-community attitudes and perceptions towards engagement practices. These include the teachers' beliefs about their profession, guarding their territories, fear of being 'exposed', their classroom experiences, their expectations about success and failure (MacLean, 2003). According to Hargreaves (1996), the quality, range and flexibility of teachers to accommodate others in their classroom work is tied to their beliefs and values about the teaching profession with the questions: 'Can the classroom be opened to all?', 'Do the teachers believe that all members of the community should be held to the same standards?' and 'Are communities willing and able partners?' (Swift-Morgan, 2006; McDiamid, 1995; Preedy, 1993). Many teachers, however, feel threatened by the involvement of communities in educational matters (Humphreys, 1993; Hargreaves, 1996). They fear that engaging community members in curriculum implementation, the teachers may experience a loss of boundaries and influence with little distinction between themselves and the community members (Hargreaves 1996). This has created attitudes and perceptions that engaging the communities can destroy real academic classroom discourse and reflection (Hargreaves, 1996). In this regard, teachers continue to find ways to protect their classroom territories.

Teachers believe that engaging the community members in curriculum implementation, who may use any language in the classroom which is not English, may create what Rose (2000), calls 'instructional dead time'. This is where there is little or no learning. With this belief the teachers 'close' their classrooms (Preedy, 1993). Yet, communities are fully aware of their potential. The challenge they face knows how the information they possess is relevant to teaching and learning (Training and Research Support Centre) (TARSC, 2006). Communities are usually omitted from curriculum implementation Holcomb (2009) because; according to Swift-Morgan (2006), the

educated cannot be assisted and evaluated by the uneducated. They do not have the technical capacity, yet there are very few classroom problems that can be solved without the involvement of communities. It is this history of mistrust that makes it difficult to generate authentic participation in education in general and in curriculum implementation in particular from most communities (Holcomb, 2009 and Swift-Morgan's, 2006).

Researches on parental involvement Chindanya, (2011); Ngwenya, (2010) and community involvement Swift-Morgan (2006), have converged on the understanding that involving these stakeholders in educational matters has the advantage of enabling the teachers to use an eclectic approach. Educational experiences do not remain within the narrow confines of the school, more specifically the classroom (Barnhardt, 2006). It is what the teachers think, what the teachers believe and what the teachers do Hargreaves (1996), which can make or break the working with communities in pursuit of common classroom goals. It becomes incumbent upon both parties (teachers and communities) to heal the pain from previous non-engagement practices (Holcomb, 2009). Both parties need to hear the whole story, see the full picture, know the main worries, knowledge, and strengths Davis, Day & Bidmead (2002), and to build a long-lasting effective relationship. A sound relationship is impossible if the communities and teachers dislike or distrust each other. Furthermore, the teacher-community relationship in classroom issues is shaped by how they value each other. Community participation is often limited to certain people. It is generally the parents or guardians of the children enrolled in school, or those persons with more education and other enlightened members of the community (Swift-Morgan, 2006). Unfortunately, though, the poorer community members who cannot easily leave their fields and other wage-earning jobs are less likely to be involved in the curriculum implementation process (Swift-Morgan, 2006). The involvement process should look beyond attitudes such as race, ethnicity, gender, language or dialect, social class, and disabilities. Instead, the focus should be on their potential to provide useful information that can scaffold the teachers' teaching and the pupils' learning.

Thus, the involvement can take on board members of the community, such as chiefs, headmen, religious leaders, elders, local association members, health workers and significant others. They can enter the exclusive territory of the teacher Swift-Morgan (2006) the classroom, as a converging point in enriching the pupils' learning (Bull, 2011). The process of community

engagement in curriculum implementation is heavily dependent upon good communication. Communication influences and is influenced by the nature of the community-teacher relationship (Davis et al. 2002). Communication entails making essential impressions about each member or group of the community as being understood, trusted, helpful or useful in a number of ways. Literature Davis et al. (2002); Bull (2011); Munt (2002); Burkhill & Eaton (2011), has showing that the communities are always ready to be engaged in curriculum implementation issues. It can be achieved as long as they are respected, are shown care and consideration, and if the teachers are also free to disclose and discuss intimate aspects of their classroom lives (Davis et al. 2002). This may seem novel, especially to teachers, but this potentially supportive relationship can help the teachers get information, advice, possible strategies and the necessary resources. It becomes a vehicle by which curriculum implementation can be delivered more effectively. With a change in attitude, the communities can be accorded the importance they deserve in curriculum implementation, given the kind of help and support they provide.

2.8 Barriers to Effective Community Participation in Curriculum Implementation

The process of working together a mutually beneficial engagement between teachers and community members starts off with establishing a sound partnership with a common understanding based on effective communication. The journey to get to know each other and come to a working agreement Davis et al. (2002) is never easy. Usually, it is fraught with differences and conflicts (Holcomb, 2009). Therefore, among the excess amount of problems of effective community participation in curriculum implementation are the lack of interest, lack of training, lack of time and school principal related factors are given the impasses in the presentation.

2.8.1 Lack of Interest

Lack of interest arises from different perspectives. Teachers prevent parent involvement due to their unwillingness to face hostile parent, fear of failure and fear of criticism (Aggrawal, 1996). There is also unwillingness from the side of parents due to their feeling powerless when they communicate with educators. Emphasizing this, Molnar (1996) described that education organizations, for a multitude of reasons, are unwilling to share their power with parents. He further generalizes that absence of clear roles for teachers, principals and parents makes them

disinterested in school activities. According to Shea and Bauer (1997), the factors that prevent parents or community from being involved in school program are; Parents detained the attitude that school is not important enough to take time from work; Parents are unable to help school work; Parents are jealous of teachers' upward mobility; Parents feel that long-time teachers are apathetic and not responsive to them; There is an absence of activities to attract parents to schools. Regarding this, Shea and Bauer (1997), also concluded that the most frequent barrier to collaboration is the parents' attitude toward the school. Teachers must take the initiatives in working cooperatively and teachers must develop friendly feelings toward parents who are often critical, because of the previous school experiences of their own.

2.8.2 Lack of Training

Inadequate training of principals and teachers can be one of the barriers to parent involvement in school activities. According to Bagin and Gallagher (2001), many teachers feel that they have been hired only to teach and not to carry out parent involvement responsibilities. Shea and Bauer (1997), also asserted that training parents in this regard require a great deal of commitment of the professionals to allocate substantial time for this purpose. Parent training is one of the critical issues in the cooperation between the school and the community. Parent training helps to change the current behaviors and interaction patterns of the parents. The barrier to collaboration with parents is the unrealistic expectation of the school and the lack of experiences and skill of parents to carry out the expected responsibilities of the schools.

2.8.3 Lack of Time

Not have allocating appropriate time may also be another obstacle to the teacher - parent collaboration. The teachers may not be able or willing to spare time to meet the parents. On the other hand, the parents may also not be able to visit the school due to busy lifestyles, in addition to the lack of interest or awareness. In Butler's study (1992), as cited by Tadewos (2014), it was found that teachers have little time available for meetings due to the rigid structure of the school days and parents may be too busy with their jobs and other commitments to schedule around. In addition to the rigid structure of school days, teachers may have to allocate time for their families and may not have the flexibility to meet at the parent's convenience. Thus the lack of time and conflict in work schedule are obstacles to parent involvement in children's educations. Therefore

busy life from the side of parents to contact teachers and the rigid structure of the school day from the side of teachers can be obstacles for parent involvement in school activities.

2.9 Alleviation to Challenges of Community Participation in Curriculum Implementation

In the school system, the principal is a key person to organize and mobilize the schools human and materials resources for the successful realization of the educational objectives, so as to bring about quality education. Regarding this Schiefelbein (1990), stated that a good principal has multiplier effects on his/her teaching staff. Alison (1997) noted that the more democratic the principal is, the better the community participation will be. Kandasamy and Lio (2004), also claimed that the principal's effectiveness as a democratic leader depends on much more on his/her attitude towards participating the community and community representatives in the decision making of the school affairs.

The internal management of the school is often taken care of by teams or councils with various members of the school structure. This includes the school principal, deputies, unit leaders, department heads and school board members. Regarding this, Burrup (1972), stated that partnership between teacher and parent forms the basis and the only real hope for a superior school program at all levels Principals have to sensitize, motivate and welcome the community education committee and the whole public to the school. Much of the school's success depends on the quality and effectiveness of the school's leadership. The role played by the school principals either hinder or facilitate community's participation in the school management. The approach and leadership style of the principal could have the direct bearing on school improvement programs. His/her approach and style can make or break the effectiveness of the collaboration between the school and the community. The level of community participation is predominantly influenced by the principal's leadership style. In relation to this, Koontz et.al in USAID/CSPP (2008), defined leadership as: "the art or process of influencing people so that they will strive willingly and enthusiastically towards the achievement of group goals". Since educational leadership is similar to other forms of leadership, educational leadership can be defined as the art or process of influencing people involved in the education sector at various levels so that they will willingly and enthusiastically strive to implement educational goals. In the same document, USAID/CSPP also asserts that the school principal plays an important role in integrating and coordinating the efforts of teachers, staff member, students, and parents to

achieve the desired objectives of education and facilitate the overall aspects of the teaching-learning process.

There are many educational profits to be derived from engaging the communities in curriculum implementation, despite the challenges faced by stakeholders in implementing these classroom reforms. There are no problems that are insuperable as long as there is a will. For the rural teachers to be successful in combating their classroom problems, they have to capitalize on their ties with the community (Howley & Maynard, 2003). Soliciting community participation involves moving everyday life into the classroom and moving the classroom out into everyday life (Barnhardt, 2006). This requires careful and considered planning by the teacher. The success of any meaningful partnership between the teachers and the communities in curriculum implementation depends on the kind of orientation given to the persons involved (Barnhardt, 2006). Sustainable community engagement in curriculum implementation can be achieved by means of a number of community-friendly ways. For example, Gboku and Lekoko (2007), indicate that information-sharing between communities and teachers are essentially the most basic element. It helps the communities to understand what goes on in the classroom, putting them on the right path for involvement. Based on the above idea the information - sharing should be accurate, timely, relevant and within the community's realm of understanding. Wilcox (1999), gives a ladder of participation, where information is deemed top priority, showing the kind of partnership that can be developed between the schools and the communities.

TARSC (2006), adds that a community that is well-informed about existing classroom activities stands a better chance of raising its voice, debating and demanding inclusion and participation. Before the engagement process can begin, the teacher has to do what TARSC (2006), calls a 'transect walk'. This is a systematic walk across the community, allowing the teacher to see a range of features and possibilities, resources (human and material) and conditions in the community. This can be achieved through interviewing, observing and discussing with the community members. This stakeholder mapping is designed to interface with the local environment, tapping into knowledge, skills, and resources in the community available to the teacher (TARSC, 2006). The stakeholder mapping allows for the development of a logical and productive engagement framework between the teacher and the community members. Community members often have an idea of what happens in the schools and the classroom. They

chat with their children at different informal platforms, through national education information systems and other unorthodox surveillance systems.

Gorinski and Fraser (2006), say the following teacher-community engagement practices can be employed, namely: providing a schedule of all classroom activities and programmes, including syllabuses, timetables, sports diaries, etc. to the communities; teachers thinking about communities when planning these classroom activities; incorporating communities in the planning and management of classroom activities, and also accepting and listening to community voices whenever and wherever possible; and teachers can advocate for a curriculum that reflects the culture, interest, experiences, and concerns of the communities. According to Gboku and Lekoko (2007), the two important features of community engagement in the school are incorporating community members' ideas in the planning process and acting together. According to Gorinski and Fraser (2006), this will make both the teachers and the communities accountable. While it is impossible to work with everyone in the community when implementing the curriculum, there are ways of continuously keeping community members alert about what is going on in the classroom. Feedback can be given about the impact of their contribution to children's learning, and what resources are needed. To keep communities informed about curriculum implementation issues, TARSC (2006), advocate for teacher-communities meetings and announcements, especially during communal gatherings, the teacher's research trip to have an awareness of whom to involve, what to include in the curriculum plan and when to consult communities. By means of this stakeholder analysis, assessment, roles, and influences (TARSC, 2006), the teacher can put some aspects of education into the hands of communities thus opening up opportunities for meaningful learning Barnhardt (2006), to the learners.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AREA

3.1. Description of the Study Area

Wolaita zone is one of the 14 Zones found in the southern region and located 390 km southwest of Addis Ababa and 165 km from the capital city of the region, Hawassa. Geographically, the area is located between 6.47⁰& 7.1⁰ N latitude and 37.4⁰& 38.0E longitude. It is surrounded by Kambata-Tambaro and Hadiya zone in the North, GamoGofa Zone in the South, Dawro Zone in the West, Sidama Zone in East and Oromia region in the South East. Nowadays, the Zone has 12 Woredas and 3 reform towns, namely Kindo Koyisha, Boloso Sorie, Offa, Sodo Zuriya, Damot Woyede, Humbo, and Damot Gale, Bombe Boloso, Damot Sorie, Duguna Fango, Kindo Didaye and Damot fulasa woredas, while Soddo, Bodditi and Areka are reform towns. Its total area is 4383km square (438370 ha).

According to CSA (2007) census result the population size of Wolaita Zone was 1,527,908 million of which male 49.2% and female 50.8%. Wolaita Zone is one of the most densely populated areas in the region next to Gedio zone. The annual growth rate is estimated to be more than 3% and the population density is 342 persons per square kilo meter and an average size of 7.3 persons per household (WZFEED, 2014). The economic base of the area is agriculture. It employs 92% of total population and mainly mixed farming system is dominant in the zone. It has the mean annual temperature of 19⁰c.

