THE STATE OF COMMUNITY BASED RESEARCH IN JIMMA UNIVERSITY

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIES
P.O.BOX 1176
ADDIS ABABA ETHIOPIA

BY

MEKURIA ABEBE

EDUCATION RESEARCH CENTER LIBRARY
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

JUNE, 2008
ADDIS ABABA

THE STATE OF COMMUNITY BASED RESEARCH IN JIMMA UNIVERSITY

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIES
P.O.BOX 1176
ADDIS ABABA ETHIOPIA

BY

MEKURIA ABEBE

EDUCATION RESEARCH CENTER LIBRARY
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

JUNE, 2008
ADDIS ABABA

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

THE STATE OF COMMUNITY BASED RESEARCH IN JIMMA UNIVERSITY

BY
MEKURIA ABEBE

A Thesis Presented to the Institute of Educational Research in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of Master of Arts in Educational Research and Development

JUNE, 2008
ADDIS ABABA

Acknowledgements

I greatly appreciate the contributions of my advisor, Ato Firdissa Jebessa Aga, who provided his skilful and constructive advice and input during my research process.

I deeply appreciate the considerable support, commitment and contributions of my brother, Wudu Melesse, a lecturer in Jimma University. I also express my gratitude to my colleague, Alemayehu Mamo, for his invaluable input in the study.

Acronyms Used

AHRQ	Agency for Health and Research Quality
JU	Jimma University
HE	Higher Education
HEIs	Higher Education Institutions
ETP	Education and Training Policy
CBE	Community Based Education
CBR	Community Based Research
FoE	Faculty of Education
PHF	Public Health Faculty

Abstract

This study was conducted to investigate the state of CBR in JU. More specifically, the study sought to(1) explore the place of CBR in JU;(2) examine the level of involvement of various groups in CBR; and(3) examine barriers and facilitators to conduct CBR. A descriptive survey method was employed using both qualitative and quantitative data. Data were gathered using questionnaire, interview, and document review.. The quantitative data generated were analyzed using percentage, mean, rank, Pearson correlation and t-test. Qualitative data substantiated the quantitative data. The results indicate that most important barriers and facilitators relate to methodological and funding and/or institutional issues. The key barriers include lack of CBR researchers, few grants/rewards/ incentives given for faculty, scarcity of funding to support CBR, belief that results will not be disseminated or acted upon, and lack of knowledge or training in CBR. Facilitators include increasing funding opportunities, provision of financial and other incentives, conducting educational forums and training opportunities, creating interdisciplinary research teams and increasing institutional supports (including promotion practices). Besides,the findings of the study revealed that FoE and PHF significantly differed only in one of the twenty barriers and the twelve facilitators. It was concluded that CBR was in a state of uncertainty, as teachers were perceived to be the most active in all areas of research and community members were then least involved. It is , therefore,recommended that the trend of research in Jimma University had to change by taking into consideration the barriers that hindered the practice and the facilitators that help to support CBR.

Table of contents

Page

Acknowledgements I

Acronyms Used ii

Abstract iii

Table of Contents iv

List of Tables v

Chapter ONE

INTRODUCTION 1

1.1. Background of the Study 1

1.2. Problem Statement 2

1.3. Significance of the Study 3

1.4. Delimitation of the Study 3

1.5. Organization of the Research Report 4

CHAPTER TWO:

LITERATURE REVIEW 5

2.1. Multiple Ways of Knowing: Alternative Inquiry Paradigms 5

2.2. The Development of Campus-Community Partnerships 6

2.3. Defining CBR 8

2.4. CBR Principles 10

2.5. Benefits of CBR 13

2.6. Barriers and Facilitators to Conducting CBR 15

2.7. Research and Higher Education in Ethiopia 16

2.7.1. Research and Higher Education: An Overview 16

2.7.2. Research in Higher Education Institutions of Ethiopia 17

2.7.3. Jimma University and Its Research Undertaking.. 19

CHAPTER THREE:

RESEARCH METHODS 20

3.1. Instrument Development 20

3.2. Data Collection 21

3.3. Data Analysis 21

CHAPTER 4:

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA 22

4.1. Sample Characteristics 22

4.2. Participation and Involvement 23

4.3. Barriers 24

4.4. Facilitators 26

4.5. Additional Barriers and Facilitators Described by Survey Participants 29

CHAPTER 5:

5. DISCUSSION 33

5.1. The Place Given to CBR 33

5.2. Participation and Involvement 33

5.3. Barriers 34

5.4. Facilitators 38

CHAPTER 6:

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 41

6.1. Summary 41

6.2. Conclusions 43

6.3. Recommendations 44

Bibliography

Appendixes

Appendix 1: Questionnaire

Appendix 2: Survey Items: Barriers

Appendix 3: Survey Items: Facilitators

Appendix 4: Differences in the Mean Ratings of Barriers between FoE And PHF

Appendix 5: Differences in the Mean Ratings of Facilitators between FoE and PHF

Appendix 6: Pearson Correlations

Appendix 7: Interview Guide

Appendix 8: Criteria for Appointments and Promotions

List of Tables

Page

Table 1: Mean Level of Involvement in the Research Process 23

Table 2: Mean Ratings of Barriers 25

Table 3: Mean Ratings of Facilitators 27

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

The latter years of the 20th century saw a dramatic increase in the involvement of HEIs in their surrounding communities. Several forces have helped to create these states of affairs. Two of them- wide spread criticism of higher education's disconnection from communities and growing concern about the professorates exceedingly narrow definition of research-originated outside the institutions but quickly led to wide ranging and often heated debate across campuses. The third force the cognition of the need to develop students' civic capacity and prepare them for active democratic citizenship came largely from within the institutions (Strand et al., 2003).

The result of the above three major forces has been an increase in the involvement of higher education institutions in their surrounding communities. Community therefore has become central to higher education. Today a growing number of institutions are forging connections with the communities that often lie just beyond their campuses.

One of the supportive evidences for JU's perceived need for a new vision and paradigm of HE is the document 'World Declaration on Higher Education for the 21st Century (UNESCO, 1998). Article 9 of the document stipulates the importance of innovative educational approaches in higher education as one of the missions and functions of HE to encourage critical thinking and creativity. This article states that: (a) in a world undergoing rapid changes, there is a perceived need for a new vision and paradigm of HE, which should be student oriented, calling in most countries for in-depth reforms and an

open access policy so as to cater for ever more diversified categories of people, and of its contents, methods, practices and means of delivery, based on new types of links and partnerships with the community and with the broadest sector of society, (b) higher education institutions should educate students to become well informed and deeply motivated citizens, who can think critically, analyze problems of society, look for solutions to the problems of society, apply them and accept social responsibilities, and (c) to achieve these goals, it may be necessary to recast curricula, using new and appropriate methods, as to go beyond cognitive mastery of disciplines.... One of the priority actions suggested- partnership approaches to HEIs- should be a prime matrix for renewal in HE