Damot Woyde Woreda is one of the woredas of Wolyta zone in SNNPRS. The capital city of Damot woydie woreda is Bedessa. This is located at 396 Km southwest of Addis Abeba, 162 Km West of Hawassa and 26 km East of Wolyta Soddo town. The Woreda capital city, Bedessa, is located 6°52 40 N latitude and 37°56 09 E longitude. According to the Woreda statistics office relatively Damot Woydie is found in the direction of the South of Damot Gale, North of parts of Duguna Fango and Humbo, East of Humbo Tabala and West of Duguna Fango according to DWWFEED (2016). The elevation of the Woreda ranges from 1,187meters to 2,136 meters above sea level. The total area of the woreda is 351.96 km². Regarding the climatic conditions, 65% of the area is “wainadega” and 35% of the area is “kola” respectively.

The 35% of the people who live in kola, they are almost all are involved in small-scale trade and the rest 65% are use both agriculture and small-scale trade. The small-scale trade is more affect the children as well as their parents to involve in school affairs. The economic activity of the woreda is predominantly agricultural activity, though it is practiced on fragmented land because of the shortage of farming land. The other major economic activity is the small-scale trade. According to the population survey of CSA (2012), report the woreda had a total population of 105,688 of which 51,782 were males and 53,906 were females. Out of the total population, 7,175 people lived in urban areas and the remainders of the population live in rural areas. The average population density of the woreda is 300 people in one square kilometer.

Availability of school in each Keble contributes greatly to the entire economic development of the woreda in general and growth of education in particular. However, the woreda has great challenges of social services like problems of electricity, water supply, roads and the economy source of the people. This in turn greatly harms the growth of school since the growth of school highly depends on the availability of these services (see Appendices A).

3.2. Research Design and Methods

A main aim of the study was to assess the participation and contribution of the community in the curriculum implementation. For this study, the descriptive survey design was employed. Both quantitative and qualitative approaches were used. Using this approaches because it could minimize the biases of any simple approaches; the more dominant approach used in the research is quantitative but the qualitative data obtained from interviews and observation were applicable to support quantitative data. It is used as a means for convergence and integrating qualitative and quantitative data (Creswell, 2009).

The descriptive survey design also helps to provide adequate information that enables the researcher to suggest some valuable alternatives. Supporting this, Keeves (1990), has pointed out that a descriptive survey design of research is a fact-finding method with adequate and accurate interpretations of the findings. Descriptive survey design was used to gather adequate and relevant data on the actual practice existing challenges & opportunities of curriculum implementation through community participation.

3.3. Target Population and Sampling Techniques

The population of a study refers to the target groups from which the researcher is interested in gaining information and drawing conclusions (Tuckman, 2012). The populations of this study, therefore, are the schools and their communities in Damot Woyde Woreda. There are 32 governmental primary schools in the woreda. By giving similar chance of all schools of the Woreda the researcher select from a total population of six (18.75%) schools were selected as a sample for the study using stratified sampling techniques and then simple random (lottery) methods were used to select one (20%) from city administration & five (18.5%) from rural areas. The target population also comprises primarily WEOs, SPs, teachers, students and community members, namely parents and the community representatives from selected primary schools. In order to select the WEOs, SPs and community representatives and parents a purposive sampling and simple random (lottery) methods were used respectively. Similarly, to choose the school teachers' and students' were selected using stratified sampling technique and simple random (lottery) method respectively.

3.4. Sources of Data

The data were gathered from both primary and secondary sources to accomplish the study and to get reliable and valid information. The primary data were collected from the Woreda Education Officers (WEOs), school principals (SPs), teachers, students, parents and community representatives (PTSA and SETB). The selection of these participants as a source of data were based on the expectation that they have better information and knowledge about the issue of the study as they have better involvement and interaction with the schools as well as activities. Secondary data were gathered from school documents, such as school reports, annual plan, letters written to PTSA and SETB members, the record of PTSA and SETB, the researchers' observations and other committee's documents which are relevant to the objective of this study.

3.5. Sample Size

The sample size refers to a specific number of individuals or cases that are used as the representative of the target population. Mugenda & Mugenda (2003), define sampling as the process of selecting the subject or cases to be included in the study as representative of the target population. Therefore, the researcher selected sample schools from 32 total schools by using

stratified sampling technique. A total of six schools were selected using stratified sampling techniques to get representatives from the urban and rural schools. The target populations are, 20 WEOs, 6 principals, 112 teachers, 1010 students from grade 7 and 8, 42 PTSA and 48 SETB (total=1238) were selected and used for the research.

The main sampling strategies used were purposive, simple random and stratified sampling techniques. Therefore, to select the representative from schools, namely, WEOs, SPs and parents the researcher were used purposive sampling technique. To select community representatives (PTSA & SETB) the researcher used simple random sampling method. The researcher selected the participants like teachers and students by using stratified sampling method then simple random method. This method was used to select the representatives and balance the size. The sizes of samples from all concerned population determined by using the techniques specified are presented in the Table.

Table: 3.1. Sample Size Summary

Respondents		Target population	Sample size	Percentage
Principals		6	6	100
Teachers	Ade Dawe primary school	17	4	21.4
	Adecha primary school	19	4	
	Aratu Sake primary school	20	4	
	Chifissa primary school	18	4	
	Denba Girara primary school	22	4	
	Sura Koyo primary school	16	4	
	Total	112	24	
PTSA		42	8	19.04
SEBT		48	10	20.8
Parents			20	-
Students		1010	202	20
WEOs		20	4	20
Total		1238	274	

3.6. Tools of Data Collection

The questionnaire, interview, focus group discussions (FGD), observation and document analysis were used in this study. The tools were prepared in English language. However, the items of the questionnaires and FGD were translated into Amharic for most teachers use Amharic for daily communication and the interview questions were translated into Wolaytato language, i.e. locally spoken language. This is to avoid language barrier and to get relevant information from the respondents. All translations were done by two language teachers who teach in Demot Woyde Woreda preparatory school and they had good in doing the translation.

1. Questionnaire

The questionnaire is not only instrumental in gathering accurate and factual information about people's opinions and views but it also serves as an appropriate tool to obtain a variety of opinion within relatively short period of time. In this regard, Koul (1998), suggested that questionnaire is widely used in educational research to obtain information about certain conditions and practices to acquire opinions and attitudes of individuals and groups.

The questionnaire was organized in close-ended question and was distributed to the sample population (teachers and students). The questionnaire for both teachers and students were consisted of two parts. For the teachers; the first part was designed to collect their background information like age, sex, educational level, service year and period allotment of teachers per week. The second part of the questionnaire consisted of 21 items. These all 21 items were Likert scale type question items ranging from Strongly Disagree (SD) to Strongly Agree (SA). For the students; the first part was designed to collect their background information like age, sex, educational level. The second part of the questionnaire consisted of 16 items. These all 16 items were Likert scale type of question. It helps the researcher to get valuable information on the level of community participation in the primary school curriculum implementation. The questionnaire was designed to answer the question based on the scale of 1 to 5. A value of one being the least initiative chosen as Strongly Disagree and a value of five being the highest initiative chosen as Strongly Agree commonly.

2. Interview

Interview questions were employed as an instrument to collect significant and relevant information from WEO, SPs, community representatives and parents. The reason for using interview questions is that it provides flexibility for both the interviewer and interviewee to better explain more explicitly what he/she knows and thinks about the issue. The entire interview was audio recorded and transcribed and then directly quoted in the analysis as appropriate. There were eight semi-structured interview questions which were designed for PTSA and SETB members, ten semi-structured interview questions, which designed for SPs, ten semi-structured interview questions, which were designed for WEOs and other seven interview questions were designed for parents who have children in the schools. These interview questions designed to supplement the information that was collected by the questionnaire. These interviews were conducted by the researcher and notes were taken while the interviewees were responding.

3. Focus group discussion

The focus group discussions are means of understanding how people feel and think, and issues or services as participants respond in a collective manner on phenomena impacting and affecting those (De Vos et al. 2012). Within the discussions, the participants share perceptions, the point of views, experiences, and wishes without forcing compromise. Therefore, by definition, according to De Vos et al. (2012), a focus group discussion is a carefully planned discussion designed to obtain perceptions on a defined area of interest in a permissive non-threatening environment. Bell (2012), asserts that a focus group guide is a series of questions and at the appointed time for the facilitator to use.

The researcher constructed six focus group discussions with the teacher for the study. For each group there were nine same questions. Based on De Vos et al.'s (2012), suggestions, all the members' contributions were valued, and the expression of ideas were done without fear of criticism or reprimand. The participants were told at the beginning of each discussion that there are no wrong answers. The goal of using focus group was to hear the participants' general perspectives and allowing them to actively debate on issues (Maree, 2012). For convenience purposes, focus group discussions should take in a pre-selected quiet, comfortable, relaxed, friendly and controlled school environment (Patton & Cochran 2002; De Vos et al. 2012). The

actual discussions took place in classrooms. The discussions lasted for one and half hours. The focus group discussions were recorded using a Digital Voice Recorder (DVR) and also by means of detailed handwritten notes taken by the researcher himself. By means of discussions, the researcher was able to gather the ideas and opinions of a number of teachers at the same time. Each of the groups consisted of six teachers drawn from each of the participating six primary schools. Because to keep teaching learning process safely the researcher organized only six teachers in each school. The members were homogeneous group of primary school teachers. The researcher wanted the broad range of ideas on issues of community participation in curriculum implementation. In order to establish the group norms and to make the discussion focused, the researcher gave the following ground rules at the beginning of each discussion: there is no right or wrong answer; hence the need to respect each other's views; remain focused on the topic under discussion; only one person may talk at a time; everyone is encouraged to participate; the information discussed remains known only to the members of the group and should never be discussed at any time after the discussion has ended.

The enforcement of ground rules (in a diplomatic and polite manner) was done in order to control the discussions and to avoid disruptions especially irrelevant aspects was brought up. Throughout the six focus group discussions, the researcher followed Morgan's (2010), suggestion of demonstrating that the researcher was a good and interested listener, by paying special attention to what the participants were sharing but always staying neutral and impartial.

4. Document Analysis

The document analysis checklist was prepared in a similar process as that of the questionnaire and interview. The document analysis was used to collect data from previously documented activities regarding community participation in the teaching and learning process. These data were gathered from annual plans, annual reports, and official letters.

5. Observation

The observation was done by the researcher himself carefully and attentively from the school environment based on the check list which was prepared by the researcher purposefully and the data were gathered while the researcher conducted the school for the purpose of the research.

3.7 Validity of the Instruments

Validity is the extent to which research instruments measure what they are intended to measure, (Oso & Onen, 2008). There are different forms of validity; content validity and face validity. Content validity refers to whether an instrument covers the content expressed in the objectives properly. In this study, the instruments were prepared to cover areas under investigation. Face validity refers to the overall impression about the suitability of an instrument whether the item was understandable or not. To test the validity of the instruments, a draft of the questionnaires were distributed to my advisor and for two PHD students. They commented on that the instruments lacked of consistency, clarity in some aspects. Based on their comment, the necessary correction had done to improve the validity of the instrument.

3.8 Reliability of the Instruments

The reliability is a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields constant results or data after repeated trials (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). It enables a researcher to estimate error and make corrections if any. The research instruments were tested in order to assess their reliability. The pilot study was done in one school that was not involved in the actual study. A sample of 15 students from grade 7 & 8 was selected by giving a number to every student then placing the numbers in a container and then picking at random by using simple random method. And again the sample of 8 teachers was randomly selected by using the procedures and involved in the pilot study. To test the reliability, the test-retest technique was used. The questionnaires were given to the respondents to fill in and then after one week, the same questionnaires were given again to the same respondents. After the two tests were administered, the Pearson product-moment correlation was computed to determine whether the scores on the test correlate. The teacher's questionnaire yielded a reliability of 0.89 and the student's questionnaire yielded a reliability of 0.84. According Mugenda & Mugenda (2003), the correlation coefficient greater than 0.7 it considered as appropriate. Therefore, the instrument was found to be reliable as statically recommended a test result of 0.70 and above is reliable as results of the feedback from the pilot test. The formula that was used to determine the correlation coefficient (r) we can see from appendices B.

3.9 Procedures for Data Collection

After developing the data gathering tools, the pilot test was carried out in one of the primary schools, different from the target schools to test validity and reliability of the instruments. This helped the researcher to check whether or not the items were clear and understandable by the respondents. After this, the respondents identified the teachers, and students in each school were invited by the respective principals for an orientation. A briefing on how they will go on to fill the questionnaire was given by the researcher and the questionnaires were immediately distributed to the respondents in each school. After the respondents completed filling their responses to the questions, the appropriately completed questionnaires were collected by the researcher. The orientation for WEOs was given at the education office and then immediately the interview was proceeding.

For the interview, the SPs, PTSA and SETB members, as well as parents in each school, were called and orientation was given by the researcher on how to give the response to each interview questions and immediately the interview was conducted. Finally, all the respondents were interviewed one by one by the researcher and then their responses were recorded on sheets of paper and the audiovisual and transcribed. The final data gathering tools were document analysis and observations, which were taken by the researcher. The data gathering from documents of each school was conducted by the researcher using the checklist. Then, the researcher has compiled the data, which were gathered from each school.

3.10 Method of Data Analysis

The purpose of this study was to assess the participation and contribution of the community in curriculum implementation of government primary schools in Damot Woyde Woreda in Wolayita Zone. In order to achieve the objectives, data obtained from different sources through different data gathering instruments were analyzed based on the nature of the data. Therefore, both quantitative and qualitative data were used and analyzed accordingly. The data which were obtained through questionnaires' (teachers and students) statistical analysis through calculating percentage of each item, frequency of each item and the mean value in the questionnaires. During analysis, similar items were clustered together for the sake of simplicity of presentation.

Qualitative data analysis method was also employed as a supplementary data analysis technique for triangulation and justification purpose. As a result, the data collected through the interview (WEOs, SPs, PTSA, SETB and Parents) were open-ended questions; observation and document review were narrated under quantitative data items related to it. Then analysis and interpretation were made in relation to the basic questions of the study and then the findings of the study were compiled. Finally, conclusions and recommendations were drawn.

3.11 Ethical Consideration

Ethical issues were taken care of by the verbal consent of the participants and the researcher. For the purpose of anonymity, I did not attribute quotations to individuals. Furthermore, the researcher assured all the respondents of anonymity prior to the collection of data. They were also informed that the data that was generated through the questionnaires, interviews, and group discussion were to be used only for the purpose of research and the participants were at liberty to ask any questions about the study before as well as during the data collection.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter deals with the presentation, analysis, and interpretation of the data gathered through the questionnaire, interviews, FGD, Observation and document analysis. It is divided into six sub-sections as presented below.

The data obtained from the respondents are summarized in Tables and analysis of the responses is presented. Analysis of the data obtained through close-ended questions has been done by calculating the frequency, percentages and mean values. The open-ended questions like interviews, FGD, Observation and documents analysis, are analyzed through qualitative narrations are used to supplement the analysis of the questionnaire.

4.1 The characteristics of the Respondents

This section presents the findings on the characteristics of the respondents. The purpose of examining this section is to perceive if there are socio-demographic and other factors that can affect the teachers and school management correlation with the community through the implementation of the curriculum. Socio-demographic factors, such as age, sex, educational qualification, years of service, responsibility other than teaching and teaching load in terms of period's allotment of each teacher has been compiled and is shown in Table 4.1 below.

Table: 4.1. The characteristics of school teacher respondents

No	Items		Respondents	
			No of teachers	%
1	Age	21-26	6	26.1
		27-32	12	52.1
		33-38	0	0
		Above 38	5	21.7
2	Sex	Male	12	52.17
		Female	11	47.8
3	Educational qualification	Diploma	16	69.6
		Degree	7	30.4
		If any other	0	0
4	Years of service	1-6	8	34.78
		7-12	11	47.82
		13-18	1	4.3
		Above 18	3	13.04
5	Responsibility other than teaching	Unit leader	3	13.04
		Dep. Head	12	52.17
		PTSA members	2	8.69
		If any other	6	26.08
6	Teaching load per week	10-14	1	4.3
		15-19	3	13.04
		20-24	10	43.48
		25-30	9	39.13

Concerning the age of the teacher, 26.1% of participants are between 21-26 years of age, 52.1% of them are between 27-32 years of age and 21.7% are above 38 years of age. As we can see from above description majority of the teachers are below 35 years. This shows that they have age difference it can affect the communication of teachers with the parents and community appropriately based on curriculum implementation and other school activities because most of them are below 35 years of age. Teachers might not see the problems from a parent's perspective in addition to their teaching roles.

Regarding the sex of the teachers, 52.2% of participants are male and 47.8% of participants are female. The teachers who participated in this study have the nearest equal number of sex. Based

on the above description almost there are an equal number of both male and female teachers in the school. This helps schools to reduce sex related factors.

Regarding professional qualification of the teachers, Table 4.1 shows that 69.6% of participants are diploma holders and 30.4% of participants are first degree holders. According to the current teachers', supervisors', and principals' profile framework commonly called as the "blueprint", the qualification requirement of teachers for primary schools is diploma level. Based on this qualification standard, all teachers within the sample taken from the six schools are meeting the minimum qualification requirement currently in effect. Further, reviews of the teachers' qualification, 30.4% of the teacher in the sample school have degrees while their position requires only diploma. Based on this, therefore, all of the school staff is fulfilled the minimum qualification standard set by the Ethiopian Ministry of Education and hence we can safely say that the schools under study do not have significant deficiency that can negatively affect the school community interaction concerning qualification.

The years of service of the participants from the Table 4.1 above, 34.78% of teachers have between 1-6 years of service, 47.82% of teachers have between 7-12 years of service, 4.3% of teachers have between 13-18 years of service and the remaining 13.04% of teachers have above 18 years of service. This means most of the teachers have less work experience, so this can influence teacher's communication with the community regarding the issue of curriculum implementation. Therefore as far as service year is concerned, lack of sufficient service years might be expected to have a negative impact on the teacher community interaction.

Regarding the responsibility of the teachers other than teaching, according to Table 4.1, 13.04% of teachers participant are the unit leader, 52.17% of teachers participant are head of the department, 8.69% of teachers participant are PTSA members and the remaining 26.08% of teachers' participant have another responsibility. Based on the above description, the researcher came to generalize almost all teachers have the responsibility other than teaching. The additional responsibilities can influence to the teacher- community interaction.

Concerning to the teaching load on the teachers the data above in Table 4.1 shows that 4.3% of teachers had a weekly workload of between 10-14 periods; the 13.04% of teachers had a weekly workload of between 15-19 periods; the 43.48% of teachers had a weekly workload of between

20-24 periods and the remaining 39.13% of teachers had a weekly workload between 25-30 periods respectively. The majority number of teachers (82.61%) had 24 and above periods per week. Since the maximum number of periods in each class takes per day is 6, the teachers with 30 periods per week are 100% fully occupied every day of the week and the teachers with 25 periods per week are 83.3% occupied every day of the week and the like. The researcher, therefore, came to generalize the idea it is difficult to expect the teachers with such high workloads to have time for interaction with parents and community. However, the teachers who have less than or equal to 20 and below periods per week respectively have a great opportunity to interact with parents and community effectively.

The Table 4.2 below; presents the findings on the characteristics of the students. The purpose of examining this section is to perceive if there are socio-demographic and other factors that can affect the students learning activities and interaction with the school environment based on the implementation of the curriculum. Socio-demographic factors, such as age, sex, students parent educational status and parent occupation status has been compiled.

Table: 4.2. The characteristics of student's respondents

No	Items		Respondents	
			No of the pupils	%
1	Age	13-15	144	72.4
		16-18	41	20.6
		Above 18	14	7.0
2	Sex	Male	98	49.2
		Female	101	50.8
3	Students grade level	7 th	101	50.8
		8 th	98	49.2
4	Students parent educational status	Illiterate	53	26.6
		Literate	146	73.6
5	Students parent occupation status	Civil servant	26	13.1
		Private work	173	86.9

The age of the student from the Table 4.2, 72.4% of participants are between 13-15 years of age, 20.6% of them are between 16-18 years of age and 7% of participants are above 18 years of age. The majority of the students are 13-15 years of age representing 72.4%. This goes to ascertain

that the students used in the study had the experience and the mentality to understand and respond to the questions presented to them. This had an important impact on the study in trying to ascertain the influence in the curriculum implementation of primary schools.

The sex of the students from the Table 4.2, 49.2% of participants are male and 50.8% of participants are female. The students who participate in this study have balanced number of sex. Based on the above description almost there are an equal number of both male and female students in the school. This helps schools to reduce sex related factors.

As we see from Table 4.2 students' Parent Status of Education, 26.6% of participants are saying parents are illiterate and 73.6% of the participants are saying parents are literate. The majority number of parents are literate especially most of them are learned up to grade eight or they complete the first cycle based on the above data.

When we see the student's parent job status as illustrated in Table 4.2 above 13.1% of participants are saying parents are government employees and 86.9% of participants are saying parents are the private workers. The majority number of parents are private worker especially most of them are farmers and merchants.

During the interview time, the researcher asked the parents how they attempt to help their children with regard to their learning and they replied that:

We are more than willing to assist school activities as well as children but we cannot force ourselves into the school rather than keeping the children's school time if the school does not invite us. If there is no invitation for us, we will not be angry with them. We will continue to play our usual roles.

Based on the parents' idea the researcher, therefore, came to generalize that it is difficult to expect the parents with such private workers to have time to assist in school activities and helping their children regarding their learning without the school support. Students enter a classroom environment with differing levels of parent involvement and attitudes towards education, which may be a barrier in maximizing the students' learning potential, resulting in possible decreased academic success. Whatever the educational background or social class of their parents, research has shown that students at all grade levels experience increased academic success when their parents participate at school and encourage education and learning at home (Dauber & Epstein, 1989).

4.2 The Attitudes of Community towards Primary Education.

This section presents about the role of school principals and teachers to have the positive attitude for community on primary education and the community attitude based activities. Having a comprehensive approach to partnerships between schools, families, and communities allows schools to build on their strengths. A comprehensive approach fosters positive attitudes about the school and about families and community members because it respects the varying capacities of the school population as a whole. The achievement of any effort to involve the communities in curriculum implementation heavily depends on the attitudes and perceptions of both the teachers and the community members (Swift-Morgan, 2006). With a change in attitude, the communities can be accorded the importance they deserve in curriculum implementation, given the kind of help and support they provide. Having good relationship of schools have with community members and encouraging their participation from planning up to evaluation all school-related issues; it can develop the sense of ownership. The following Table 4.3 is containing the analysis of teachers' response.

Table: 4.3. Teachers' response regarding to activities of school which makes parents having positive attitude on primary education

n = 23

No	Items	SD	D	U	A	SA	Mean
		%	%	%	%	%	
1	In my school teachers provides clear information about curriculum, assessment and achievements level for parent and community.	13.04	34.8	26.1	17.4	8.7	2.73
2	In my school there is motivation efforts supports made by the school principals to make me active participant in all school programs.	13.04	43.5	30.4	4.3	8.7	2.52
3	In my school teachers encourage parents and community members to share their experience with students as part of classroom activities.	17.4	21.7	30.4	21.7	8.7	2.82
4	In my school parents gave frequent feedback on their children's homework performance.	21.7	21.7	30.4	13.04	13.04	2.73

Key: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, U = Undecided, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree, n = number of participants

Question one of Table 4.3 addressed that teachers provide clear information about curriculum, assessment and achievements level for parent and community. We can see from Table 4.3, 13.04% of participants said that the activity has been done very rarely, 34.8% of participants said that the activity has been done rarely, 26.08% of participants said that the activities have been done sometimes, and 17.4% of participants said that the activity has been done most of the time and 8.7% of participants said that the activities have been done frequently. The mean value is 2.73 approaches 3. This shows that the attitude of school teachers to provide clear information about curriculum, assessment and achievements' level for parent and community is neutral. Why it could so because the respondents are fire to give the exact answer to issue.

According to the question 2 from the Table 4.3, 13.04% of participants said that the activity has been done very rarely, 43.5% of participants said that the activity has been done rarely, 30.4% of participants said that the activities have been done sometimes, 4.3% of participants said that the activity has been done most of the time and 8.7% of participants said that the activities have been done frequently. The mean value is 2.52 approaches 3. This shows that the attitude of principals to make motivation efforts support for both PTSA & SETB to have the active participant in all school programs is neutral. Why it could so because the respondents are fire to give the exact answer to issue.

During the interview time, the researcher had asked the principals if they had taken any pieces of training concerning community-school interaction all principals responses were similar things. One of them responds the following:

I haven't taken any that much training concerning the issue of the mechanisms of school-community interaction. It may be a matter of service year, mean that before when I came to the principal it might be given. Now I have only two years of service on school principals. Within my staying time I didn't take such training focused on the issue. But if I take such kinds of training I may give the hint to the teachers on how to involve the community in school activities.

This shows that all the principals in the six schools do not have any formal or conditional exposure or training focused on community participation in school activities. Based on the above idea researcher hence has the notion that although most of the teachers and principals working in the target schools have stayed in the job for few service years, they do not have sufficient

experience on community-school interaction. Because of this their action becomes neutral. Why it could so because the respondents are fire to give the exact answer to issue.

Questions of Table 4.3, namely number 3 addressed that the issue of teachers giving support and encourage the community to participate in teaching learning activities. From the respondents with percentage value of 17.4% participants said the activities have been done very rarely, 21.7% participants said the activities have been done rarely, 30.4% participants said the activities have been done sometimes, 21.7% of participants said that the activities have been done most of the time and 8.7% of participants said the activities have been done frequently. The mean value is 2.82 then it approaches 3. This shows that the attitude of the teachers to give support and encourage the community to participate in teaching learning activities is neutral. Why it could so because the respondents are fire to give the exact answer to issue.

During the FGD discussion time, one teacher, he reacts the following:

The community is one of the backbones of education. Without the strong community participation, the school or the government can't achieve the education goal. Most of the time schools may fell without the support the community. In our school, the situation is the same. To bring the community participation teachers are the number one stakeholder. At this time including me and other teachers in our school haven't try to involve the community in the curriculum implementation as well as other school issues. What I now in our school is the only thing coming to school on time and teaching students. Up to know I am not trying to encouraging and support the community so that they participate in school activities.

Question four from the Table 4.3 above addressed that the teachers' perspective on the level of parents' intervention on their children's homework. The responses show that; 21.7% said that the activity has been done very rarely, 21.7% said that the activity has been done rarely, 30.4% said that the activities have been done sometimes, 13.04% said that the activity has been done most of the time, and 13.04% of the respondents is that the activity has been done frequently (100%). The mean value is 2.73 then it approaches 3. This shows that the attitude of parents to give frequent feedback on their children's homework performance is neutral. In general, the attitude of the community as well as the school staff to participate the community in the school curriculum implementation is neutral so it needs some motivation effort from the Education office to the stakeholder on how to involve the community in the implementation of the school curriculum.

During the interview parents narrated an interesting story to the researcher about their experience with their student children. One students' father narrated the story as follows:

Initially, I was not doing any follow-up on my son educational experiences. But one day I was called by the school teacher and a teacher told me that my son performance at school both academically and behaviorally was not good. I was alerted by this and I started to develop a program for my son study at home, follow him with his homework activity, to give feedback upon it and restricted my son from spending too much time playing. While I have not educated myself, I asked my wife, who is better educated than me, to help my son with his studies. Furthermore, I said that I advised my son to avoid friends whose behaviors were not desirable. Following this interference, the father claimed that his son improved his learning performance in his class.

The other parents interviewed, however, offering similar responses when asked about the level of their involvement in their children's education. All of them similarly said that they are not providing any academic assistance to their children, other than fulfilling their material requirements and following up their children's on time return back home.

When the researcher conducts the interview with the parents and community representatives by raising different questions to see what their attitude seems like toward to the education and educational activities they react the following point.

Education is the basic one for the community to change themselves. Up to now we participate in different activities in school. But we have lot of problem like economic and knowledge. To cover our problems we lost our time in different activities. We are together with our children at night. As we know that when we sent our children to school at school time that is the only way to educate our children. Because of the shortage of time and lack of knowledge how to asses our children by their education we up to now not appropriately participate in the curriculum implementation but our attitude towards to education is not negative. If any professional give us hint on how we participate in curriculum implementation we implement it because it is ours. From this above idea the attitude of the community towards to education is not negative but to have positive attitude and participate effectively professional support is needed.

Some teachers and principals purposely or unknowingly, discourage parents and community participation (Kandasamy and Lia, 2004). Supporting this, the report of UNESCO (2002) noted that principals and teachers sometimes refuse to encourage the school board and association board members or parents to actively participate for they fear that these community members

would get overall control of the pedagogical matters, which they have no mastery. On the other hand, principals and teachers may perceive that school board and association members often have few decision-making skills and they degraded the capacities of the community representatives to participate in the educational activities of the school. Parents who had unpleasant school experiences are often reluctant to become involved with their children's schools because they develop the negative attitude to the school (Barbour and Barbour, 1997). Also, some parents view that the responsibility of schooling is that of schools. School personnel may conceptualize and perceive parent involvement activities' outcomes differently, that of academic achievement while parents viewed it as means of supporting the total well-being of the child.

Table: 4.4. Students' response regarding to the school activities which indicates parents' attitude on primary education

n = 199

No	Items	SD	D	U	A	SA	Mean
		%	%		%	%	
1	My parent's discuss about educational values at home.	18.6	24.6	33.2	20.6	3	2.66
2	My parents know about whether I really go and what I do in the school.	15.6	32.2	33.2	10.1	9	2.65
3	My parents advise me to show good discipline at school.	13.1	22.1	27.6	25.6	11.6	3.02

Key: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, U = Undecided, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree, n = number of participants

Question one from Table 4.6 addressed that parents discuss on educational values at home. From the analysis 18.6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done very rarely, 24.6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done rarely, 33.2% of the respondents said that the activities have been done sometimes, 20.6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done most of the time and 3% of the respondents said that the activities have been done frequently. The mean value of question one is 2.66, then this approaches 3. Based on mean value the attitude of parent's to discuss educational values with children at home is below the expectation.

Question two from the table 4.6 addressed that parents know about whether their children really go and what they do in the school. From the analysis 15.6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done very rarely, 32.2% of the respondents said that the activities have been done rarely, 33.2% of the respondents said that the activities have been done sometimes, 10.1% of the respondents said that the activities have been done most of the time and 9% of the respondents said that the activities have been done frequently. The mean value of question two is 2.65, then this approaches 3. Based on mean value the attitude of parents to know about whether children's really go and what they do in the class is below the expectation.

Question three from the table 4.6 addressed that parents advise their children to show good discipline at school. From the analysis 13.1% of the respondents are said that the activities have been done very rarely, 22.1% of the respondents said that the activities have been done rarely, 27.6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done sometimes, 25.6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done most of the time and 11.6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done frequently. The mean value of question three is 3.02. Based on the mean value the attitude of parents to advise their children to show good discipline at school is neutral. In general, the attitude of parents to involve student's school activities as the above result show that is neutral.

The idea of community participation in curriculum implementation by itself is one geared towards making education easily accessible to the citizen, making children learn about the community from members themselves; and making the school a cultural and educational center of activities of the community. Community participation in the implementation of primary school curriculum in Damote Woyide Woreda, Wolyita Zone premises on the acceptance that primary education is a lever for social, economic and political advancement. The community believe that the basic tools to prepare the individual for a modernizing role can be impacting in the primary school curriculum and this formed the bedrock of community participation in the implementation of primary school curriculum in Damote Woyide Woreda, Wolyita Zone.

4.3. The Value of Primary Education As Perceived By the Community.

The norms and values of the community could be said to be synonymous with its culture. Every society holds in high esteem, its cultural values and therefore guides it jealously from extinction;

one of the best ways a culture of norms could be preserved is through education. The inclusion of such norms and values in the curriculum will be possible if the community develops the interest in what the school does through their active participation. Some communities have, due to their own understanding of the relationship that should exist between school and the host community went ahead to even establish the community school. This is what Michael, (1974) terms “breaking the barriers between school and the community around it”. He further opined that;

The community school also requires community control through its managing or governing body. The community school does not consist of just letting the community into the school. But it is equally concerned with making the education of the children relevant to the community.

The children’s education must be relevant not only to their experience, and thereby engage their interest, but also to the life they will lead. This section presents about the role of the school to initiate community having the good perception on primary education. All the data is presented in Table 4.5 below.

Table: 4.5 Teachers’ response regarding school encouraging the community to give value for their primary education

n = 23

No	Items	SD	D	U	A	SA	Mean
		%	%	%	%	%	
1	In my school teachers provide ongoing and specific information to parents on how to assist their child with skills that they need to improve.	13.04	34.8	30.4	8.7	13.04	2.73
2	My school provides opportunity to parents and community members to manage, monitor and supervise school resources and activities.	13.04	34.8	30.4	8.7	13.04	2.73
3	In my school teachers send students work daily or weekly for parents to assess and comment on.	26.08	30.4	13.04	21.7	8.7	2.56

Key: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, U = Undecided, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree, n= number of participants

Question one of Table 4.5 addressed that teachers provide ongoing and specific information to parents on how to assist their child with skills that they need to improve. We have seen from

Table 4.5, 13.04% of participants said that the activity has been done very rarely, 34.8% of participants said that the activity has been done rarely, 30.4% of participants said that the activities have been done sometimes, 8.7% of participants said that the activity has been done most of the time and 13.04% of participants said that the activity has been done frequently (100%). The mean value of question one is 2.73, which approaches 3. Based on the mean value teachers sometimes provide ongoing and specific information to parents on how to assist their child with skills that they need to improve.

Question two of Table 4.5 addressed that the school provides the opportunity to parents and community members to manage, monitor and supervise school resources and activities. For the question two, 13.04% of participants said that the activity has been done very rarely, 34.8% of participants said that the activity has been done rarely, 30.4% of participants said that the activities have been done sometimes, 8.7% of participants said that the activity has been done most of the time and 13.04% of participants said that the activity has been done frequently (100%). The mean value of question two is 2.73, which approaches 3. Based on the mean value the school providing the opportunity to parents and community members to manage, monitor and supervise school resources and activities is sometimes.

During the interview with the parents' representatives of four schools, however, the above result was supported by the parent's representatives interviewed as the parents what they feel that:

Most of the time the schools are not provide the opportunity to parents and community members to manage, monitor and supervise school resources and activities. The only thing school invites us during end of the year to tell the end implementation result of all school activities. At the time all things are new for us and it has no sense for us. According to our condition, the school's activities are not clear and open to the community members to manage, monitor and supervise it. This condition makes us to reduce our impasses to give to educational activities and finally our value giving to our school is no significant.

Question three of Table 4.5 addressed that the teachers send students to work daily or weekly for parents to assess and comment on. As we see from the table 4.5, 26.08% of participants said that the activity has been done very rarely, 30.4% of participants said that the activity has been done rarely, 13.04% of participants said that the activities have been done sometimes and 21.7% of participants said that the activity has been done most of the time and 8.7% of participants said that the activities have been done frequently. The mean value of question three is 2.56, so it

approaches 3. Based on the mean value teachers sometimes send students to work for parents to assess and comment on it. It shows that there is less cooperative work in the school and it affects the curriculum implementation. Shea and Baur (1997) indicated that if teachers work cooperatively, develop friendship feelings with parents, community participation will be improved.

Table: 4.6 Students’ response regarding parent reward to their child based on their school activities

n= 199

No	Items	SD	D	U	A	SA	Mean
		%	%	%	%	%	
1	My parents encourage and help me to achieve better in my learning.	10.1	24.6	39.2	16.1	10.1	2.92
2	My parents initiate me to study at home.	10.6	27.6	38.2	18.6	5	2.81
3	My Parents praise me when I got good result.	11.1	24.1	17.6	22.1	25.1	3.27

Key: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, U = Undecided, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree, n = number of participants

Question one from the Table 4.6, addressed that parents encourage and help their children to achieve better in their learning. The analysis shows that 10.1% of the respondents said that the activities have been done very rarely, 24.6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done rarely, 39.2% of the respondents said that the activities have been done sometimes, 16.1% of the respondents said that the activities have been done most of the time and 10.1% of the respondents said that the activities have been done frequently. The mean value of question one is 2.92, then this approaches 3. Based on the mean value parents are sometimes encouraging and help their children to achieve better by their learning.

Question two from the Table 4.6, addressed that parents initiate their children to study at home. The analysis shows that 10.6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done very rarely, 27.6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done rarely, 38.2% of the respondents said that the activities have been done sometimes, 18.6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done most of the time and 5% of the respondents said that the activities have been done frequently. The mean value of question two is 2.81 and it approaches 3. Based on the mean, parents are sometimes initiating their children to study at home.

Question three from the Table 4.6, addressed that parents praise their children when they get the good result in the class. The analysis shows that 11.1% of the respondents said that the activities have been done very rarely, 24.1% of the respondents said that the activities have been done rarely, 17.6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done sometimes, 22.1% of the respondents said that the activities have been done most of the time and 25.1% of the respondents said that the activities have been done frequently. The mean value of question three is 3.27. Based on the mean value parents sometimes praise their children when they get the good result in the class.

The community understood the school-community partnership and its importance. They did not go further to appreciate the importance of the community members in the classroom. It appears that the value of the community members has been appreciated outside the classroom, given the fact that they were conversant with issues outside the classroom, such as infrastructural development, the paying of school fees, donating sporting equipment, etc. The school heads and the teachers also underscored the utilitarian value of community engagement in all facets of the school life. This finding is supported by the following statements by primary school principals and teachers during the interview responses and FGD discussion:

- Community engagement is important because it is an integral part of curriculum implementation. Without the community, it might be difficult to implement.
- It is important because any program or project undertaken by the school is doomed to fail if not supported by the community.
- It is extremely important because communities provide the core input (students), they pay fees and they provide material support etc. and assist in educating the students.
- Community involvement is definitely important. The school cannot develop if it is isolated from the community. The school and the community should develop together.

4.4. The School-Community Relationship Vis-À-Vis the Implementation of Primary School Curriculum.

In this section what we have seen that the level of interaction between the school and the community and again the efforts made by teachers to communicate with parents. This gives us a hint on the extent and type of information they exchange and the methods they use and hence

help us to understand how the schools are involving their respective community in the curriculum implementation as well as the roles played by the teachers and school principals in participating the community representatives in all the school activities. The Ethiopian Education and Training Policy issued in 1994 and still in effect, gives strong emphasis on the close collaboration between schools and the community. Thus, for schools to get the collaboration of the community, it is imperative for the school to take an initiative and start building a bridge with the community. For the study area it is also the same. For this analysis, nine questions were designed and the response results are summarized in Table 4.7 below.

Table: 4.7 Teachers’ response regarding to the extent of school-community relationship

n = 23

No	Items	SD	D	U	A	SA	Mean
		%	%	%	%	%	
1	My school establishes a clear two way communication from school to parents and from parent to school.	8.7	30.4	39.1	8.7	13.0	2.86
2	In my school there is a welcome orientation meeting on school opening time.	4.3	13.0	52.2	21.7	8.7	3.13
3	My school provides parents & community members meetings, workshops and training on curriculum implementation and students’ academic achievement.	8.7	21.7	30.4	21.7	17.4	3
4	My school conducts a formal conference with community members at least two times a year.	8.7	30.4	26.1	21.7	13.0	3
5	My school participate PTSA and SETB members in the rate of increasing students enrollment.	13.0	17.4	43.5	13.0 4	13.0	2.21
6	My school participate PTSA and SETB members in the rate of decreasing students dropout.	8.7	30.4	34.8	8.7	17.4	2.95
7	In my school teachers make parents aware of the importance of helping their children at home by school activities like reading, doing homework and etc.	4.3	30.4	34.8	17.4	13.0	3.04
8	In my school teacher’s contact with parents of students having academic or behavioral problems.	8.7	17.4	39.1	21.7	13.0	3.13
9	My school organizes PTSA, SETB, teachers’ association, students’ council and clubs.	8.7	21.7	39.1	17.4	13.0	3.04

Key: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, U = Undecided, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree, n= number of participants

Question one of Table 4.7 addressed that the school establishes a clear two-way communication from school to parents and from parent to the school. According to the Table 4.7, 8.7% of participants said that the activity has been done very rarely, 30.4% of participants said that the activity has been done rarely, 39.1% of participants said that the activities have been done sometimes, 8.7% of participants said that the activity has been done most of the time and 13.04% of participants said that the activity has been done frequently (100%). The mean value of question one is 2.86 and it approaches 3. Based on the mean value the establishments of clear two-way communication from school to parents and from parent to school have done sometimes.

Question two from the Table 4.7, addressed that schools initiative in conducting a welcoming orientation to parents during school opening seasons. On this, 4.3% of participants said that the activity has been done very rarely, 13.04% of participants said that the activity has been done rarely, 52.2% of participants said that the activities have been done sometimes and 21.7% of participants said that the activity has been done most of the time and 8.7% of participants said that the activities have been done frequently. The mean value of question two is 3.13. Based on the mean value the welcome orientation meeting on school opening time is conducting sometimes in the school.

During the interview time the researcher asked the parents from four schools out of six samples schools if there were welcoming orientation meetings on school opening time, they said that:

In our school, the welcome meeting is not familiar during school opening time but the meeting is conducted on end of the semester. The school principal rarely invites the community in school opening and closing days by sending either oral or written message through students but most of the community members do not attend the meetings because we consider it is not mandatory. Most of the school stated that they do not have regular meeting with the community.

Meaningful communication is essential in building & maintaining the healthy relationship between school and parents. But communication between the school & the community in the study zone as stated by school principals is always performed by the school initiative. This conclusion indicates that conducting of meetings and conferences between the school and the parents such as the parent–teacher conferences are very important in school to involve the community as whole but its performance currently is medium. This goes with what Davis and

Julia (2007) and Burrup (1972), which stated that the art of welcoming students and parents is a way for striving to get willingness and enthusing of participation.

Question three of Table 4.7, addressed that parents & community members meetings, formal conference, workshops and training on curriculum implementation and students' academic achievement. From the Table 4.7, 8.7% of participants said that the activity has been done very rarely, 21.7% of participants said that the activity has been done rarely, 30.4% of participants said that the activities have been done sometimes, 21.7% of participants said that the activity has been done most of the time and 17.4% of participants said that the activity has been done frequently (100%). The mean value of question three is 3. According to the mean value conducting parents & community members meetings, formal conference, workshops, and training on curriculum implementation and students' academic achievement issues are sometimes practicable.

Question four in the above table 4.7, addressed that school conducts a formal conference with community members at least two times a year. From the Table 4.7, 8.7% of participants said that the activity has been done very rarely, 30.4% of participants said that the activity has been done rarely, 26.08% of participants said that the activities have been done sometimes, 21.7% of participants said that the activity has been done most of the time and 13.04% of participants said that the activity has been done frequently (100%). The mean value of question four is 3. Based on the mean value school conducts a formal conference with community members at least two times a year are sometimes. It shows that there is no a formal conference in the school.

From question 5 of Table 4.7, addressed that whether or not the schools encourage the PTSA and SETB members to participate in helping the school with on time enrollment and reducing dropout of students. For question 5, 13.04% of respondents said that the activity has been done very rarely, 17.4% of respondents said that the activity has been done rarely, 43.5% of respondents said that the activities have been done sometimes, 13.4 of respondents said that the activity has been done most of the time and 13.04% of respondents said that the activity has been done frequently (100%). The mean value of question five is 2.21 and it approaches 2. Based on the mean value school participate PTSA and SETB members in the rate of increasing students' enrollment rarely.

From question 6 on Table 4.7, 8.7 of respondents said that the activity has been done very rarely, 30.4% of respondents said that the activity has been done rarely, 34.8 of respondents said that the activities have been done sometimes, 8.7 of respondents said that the activity has been done most of the time and 17.4% of respondents said that the activity has been done frequently (100%). The mean value of question six is 2.95 and it approaches 3. Based on the mean value school participate PTSA and SETB members in the rate of decreasing students drop out school participate PTSA and SETB members in the rate of decreasing students drop out sometimes.

Questions seven of Table 4.7, addressed that the school teachers make parents aware of the importance of helping their children at home by school activities like reading, doing homework and etc. From the respondents with percentage value of 4.3% participants said the activities have been done very rarely, 30.4% participants said the activities have been done rarely, 34.8% participants said the activities have been done some times, 17.4% participants said the activities have been done most of the time and 13.04% participants said the activities have been done frequently. The mean value of question seven is 3.04. Based on the mean value school teachers make parents aware of the importance of helping their children at home by school activities like reading, doing homework and etc. are sometimes.

Question eight of table 4.7, addressed that the issues teacher's contact with parents of students having academic or behavioral problems. From the Table 4.7, 8.7% of respondents said that the activities have been done very rarely, 17.4% of the participants said that the activity has been done rarely, 39.1% of the participants said that the activities have been done sometimes, 21.7% of the participants said that the activity has been done most of the time and 13.04% of the participants said that the activity has been done frequently (100%). The mean value of question eight is 3.13. Based on the mean value teachers are sometimes contacting with parents of students having academic or behavioral problems.

During the review of school documents conducted by the researcher, this was confirmed as the parent of students with academic and behavioral problems have signed at the back of the student's attendance sheets. In fact, I have seen written notes where some parents of such students have given their comment to help their children to improve their shortcomings but it is not sufficient.

Question nine from the table 4.7, addressed that if the school organizes PTSA, SETB, teachers' association, students' council and clubs accordingly in the school. Accordingly the analysis 8.7% of the respondents said that the activity has been done very rarely, 21.7% of the respondents said that the activity has been done rarely, 39.1% of the respondents said that the activities have been done sometimes, 17.4% of the respondents said that the activity has been done most of the time and 13.04% of the respondents said that the activity has been done frequently (100%). The mean value of question nine is 3.04. Based on the mean value school are sometimes organizes PTSA, SETB, teachers' association, students' council and clubs.

During the FGD the researcher asked teachers how they communicate with parents and what mechanisms were they using to communicate with parents and finally what about their attitude towards communicating with parents and community on different school issues. In both groups almost all teachers react the same thing. Among them one teachers react on the above idea was:

I know that if there is a good communication with different stakeholders about school issues it can enhance the participation of community on the implementation of school curriculum but at this time my communication with parents and community member is very low, I communicate rarely at all. The communication mechanisms are through meeting and inviting individual parents who have students in the school. This makes barriers between me and community because I cannot get all parents at the same time. Regarding attitudes, I am not like openly to communicate with parents and community because most of them said that it makes us ordinary vise. To keep their attention I left them and I don't want to communicate with them.

During the interview time one parent told that the idea regarding the importance of school-community relationship as follows.

The school-community relationship is very important especially when our children have problems, we can always work together with teachers to solve them. However, in some instances, some teachers have the mistaken notion that we do not have knowledge and ideas about education hence they often dictate to us what to do. Meetings are mainly about increasing fees and not to do with teaching and learning of children. The members of the communities seem content with the status quo, only availing themselves when invited. This finding is supported by the following remarks from one parent, which also summarizes other community members' views: We are more than willing to assist teachers as well as children but we cannot force ourselves into the classrooms if the teachers do not invite us. If they do not invite us, we will not be angry with them. We will continue to play our usual role of paying fees, buying uniforms and books for our children. What else can we do?

The above reaction, taken from the interviews with the community members, clearly indicates that as much as important the community members are prepared and forthcoming to partner with the teachers in curriculum implementation. They can only do that upon invitation from the teachers. Without this invitation, they cannot do anything except sending their children to school with fees, uniforms, and books. So, according to these community members, the teachers should be open to the partnership and assign the community members specific roles in the teaching and learning process. Therefore, from these interpretations, it can be summarized that the members of the community stand ready and are willing to contribute to curriculum implementation. They (the community members) are waiting for the invitation card, and whether they know what to do in the classroom, they stand guided and directed by the teachers. Concerning the communication, Shae and Baur (1997), stated that teachers should interact and communicate with the community through informal feedbacks, progress reports, conferences, program information, and parent-coordinated service programs so as to enhance community participation in implementing school curriculum.

Table: 4.8 Students’ response regarding to the extent of school-community relationship

n = 199

No	Items	SD	D	U	A	SA	Mean
		%	%	%	%	%	
1	My parents participate in school conference and PTSA meeting.	9.5	36.7	29.6	17.6	6.5	2.75
2	My parents contact with my teacher concerning my academic progress and achievement.	16.1	33.2	32.2	13.6	5	2.58
3	My parents visit our school through the year.	24.6	37.7	25.6	7.5	4.5	2.3

Key: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, U = Undecided, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree, n = number of participants

Question one from the Table 4.8 addressed that parents participate in school conference and PTSA meeting. From the analysis 9.5% of the respondents said that the activities have been done very rarely, 36.7% of the respondents said that the activities have been done rarely, 29.6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done sometimes, 17.6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done most of the time and 6.5% of the respondents said that the activities

have been done frequently. The mean value of question one is 2.75 and it approaches 3. Based on the mean value parents sometimes participate in school conference and PTSA meeting.

Question two from the Table 4.8 addressed that parent's contact with teacher concerning their children's academic progress and achievement. From the analysis 16.1% of the respondents said that the activities have been done very rarely, 33.2% of the respondents said that the activities have been done rarely, 32.2% of the respondents said that the activities have been done sometimes, 13.6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done most of the time and 5% of the respondents said that the activities have been done frequently. The mean value of question two is 2.58 and it approaches 3. Based on the mean value parents sometimes contact with teacher concerning their children's academic progress and achievement.

Question three from the Table 4.8 addressed that parents are visit school through the year. From the analysis 24.6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done very rarely, 37.7% of the respondents said that the activities have been done rarely, 25.6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done sometimes, 7.5% of the respondents said that the activities have been done most of the time and 4.5% of the respondents said that the activities have been done frequently. The mean value of question three is 2.3 and it approaches 2. Based on the mean value parents are rarely visit school through the year.

4.5 The Community Involvement and Participation in the Implementation of Primary School Curriculum.

Morgan (2006) cited in the World Bank (2000b), describing participation as a process through which the stakeholder's influence and share control over development initiatives and the decisions and resources which affect them. In our context, therefore, the development initiative is the effectiveness of education while the main stakeholders being analyzed here are the school staff particularly the teachers, school principal, and community, particularly parents and community who can influence and can be affected by the school. The table below provides the summary of the teachers' perspective and students' perspective on the above idea.

Table: 4.9 Teachers’ response regarding to the level of community involvement in curriculum implementation

n = 23

No	Items	S	D	U	A	SA	Mean
		%	%	%	%	%	
1	My school PTSA participates in solving disciplinary problems that might be made by students.	8.7	39.1	30.4	8.7	13.04	2.78
2	My school makes parents, SETB & PTSA members to participate in the preparation of different school plan.	4.3	39.1	21.7	21.7	13.04	3
3	My school makes parents and community to participate in decision making on budget preparation and implementation.	4.3	39.1	30.4	17.4	8.7	2.86
4	My school’s PTSA and SETB mobilizes the community to contribute money for building classrooms, maintain library, laboratory, pedagogical center and etc.	8.7	34.8	21.7	21.7	13.04	2.95
5	My school community members participate in providing money and labor to fulfill school infrastructure.	4.3	26.1	39.1	21.7	8.7	3.04

Key: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, U = Undecided, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree, n = number of participants

Question one of Table 4.9 addressed that the school PTSA participates in solving disciplinary problems that might be made by students. We have seen from Table 4.9, 8.7% of participants said that the activity has been done very rarely, 39.1% of participants said that the activity has been done rarely, 30.4% of participants said that the activities have been done sometimes, 8.7% of participants said that the activity has been done most of the time and 13.04% of participants said that the activity has been done frequently (100%). The mean value of question one is 2.78 and it approaches 3. Based on the mean value school PTSA sometimes participates in solving disciplinary problems that might be made by students.

During the interview time one PTSA reacts about the idea of school PTSA participates in solving disciplinary problems that might be made by students as follows:

I stay in this school for last three years but I don’t see this kind of activities mostly. I only participate one meeting to solve the problem it made by students. Most of the time the problem is solved by the teachers and principal I and other representatives

have heard only the report. But still now what I heard is disciplinary problems in school.

The second question of Table 4.9 addressed that the school's level of efforts to participate, parents, SETB and PTSA members in preparation of different school plan. Here, the participants were asked to rate the degree to which the school makes the parents and community representatives participate in the school's strategy and annual plan preparation process. In terms of percentage, 4.3% of participants are said that the activity has been done very rarely, 39.1% of participants are said that the activity has been done rarely, 21.7% of participants are said that the activities have been done sometimes, 21.7% of participants are said that the activity have been done most of the time and the remaining 13.04% of participants are said that the activity has been done frequently (100%). The mean value of question two is 3. Based on the mean value school sometimes makes parents and community representative participate in the school's strategy and annual plan preparation and revision process.

In the interviews done with the PTSA members, the community representative of two schools is said that; "We there been involving fully in the school strategy and annual plan preparations and further commented that it plays important roles in incorporating the community's interests in the plans".

Review of the meeting minutes of those schools has also shown that there is a full participation of the community representatives and parents in the planning process of the school. The community representatives were involved in the financial budgeting and mobilization of resources for the school. As a result, the school facilities and infrastructure were better than the other schools studied. The other four schools, however, the participation of the community representatives are limited to approving and assisting in the implementation process through approval and control of financial expenditures. When the researcher asked one school PTSA how about you participation in the planning process of the school they said that: "we did not participate fully in the planning and revision of the plan, because of having the problem of technical knowledge and skills of preparing school strategies and annual plan and hence they left the task to the school principal".

As Ethiopian current Education and Training Policy (1994), said that, the PTSA and SETB members are expected to participate both in the preparation and implementation stage of

different school plans. This educational guideline and school plans also indicated that the responsibilities of SETB are planning, maintenance, finance, staffing, supervision, monitoring and evaluation of the school performances. Communities with the higher level of participation in school management are more willing to assist in the financing of schools.

The community representatives of four schools said that they don't fully participate especially in the preparation of the plans due to their knowledge gap. This is in agreement with the study by Swift-Morgan (2006), which showed that "international institutions and governments in developing countries often use community participation to mean locally driven reform, while in reality these institutions and governments are actually acquiring local support for pre-planned interventions and transferring costs from the public to the private sector". In generally when the participation of the school community within the preparation of different plan is low then their participation in the implementation of the school curriculum is also low because for all implementation planning is the base. During the planning time, the way how to implement the programs and the objective finally what intended to achieve is also addressed in the plan. So through the plan, it is possible to involve and evaluate. In order to get the full participation of the community in the school program plans, proper training needs to be given to the community representatives to close the knowledge gap.

Question three of Table 4.9 addressed that parents and community participation in the decision-making process on the budget preparation and implementation. For the question three, 4.3% of participants said that the activity has been done very rarely, 39.1% of participants said that the activity has been done rarely, 30.4% of participants said that the activities have been done sometimes, 17.4% of participants said that the activity have been done most of the time and the remaining 8.7% of participants said that the activity has been done frequently (100%). The mean value of question three is 2.86 and it approaches 3. Based on the mean value parent and community are sometimes participate in the decision-making process on the budget preparation and implementation.

During the interview with the parents' representatives of four schools, however, the above result was supported by the parent's representative's interview. The reaction as follows:

We feel that although the schools are mostly not participating the committee in the budget preparation and implementation process and also the schools are not clear by

budget implementation. Because of having less clear communication with community school are not doing the mobilization of the community to increase their resources to fulfill the budget requirements. We again feel that the schools can generate more income from the community to cover their budget deficits but they don't do this because of the community as well as the community representatives' participations are very low.

According to the question, four of Table 4.9 addressed that PTSA and SETB mobilize the community to contribute money for building classrooms, maintain the library, laboratory, pedagogical center and etc. Based on the above Table 4.9, 8.7% of participants said that the activity has been done very rarely, 34.8% of participants said that the activity has been done rarely, 21.7% of participants said that the activities have been done sometimes, 21.7% of participants said that the activity has been done most of the time and 13.04% of participants said that the activity has been done frequently (100%). The mean value of question four is 2.95 and it approaches 3. Based on the mean value school PTSA & SETB are sometimes mobilizing the community to contribute money for building classrooms, maintain the library, laboratory, pedagogical center and etc.

During the interview, the student researcher asked the PTSA & SETB members how they mobilize the community to contribute money for school activities they said that:

In our school, the mobilizing system is conditional which means that if the school principals raised the idea as agenda and we discussed it and come to agree with it then also we continue upon it. Mobilizing occasion is rare it is not implemented constantly through the plan. It is only the issue of school principals.

According to the question, five of Table 4.9 addressed that the school community members participate in providing money and labor to fulfill school infrastructure. The responses show that 4.3% of the teacher respondents said that the activity has been done very rarely, 26.08% of the teacher respondents said that the activity has been done rarely, 39.1% of the teacher respondents said that the activities have been done sometimes, 21.7% of the teacher respondents said that the activity has been done most of the time and 8.7% of participants said that the activities have been done frequently. The mean value of question five is 3.04. Based on the mean value the school's communities are participating sometimes on providing money and labor to fulfill school infrastructure.

The principal interviewee stated the following one. “The contribution of the community in terms of money and material resources was low in comparison to budget or fund required to the implementation of school curriculum”.

Table: 4.10 Students’ response regarding to the level of community involvement in curriculum implementation

n = 199

No	Items	SD	D	U	A	SA	Mean
		%	%	%	%	%	
1	My parents reduce my work load at home.	19.1	25.6	34.2	15.6	5.5	2.63
2	My parents provide sufficient and relevant supplementary educational materials.	16.1	26.6	32.2	17.6	7.5	2.75
3	My parents’ guide me in my daily activities.	13.6	30.7	31.2	18.6	6	2.74
4	My parents give comment after evaluating my learning activities.	15.1	34.7	31.7	13.6	5	2.59
5	My parents help me to do better the school activities at home.	18.6	37.2	28.1	12.6	3.5	2.46
6	My parents contribute money for school activities.	17.6	31.7	21.6	20.1	9	2.72
7	My parents participate in other school activity.	15.6	31.2	31.2	13.6	8.5	2.69

Key: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, U = Undecided, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree, n = number of participants

Question one from the Table 4.10 addressed that parents reduce their children workload at home. From the analysis 19.1% of the respondents said that the activities have been done very rarely, 25.6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done rarely, 34.2% of the respondents said that the activities have been done sometimes, 15.6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done most of the time and 5.5% of the respondents said that the activities have been done frequently. The mean value of question one is 2.63 and it approaches 3. Based on the mean value parents sometimes reduce their children workload at home.

Question two from the table 4.10 addressed that parents are provided sufficient and relevant supplementary educational materials for their children. From the analysis 16.1% of respondents said that the activities have been done very rarely, 26.6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done rarely, 32.2% of the respondents said that the activities have been done sometimes, 17.6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done most of the time and 7.5% of the respondents said that the activities have been done frequently. The mean value of

question two is 2.75 and it approaches 3. Based on the mean value parents are sometimes providing sufficient and relevant supplementary educational materials for their children.

Question three from the Table 4.10 addressed that parents' guide their children in daily school activities. From the analysis 13.6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done very rarely, 30.7% of the respondents said that the activities have been done rarely, 31.2% of the respondents said that the activities have been done sometimes, 18.6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done most of the time and 6% of the respondents said that the activities have been done frequently. The mean value of question three is 2.74 and it approaches 3. Based on the mean value parents sometimes guide their children in daily school activities.

Question 4 of the Table 4.10 addressed that parents give comment after evaluating my learning activities. From the table the result of item 4, 15.1% of participants said that the activity has been done very rarely, 34.7% of participants said that the activity has been done rarely, 31.7% of participants said that the activities have been done sometimes, 13.6% of participants said that the activity has been done most of the time and 5% of participants said that the activity has been done frequently. The mean value of question four is 2.59 and it approaches 3. Based on the mean value parents sometimes give comment after evaluating their children learning activities.

Question 5 of the Table 4.10 addressed that parents help their children to do better the school activities at home. From the Table result, 18.6% of participants said that the activity has been done very rarely, 37.2% of participants said that the activity has been done rarely, 28.1% of participants said that the activities have been done sometimes, 12.6% of participants said that the activity have been done most of the time and 3.5% of participants said that the activity has been done frequently. The mean value of question five is 2.46 and it approaches 2. Based on the mean value parents rarely help their children to do better the school activities at home.

Question 6 of Table 4.10 addressed that the parent's money contribution for school activities. The responses show that, 17.6% of participants said that the activity has been done very rarely, 31.2% of participants said that the activity has been done rarely, 21.6% of participants said that the activities have been done sometimes, 20.1% of participants said that the activity has been done most of the time and 9% of participants said that the activity has been done frequently

respectively. The mean value of question six is 2.72 and it approaches 3. Based on the mean value parents are sometimes contribute money for school activities

Question 7 of Table 4.10 addressed that the parents participation in other school activity. The responses show that, 15.6% of participants said that the activity has been done very rarely, 31.2% Of participants said that the activity has been done rarely, 31.2% of participants said that the activities have been done sometimes, 13.6% of participants said that the activity has been done most of the time and 8.5% of participants said that the activity has been done frequently (100%) respectively. The mean value of question seven is 2.69 and it approaches 3. Based on the mean value the parents sometimes participate in other school activity.

When the researcher conducted the interview with WEOs bringing the question, what is the current level of the community participation in the curriculum implementation, to the woreda quality officer he responds that as follows.

As the woreda level, the community participation currently is almost in all school very low. Why it is so, woreda as woreda have the great role to encourage and develop the participation of the community in the school affairs. But now the issues are not given impasses. Organizing training and conducting the training with stakeholders is the main issue to the woreda education office to enhance school community participation in the curriculum implementation. Therefore, as woreda education office has considered the issue as the important one but now it affects by different factors. Without the community participation in education, the government could not achieve the aim of educational quality in general. Our woreda and other hierarchy of education administration should have given impasses to community role in school activity and should have to make awareness through discussion and training.

4.6 Factors influencing community involvement and participation in the implementation of the primary school curriculum.

The community sees lots of roadblocks to getting involved in their child's education. Some point to their own demanding schedules and say they don't have extra time to volunteer or even attend school activities, much less get involved in bigger ways. Others reveal how uncomfortable they feel when trying to communicate with school officials, whether that's due to language or cultural differences or their own past experiences with school. Some say they lack the know-how and

resources to help their child, or they express frustration with school bureaucracies or policies they find impossible to understand or change.

Parents complain that they rarely hear from the school unless there is a problem with their child's behavior or performance. Others say the information provided by the school is not comprehensible either because of educational jargon or because the parent or family member does not read or understand the language. Some families criticize school personnel for not understanding the plight of single parents, grandparents, foster parents, or other caregivers. Others say they lack case to attend school events or have no child care for younger siblings. While some schools have made great strides in engaging parents and others in the educational process, there is still much more that can be done.

During the interview time when the researcher brings the question, what are the challenges to effective community participation in curriculum implementation, to one woreda learning teaching and assessment officer he reacts that:

The great problem in our woreda to effective community participation in curriculum implementation is school and communities have no smooth communication between them. The idea what community participation in curriculum implementation is by itself new for the schools and community. To familiarize the idea with community and teachers and to get effective community participation it needs different training and workshop but there is no such kind of training as well as workshop based on the point of how to participate the community in the curriculum implementation. We as woreda don't do anything to involve the community in curriculum implementation. This is to me the great problem in our woreda.

During the interview time what the researcher brings the question, what are the challenges to effective community participation in curriculum implementation, to one SETB members he reacts that:

Our community participates by different things in school and we left the curriculum implementation for professionals because it needs the profession. But is there any activities that we can help regarding curriculum implementation we are ok. Still, now we have no awareness about it and we haven't taken any workshop accordingly. We need the direction to implement the idea if it so good for our students' academic achievements.

In general, from the FGD and interview of school, principals were asked if they could cite factors that limit parents' participation in school activities, the following responses were obtained: -

- Lack of awareness on the importance of their participation as the parents and think that the responsibility of schooling is only that of the school and the teachers.
- Lack of good communications between school and parents (community) with all the achievements of their children at school.
- The parents believe that their role is limited to providing financial support to their children.
- Education is not leading to securing employment as some students are falling under the burden of their parents even after completing their education and hence parents are losing hope on the value of educating their children.
- The relationship between the students and parents is not healthy, and in fact, some students are out of their parents' control, some parents are not interested in following up on their children's schooling process.
- Economic problems that cause time constraints.
- The attitude of some teachers towards parents is not welcoming.
- The teachers complain that their principal has not done enough to create the conducive environment that encourages parents to participate in the school's activities.
- Principals complain that training on how to involve parents and the community in the instructional processes is the core problem that hinders community participation.
- The absences of schools acknowledge and reward parents who have better follow up on their children's education.

The above-mentioned points are the factors that are recognized as hindrances that can negatively affect the parents – teachers working relationship discussed in the literature review section of this report. These are factors such as inadequate training of principals and teachers can be one of the barriers to parent involvement in school activities. Many teachers feel that they have been hired only to teach and not to carry out parent involvement responsibilities (Bagin, 2001). Lack of allocating appropriate time on the part of the teacher may also be another obstacle to the teacher-parent collaboration. The teachers may not be able or willing to spare time to meet the parents.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter of the study present summary of the main findings, conclusions, and recommendations, which were drawn based on the analysis of the data collected from the respondents as well as the review of relevant literature conducted by the student researcher.

5.1 Summary

The main objective of this study was to assess the participation and contribution of the community in curriculum implementation of government primary schools in Damot Woyde Woreda in Wolayita Zone. The specific objectives of the study were the following:

1. To investigate the attitudes of the community towards primary education in their locality and how they value it.
2. To examine the extent of the school-community relationship and its contribution to the implementation of the primary school curriculum.
3. To identify the level of community involvement and participation in the implementation process of the primary school curriculum.
4. To find out the factors influencing community participation in the process of primary school curriculum implementation.

To achieve the above four objectives, the study was designed to address and attempt to answer the following four research questions.

1. What are the attitudes of the community towards primary education and how does the community value primary education?
2. How is the extent of the school-community relationship and its contribution to the implementation of the primary school curriculum?
3. What is the level of community involvement and participation in the implementation process of the primary school curriculum?
4. What are the factors influencing community participation in the process of the primary school curriculum?

The data sources were students, teachers, principals, WEOs, parents, parent representatives, observations and the document analysis. The number of respondents enrolled in the study were 199 students, 23 teachers, 6 principals, 4 WEOs, 20 parents, 8 PTSA, 10 SETB, adding up to a total of 270 participants. From the distributed questionnaires in the study, four questionnaires of the respondents (i.e., 1 teacher and 3 students) were not collected, which gave a response rate of 98.4%. The tools used to collect data from students and teachers were questionnaires, while interview questionnaires were used for WEOs, principals, parents and community representatives. The data gathered from students and teachers were entered to SPSS V-20 software to compute frequencies, percentages and mean values. The data obtained from interviews, observation and document sources were used to supplement the data collected from the questionnaires.

The major findings of the study are summarized as follows:

As the result shows that the attitude of the community to involve in all school activities are neutral or undecided. It means that the participants are not react with the issue openly because of their firing. For the question “There is motivation efforts and supports made by the school principals to make me active participant in all school programs” the mean value is 2.52. The mean value 2.5 up to 3.4 is taken as 3. Based on the mean value the motivation efforts are medium. Thus, the community attitudes are neutral or undecided. It indicates that to have positive attitudes towards school activities for community enforcement is needed. The attitude of parents, as well as the community towards curriculum implementation, is not that much negative as their interviews showed but it needs awareness creation. The attitude of teachers to participate parents and community in the implementation of the primary school curriculum are not significant.

The study also showed that the school involvement in encouraging the parents and community in the schools’ strategy and annual plan preparation process was found not significant. Parents and community representative respondents claimed that schools do not adequately participate them in school activities. Parents meeting on schools related issues and children development were medium. Parents’ participation in the budget preparation and implementation are not significant.

The role of the school in providing training for parents on school related issues, providing opportunities for parents to visit schools, encouraging PTSA, SETB members to enroll students, and in inviting parents to monitor school resources were inadequately performed. Schools prepare welcome orientation meetings with parents during school opening occasions medium. For the question, “school participate PTSA and SETB members in the rate of increasing students enrollment” the mean value is 2.21. It indicates that the role of school to participate PTSA and SETB members in the rate of student enrollment is rare.

The role of teachers in making parents aware of the importance of reading to their children at home was inadequately performed. Schools were found to be rarely asking parents for information about their children’s goals, desires, and talents. Teachers encouraging parents and the community members to share their experiences with the school medium. Teachers are not regularly, such as weekly and monthly, sending students’ works to parents for assessing and comments. However, the majority of the teachers inadequately contact with parents of students having academic or behavioral problems. Parents’ interaction on their children’s homework is no significant.

Communication between school and parents in the evolvment of the community for primary school curriculum implementation is medium. Teachers rarely provide ongoing and specific information to parents on how to assist students with skills that they need to improve. According to the woreda education officers, the level of community involvement in the implementation of the primary school curriculum as woreda level is below the expectation one. There is no training to make awareness on the issue of how the school principals participate parents and community in the implementation of the primary school curriculum. Parent’s discuss educational values at home with their children are medium. The school principals’ motivation to participate all stakeholders in the curriculum implementation is rare.

5.2 Conclusions

The following key conclusions are drawn on the basis main findings of this study.

The communities have positive attitudes towards to education but their participation in the implementation of school curriculum are not significant because of lack of motivation it offered from both of the school principals and other stakeholders.

The schools' level of efforts in involving the community in the implementation of primary school curriculum in Damot Woyide Woreda was Medium. This is because, the participation of the community was limited in the planning and implementation process due to lack of technical knowledge and skills of the parents, although effective primary school curriculum implementation requires community participation to drive reforms, provides financial and technical support.

The teachers' level of effort on community participation in the study area is below the expectation one. Teachers inadequately create awareness of parents on the importance of reading at home for their children. Similarly, teachers inadequately create parent awareness on the importance of children's follow-up of their goals, and aspirations. Teachers also inadequately encourage parents and the community members to share the experience with the schools.

The communication level between school and parents for enhancing primary school curriculum implementation through community participation is not significant. The schools and the teachers' role in enhancing the community participation in the study area are not significant. Parents' intervention on their children's homework is not significant.

Teachers inadequately provide ongoing and specific information to parents on how to assist students with skills that they need to improve. Teachers sometimes provide parents information on how to monitor and discuss schoolwork at home. In addition to this teachers rarely provide clear information about the curriculum assessments and achievement levels to parents.

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the above findings the following recommendations are proposed.

- Schools should deliver workshops to the community on how to monitor their children's education, what is expected of the school and the parents, and how they could communicate with each other. In this study, it was found that one of the factors why parents did not control and follow their children's education is because of lack of knowledge on what teachers provide students as the assignment and how they can communicate with their children.

- Schools should give emphasis to community participation in the curriculum implementation in addition to fundraising. They should develop the holistic plan for enhancing community participation in curriculum implementation and control of children's education.
- The schools, through the principal, should develop a mechanism of flexible work schedule and manageable period of allotments in school, as this study confirms that the main reason why teachers' roles are limited to community participation and communication with parents and community was due to well organized time table it indicates when the teacher contact to the community.
- The woreda education office deliver training to principals to update their memory on how to participate parents, community and community representatives in the implementation of the school curriculum.
- I suggest further studies in the area on how to enhance community participation in the implementation of the school curriculum.

References

- ADEA Ad Hoc Working group on quality of education. 2005. **Applying lessons learned to national contexts**. ADEA Newsletter, 17(1):17-18.
- Agneessens, F. 2006. **Different theories and measures of social capital: Application in a knowledge-intensive work environment**. Paper presented at the Research Methods Festival, Oxford, St. Catherine's College, Oxford, Available at:
www.commddev.org/files/652-file-9020037.pdf. (Accessed on 15 / 3/2017).
- Aggrawal, J.C. (1996). **Theory and Principles of Education: philosophical and Sociological Bases of Education** (10thed.) New Delhi Vikas Publishing house Pvt. Ltd.
- Alison, A. (1997). **Leadership and Community participation/A Leadership and coom part htm**
- Alonsabe, O.C, 2009. **Curriculum implementation**. Available at:
<http://www.deped.gov.ph/cpanel/uploads/issuancelmg>. (Accessed on 18-02-2017).
- Aref, A. 2010. **Community participation for educational planning and development**.
Nature and Science, 8(9):1-4.
- Bagin, D. and Gallagher, R.D. (2001). **The School and Community Relations** (7th ed.) Boston pearson: Education Company.
- Barbour, chandler and Barbour, Nita H.(1997). **Families, schools and communities Building partnership for educating children**: Columbus, ohio: prentice Hall,Inc.
- Barnhardt, R. 2006. **Culture, community and the curriculum**. Fairbanks: Alaska Native Knowledge Network.

Bell, J. 2012. **Doing your research project: A guide for first time researchers in education and social sciences**. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Burgess, J, Robertson, G. & Patterson, C. 2010. **Curriculum implementation: Decisions of early childhood teachers**. Australasian Journal of Early Childhood, 35(3):51-59.

Burrup Percy, E. (1972). **The Teacher and the Public School System** /3rded.) New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Burkill, B. & Eaton, R. 2011. **Developing teaching and learning**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bull, A. 2011. **From community engagement in education to public engagement with education**. Available at <http://www.nzcer.org.nz/research/all-publications>. (Accessed on 12-03-2017).

Caro-Bruce, C., Flessner, R., Klehr, M. & Zeichner, K. 2007. **Creating equitable classrooms through action research**. London: Corwin Press.

Ciaccio, J. 1999. **The community as LAB for service learning**. The Education Digest. Ann Arbor: Prakken Publishers.

Chindanya, A. 2011. **Parental involvement in primary schools: A case of the Zaka district of Zimbabwe**. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Pretoria: University of South Africa.

CSA (Central Statistical Authority). 2007. Agricultural Sample Survey 2006/07 [1999 E.C.] Volume II, Report on Livestock and Livestock Characteristics (Private Peasant Holdings) Addis Ababa Feb, 2007 Statistical Bulletin 388.

Dauber, S.L., & Epstein, J.L. (1989) **Parent attitudes and practices of parent involvement in inner-city elementary and middle schools**. Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools.1-29.

Davis, H., Day, C. & Bidmead, C. 2002. **Working in partnership with parents: The parent adviser model**. London: Pearson Assessment.

Davis Stan and Julia, D. (2007).**School Where Everyone Belongs**. Practical Strategies for Reducing Bullying. (2nd ed.) USA: McNaughton and Gunn, Inc.

Damot Woyde Woreda Finance and Economic Development Department. 2016. **Description about, Damot Woydein** Wolaita Zone, Ethiopia.

Dejnozka, F.L. (1983). **Educational Administration glossary**. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

De Katele, J.M. & Cherif, M. 1994.**The Courier: Africa – Caribbean – Pacific –European Union**. Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines country reports, No. 148, November – December 1994:60-62.

De Vos, AS, Strydom, H., Fouché, C.B. & Delport, C.S.L. 2012.**Research at grass roots for the social sciences and human services professions**. (4th edition). Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Dodd, W.A. and Konzal, L.J. (2002). **How Communities Build Stronger Schools: Stories, Strategies and Promising Practices for Educating Every Child**, New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Eby, J. W. (1997). **Reflective Planning, Teaching and Evaluation for the Elementary School** London: Prince-Hall, Inc.

Elliot, J. 2006. **The teacher's role in curriculum development: An unresolved issue in English attempts at curriculum reform.**

Available at: <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rpcs19>. (Accessed on 28-02-2017).

Ethiopian Central Statistical Agency (2012).**Summary and Statistical Report Of The 2011 Population and Housing Census: Population Size by Age and Sex.** FDRE

Population Census Commission, Addis Ababa

Epstein, Joyce Levy. (1995). “**School/Family/Community Partnerships: Caring for the Children We Share.**” In Phi Delta Kappan.v.76 (May 1995).pp.701-712.

Fehrman, P. Keith, T. and Reimers, T. (1987). **Home Influence on School Learning: Direct and indirect effects of parental involvement on high school grades.** A paper prepared for the research committee of the Metropolitan Nashville e/Davidson County Board of Public Education.

Gatawa, B. S. M. (1990). **The politics of the school curriculum: An introduction.** Harare: Jongwe Press.

Gboku, M. &Lekoko, R.N. 2007. **Developing programmes for adult learners in Africa.** Germany: UNESCO.

Gorinski, R. & Fraser, C. 2006. **Literature review on the effective engagement of Pasifika parents and communities in education.** Report to the Ministry of Education. Pasifika Education, Research Division. New Zealand: Ministry of Education. Available at: www.minedu.govt.nz. (Accessed on 16-03-2017).

- Hargreaves, A. 1996. **Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age**. London: Cassell.
- Heneveld, Ward and Helen Craig. (1996). **Schools Count: World Bank Project Designs and the Quality of Primary Education in Sub-Saharan Africa**. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Holcomb, E.L. 2009. **Asking the right questions: Tools for collaboration and school change**. California: Corwin Press.
- Howley, A. & Maynard, S. 2003. **Parent and community involvement in rural schools: No child left behind in poor Appalachain school districts**. Available at: www.academia.edu/attachments/1999502 (Accessed on 15-03-2017).
- Humphreys, T. 1993. **A different kind of teacher**. London: Cassell.
- Kandsumy, M. and Lia, B. (2004). **School principals: core actors in educational improvement, Ananalysis of Asian countries**. Paris: UNESCO.
- Karen L. Mapp, Ed.D. (2004), **The Why, What and How of Effective School, Family and Community Partnerships: Boston, U.S.A.** unpublished study.
- Keeves, J.P. (1990). **Educational Research, Methodology and Measurement: An international Hand Book**. Newyork: Pargamen press plc.
- Kerry, T. 2001. **Working with support staff: Their roles and effective management in schools**. London: Pearson Education.
- Studies, School of Education, Kenyatta University.
- Koul.L. (1988). **Methodology of Educational Research**. New Delhi: Vikas publishing Pvt. Ltd.

- Laurence, J.C. 2010.**Educational planning and management**. New Delhi: Rajat Publications.
- Lauridsen, D.A. 2003. **What are teachers' perceptions of the curriculum development process?**
- Lee, V.E. & Smith, J.B. 1996. **Collective responsibility for learning and its effects on gains in achievement for early secondary school students**. American Journal of Education, 104(2):19-23.
- Lim, J. 2007. **Definition of successful implementation of curriculum**. Video conferencing. Available at: www.vcoutonalim.org. (Accessed on 12-04-2017).
- MacLean, A. 2003.**The motivated school**. London: Sage Publications.
- Magazine for Alumni and Friends Connected. 2010. **Engaging employers in learning**, (1):24-26. Reading: University of Reading.
- Magstadt, T.M. 2009. **Understanding politics: Ideas, institutions and issues**. Belmont: Cengage Learning Academic Resource Centre.
- Maree, K. (Ed.). 2012. **First steps in research**. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Marsh, C.J. 2009. **Key concepts for understanding curriculum**.(4th edition). New York:Routledge.
- McDiamid, G.W. 1995. **Changes in beliefs about learners among participants in eleven teacher education programmes**. Conceptualising reflection in teacher development. Bristol: The Falmer Press.
- Miller, N. 1995.**A canon of many voices**. American Studies Newsletter, Number 36. California: The Regents of the University of California.

MOE . (1994). **Federal Democratic Republic Government of Ethiopia Education and Training Policy**. Addis Ababa: St Georg Printing Press.

_____ (1994). **Education and Training Policy**. Addis Ababa: Berhanena Selam Printing Enterprise

_____ (1994). **Educational Sector Strategy**. Addis Ababa: BerhanenaSelam Printing Enterprise

_____ (2002). **Education sector development II (ESDP II)**. Addis Ababa; United printing PLC.

_____ (2002). **Educational organization and management: Community participation guide line**. Addis Ababa: EMPDA.

_____ (2002). **The Education and Training Policy and its Implementation**. Addis Abeba

_____ (2005). **Education Sector Development Program III**. The Federal Democratic Government of Ethiopia: Program action Plan (PAP). Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.

_____ (2006). **Decentralized Management of Education in Ethiopia: A Reference Manual**: Addis Ababa.

Molnar, C.(1996). **Parent and Teacher Views of Parent Involvement in Local Governance**.

A summary of master`sThesis.University of Regiona.Htt.www.Norel. Org

/Ruraled publications.com. Building pdf/

Morgan, D.L. 2010.**Focus groups in qualitative research**. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Mugenda, O.M., & Mugenda, A.G. (2003). **Research methods, Qualitative and Quantitative approaches**, Act press, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Naidu, A., Joubert, R., Mestry, R., Mosoge, J. & Ngcobo, T. 2012. **Education management and leadership: A South African perspective**. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Nayaran, D. and Katrika, E (1997). **Design of social Funds: Participation, Demand Orientation, and Local Organizational Capacity**. New York: The World Bank.
- Ndawi, O. & Maravanyika, O. 2011. **Curriculum and its building blocks: Concepts and processes**. Gweru: Mambo Press.
- Olsen, G.E. (1954). **School and Community** (2nd ed.) USA Printice Hall.Inc.
- Ornstein, A., & Hunkins, P. (1988). **Curriculum foundations, principles and is Allyn and Bacon, London**.
- Oso, W.Y., & Onen, D. (2008). **A general guide to writing research proposal and report**, Makerere University Printers Kampala; Uganda
- Patton, M.Q. & Cochran, M. 2002. **A guide to using qualitative research methodology**. Medecins: Sans Frontieres.
- Prah, K.K. 2008. **African languages in a globalizing world**. OpenSpace initiatives for Southern Africa, 2(3):19-23.
- Preedy, M. 1993. **Managing the effective school**. London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.
- Rose, M. 2000. **Ways to better teaching**. The Education Digest. Ann Arbor. Prakken Publication.

- Rose, P. 2003a. **Communities, gender and education: Evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa.**
2003 UNESCO Global Monitoring Report. University of Sussex: Centre for
International education.
- Rose, P. 2003b. **Community participation in school policy and practice in Malawi:
Balancing local knowledge, national policies and international agency priorities.**
- Russell, S.T, Polen, N. & Betts, S. 2012. **What is stakeholder involvement?** Building
Partnerships for Youths. National 4 – H council and the University of Arizona.
Journal of Comparative International Education, 33(1):47-64.
- Schaefer Richard. T. (2005). **Sociology** (9th ed.) New York DePaul University McGraw Hill
Companies. Inc.
- Schaeffer, Shelden (1994). **Partnership and participation in Basic Education: A Series of
Training Modules and Case study Abstract for Education Planners and Managers.**
Paris: UNESCO. International Institution for education planning.
- Schiefelbein, Ernesto (1990). **Basic Elements to Reflect on the Quality of Education in the
Latin American Context.** Paris: UNESCO, IIEP.
- Shea, Thomas M. and Bauer, Anne, Marie (1997). **An introduction to special education: A
School system perspective** (2nd ed.) USA: Brown and Benchmark Publisher.
- Sternberg, B.J. 2000. **Making high schools better communities for our children:
The Education Digest**, 65(9):32-39. Ann Arbor: Prakken Publications.
- Swift–Morgan, J. 2006. **What community participation in schooling means: Insights from
Southern Ethiopia.** Harvard Educational Review, 76(3):339-368.

- Tadewos H. (2014). **Factors Influencing Community Participation in the Implementation of Primary School Curriculum in Primary Schools.**
Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Tanner, D., & Tanner, L. (1995). **Curriculum development: Theory into practice** (3rd ed.).
Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill.
- Tett, L. Et.al (2003). **Collaborative partnerships in community Education.**
Journal of Educational policy. Vol.18.
- Training and Research Support Centre (TARSC) & Ifakara Health Development Centre. 2006.
Participatory methods for a people-centered health system. Sussex: Institute of
Development Studies (IDS), Sussex University Participation Resource Centre.
- Tuckman, B.W. 2012. **Conducting educational research.** New York: Harcourt.
- UNESCO (2002). **Educational Governance at Local Levels: Towards Achieving Education to All.** UNESCO.
- UNESCO (2006). **Community participation Paris:** L. IIEP.
- USAID/CSPP (Community–School program) (2008). **Community Mobilization for Education and Health.** Addis Ababa: Training manual.
- Verspoor, A. 2006. **Schools at the centre of quality.** ADEA Newsletter: The Biennale Libreville
18(1):2.
- Wilcox, D. 1999. **Community participation and empowerment: Putting theory into practice.**
Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Wilson, K, Ruch, G, Lymbery, M. & Cooper, A. 2008. **Social work: An introduction to contemporary practice.** Essex: Pearson Education Ltd.

Wolaita zone Finance and Economic Development Department. 20014.

Description about Wolaita Zone, Wolaita Sodo, Ethiopia.

World Bank Review (1995). **Development in Practice: priorities and Strategies for education**

Washington D.C.: The World Bank.

World Bank (2000b).**Participation source book.** Washington DC: Author.

World Bank (2001).**Community Support for Basic education in Sub Saharan Africa.** Africa

Region Human Development Working Paper Series.The World Bank.

Appendix B

The formula for determining r is given as:

$$r = \frac{n \sum xy - (\sum x)(\sum y)}{\sqrt{[n \sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2][n \sum y^2 - (\sum y)^2]}}$$

Where: $\sum XY$ = Sum of the gross products of the values of variables X and Y

$(\sum X)(\sum Y)$ = Product of the sum of X and the sum of Y

\sum = Sigma (meaning sum of) sum of the values obtained in piloting

$\sum X^2$ = Sum of squared values of X

$\sum Y^2$ = Sum of squared values of Y

n = the number of participants

x = the scores for the questionnaire from the 1st test

y = the scores for questionnaire for the 2nd test

Appendix C

Addis Ababa University

College of Education and Behavioral Studies

Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Questionnaire for Teachers

Dear respondents, the purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data on the community participation in the implementation of the primary school curriculum for the work of masters of degree fulfillment program. Kindly you are requested to provide answers to these questions as honestly and precise as possible. Response to these questions will be treated as confidential. You are therefore requested not to indicate your name or the name of your school anywhere on the questionnaire. Please, read each of the items carefully and give the response that corresponds to the situation in your school and your activities.

Thank you in advance!

Part one: - Back ground information of respondents

1. Age: - A, 21-26 B, 27-32 C, 33-38 D, above 38

2. Sex: - A, Male B, Female

3. Educational qualification

A, Diploma

B, Degree

C, Any other

4. years of service in teaching

A, 1-6

B, 7-12

C, 13-18

D, above 18

5. Responsibility in the school other than teaching

A, unit leader

B, department head

C, PTA members

D, if any other

6. The teaching load (Period allotment) per week

A, 10-14

B, 15-19

C, 20-24

D, 25-30

Part two:-Directions to scoring

Give your response by putting a tick/ / mark in one of the five alternatives that correspondence to the response it is closer to the situation of your school and your activities.

1, strongly disagree (SD)..... it indicates that the activity have been done very rarely

2, Disagree (D)..... it indicates that the activity have been done rarely

3, Undecided (U)..... it indicates that the activities have been done sometimes

4, Agree (A)..... it indicates that the activity have been done most of the time

5, strongly agree (SA).....it indicates that the activity have been done frequently (100%)

No	Items	SD	D	U	A	SA
		1	2	3	4	5
1	In my school, there is a welcome orientation meeting on school opening time.					
2	My school makes parents, SETB & PTSA members participate in the preparation of different school plan.					
3	My school makes parents and community to participate in decision making in budget preparation and implementation.					
4	My school provides parents & community members meetings, workshops and training on curriculum implementation and students' academic achievement.					
5	In my school teachers make parents aware of the importance of helping their children at home by school activities like reading, doing homework and etc.					
6	In my school teachers encourage parents and community members to share their experience with students as part of classroom activities.					
7	In my school teacher's contact with parents of students having academic or behavioral problems.					
8	My school's PTSA and SETB mobilizes the community to contribute money for building classrooms, maintain library, laboratory, pedagogical center and etc.					
9	My school organizes PTSA, SETB, teachers' association, students' council and clubs.					
10	My school conducts a formal conference with community members at least two times a year.					
11	My school community members participate in providing money					

	and labor to fulfill school infrastructure.					
12	My school participate PTSA and SETB members in the rate of increasing students enrollment.					
13	My school participate PTSA and SETB members in the rate of decreasing students dropout.					
14	My school establishes a clear two way communication from school to parents and from parent to school.					
15	In my school there is motivation efforts supports made by the school principals to make you active participant in all school programs.					
16	In my school teachers send students work daily or weekly for parents to assess and comment on.					
17	In my school parents gave frequent feedback on their children's homework performance.					
18	My school PTSA participates in solving disciplinary problems that might be made by students.					
19	My school provides opportunity to parents and community members to manage, monitor and supervise school resources and activities.					
20	In my school teachers provides clear information about curriculum, assessment and achievements level for parent and community.					
21	In my school teachers provide ongoing and specific information to parents on how to assist their childees with skills that they need to improve.					

Appendix D

Focus Group Discussion Guide for Primary School Teachers

1. Discusses curriculum implementation by your understanding?
2. How do you explain the community participation in curriculum implementation in your school?
3. Which community members can participate in curriculum implementation and how?
4. Have you ever seen community participation in your school? If yes; discuss the extent of their participation.
5. In the line of your profession, how do you explain the benefits of community involvement in curriculum implementation?
6. Have you ready as a profession to work with community members in curriculum implementation issues and how?
7. Discuss the conditions that needed to be put in place or addressed by the government or school to lay the foundation for community participation in curriculum implementation.
8. What are the challenges and mechanisms to overcome the community participation in curriculum implementation?
9. What recommendation can you give to the school, government and other bodies with regards to engaging members of the communities in curriculum implementation at primary school level?

Thank for your co-operation!

Appendix E

Interview guide for school principals

1. Is there any organizational structures to participate the community in the school activities?
What are they?
2. What strategies do you use to participate the community in curriculum implementation?
3. What are the communication mechanisms of the school with parents?
4. To what extent does the PTSA and SETB involves in school leadership and mobilization?
5. Have you taken any training course on how to involve parents and communities in curriculum implementation? What do you comment regarding training of principals on the how of the involvements of parents and communities in curriculum implementation?
6. What are the major activities that parents and communities involved in the curriculum implementation?
7. What is the current status in primary schools with regards to community participation in curriculum implementation?
8. What factors influence the involvement of the parents and communities in the curriculum implementation?
9. If you think that there are factors, which limited involvement efforts, what do you suggest for the involvement of parents-school partnership for the development of students achievement?
10. What can school do to enhance community participation in your schools?

Thank for your co-operation!

Appendix F

Interview Guide for Woreda Educational Officer

1. How do you explain curriculum implementation?
2. How do you think of the term community participation?
3. How do you explain community participation in curriculum implementation?
4. Do you think community involvement in schools is important? How?
5. Which community members can participate in curriculum implementation?
6. What are the community participation activities in the woreda primary schools and how it is measured?
7. What is the current level of community participation in curriculum implementation at primary schools?
8. What are the challenges to effective community participation in curriculum implementation?
9. What can do the Woreda education office to enhance community participation in primary schools?
10. have you additional communities on the above idea?

Thank for your co-operation!

Appendix G

Addis Ababa University

College of Education and Behavioral Studies

Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Questionnaire for the Students

Dear respondents, the purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data on the community participation in the implementation of primary school curriculum for the work of masters of degree fulfillment program. You are gently requested to complete this questionnaire indicating your kindly response through each question. The information given will be treated with utmost confidentiality and you are therefore requested not to indicate your name or the name of your school anywhere on the questionnaire. Please respond to all the questions.

Part one: -Information about the respondents

1. Age: - A, 13-15 B, 16-18 C, above 18
2. Sex: - A, Male B, Female
3. Grade level: - A, 7 B, 8
4. My parents are: - A, illiterate B, literate
5. If you say literate what is their educational status
A, grade four B, grade eight C, diploma D, degree E, if any
6. My parent's occupational status
A, civil servant B, private work

Part two: - Directions to scoring

Give your response by putting a tick/ / mark in one of the five alternatives that correspondence to the response that is closer to the situation of your school and your activities.

1, strongly disagree (SD)..... it indicates that the activity have been done very rarely

2, Disagree (D)..... it indicates that the activity have been done rarely

3, Undecided (U)..... it indicates that the activities have been done sometimes

4, Agree (A)..... it indicates that the activity have been done most of the time

5, strongly agree (SA).....it indicates that the activity have been done frequently (100%)

No	Items	SD	D	U	A	SA
		1	2	3	4	5
1	My parent's discuss about educational values at home.					
2	My parents encourage and help me to achieve better in my learning.					
3	My parents initiate me to study at home.					
4	My parents reduce my work load at home.					
5	My parents provide sufficient and relevant supplementary educational materials.					
6	My parents know about whether I really go and what I do in the school.					
7	My parents' guide me in my daily activities.					
8	My parents give comment after evaluating my learning activities.					
9	My parents participate in school conference and PTA meeting.					
10	My parents contact with my teacher concerning my academic progress and achievement.					
11	My parents visit our school through the year.					
12	My parents help me to do better the school activities at home.					
13	My parents advise me to show good discipline at school.					
14	My parents contribute money for school activities.					
15	My parents participate in other school activity.					
16	My Parents praise me when I got good result.					

Thank for your co-operation!

Appendix H

Interview Guide for Parents

1. Is your home environment conducive for your child to study? That is in reducing work load, attending and giving necessary materials for their learning.
2. Have you monitoring your children school activates and how do you looks like?
3. Do you make contacts with your child's teacher to discuss regarding your children's progress, achievement or school activities?
4. Have you involve or participate in any school activities and how?
5. What are the systems of communication with you that the school developed?
6. What do you think that the role of parents and communities in assisting their children learning?
7. What do you think to be improved on the parts of the school, parents and communities so that they work collaboratively on children's educational improvement and development?

Thank for your co-operation!

Appendix I

Interview Guide for PTSA and SETB members

1. As parent representatives, do you have a regular meeting program? If yes, what are the major issues presented for the discussion?
2. What are the major activities that the parents and communities are involved in the school?
3. How do you understand about curriculum implementation?
4. As community representative, have you made conference with school and parents regarding how parents assist and monitor their children at home and at school?
5. As community representative, do you participate in the preparation of strategic and annual planning time and evaluation time?
6. What are the motivation efforts and supports made by the school principal to make you active participant in all the school programs?
7. Do you think that, it is important to work together with teachers and involve yourself with the development of the teaching and learning process?
8. What do you suggest for the improvement of community participation in the curriculum implementation in your school?

Thank for your co-operation!

Appendix J

Checklist for document sources regarding to community participation

1. The availability of different policy and manuals

Education and training policy 1994

CPD manuals

2. Based on policy, committee establishment (Minutes)

PTSA

SETB

SIP

Students' council

Women's club

Teachers association and etc.

3. Each committee has

Guide line

Regulation

Annual plan

Meeting schedule

Files

4. Documents available in the school

Classroom visits

Feedback on the progress reports of their children

Parent teacher meetings

Decision made by PTSA and SETB member (minutes, files, reports)

Experience taken by PTSA and SETB

Workshops or orientation given to parents

Money/material contribution to the school

Labor contribution by parents for construction

Parents as teacher aid

5. Communication mechanisms

Plan

Meeting

Official letters

Brochures

Report card

Progress reports to parents

6. Constructed building and furniture purchased by community fundraising

N_o of classroom

N_o of desks

N_o of maintained

Latrines

Office

Library

Laboratory

Pedagogical center

Appendix K

Checklist of observation regarding the performances done by community participation

1. Number of classrooms constructed from the community funds.
2. Number of desks fulfilled by the community
3. Number of offices, laboratory, library, pedagogical center, and latrine.
4. Fences of the school compound.
5. Black boards
6. Doors
7. Classrooms maintained
8. Chairs
9. Tables
10. Parents as classroom volunteers
11. Parents as tutors

Declaration

I, the undersigned, declare that this study entitled “Assessment of community participation in the implementation of primary school curriculum with specific reference to Wolayita Zone Damot Woyde Woreda, SNNPRS” is my own work. I have undertaken the research work independently with the guidance and support of the research advisor.

Declared by:-

Name:-Memhiru Kumalo

Signature: - _____

Date: - _____

Approval

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

Advisor: - Solomon Areaya (PhD)

Signature: - _____

Date:-_____

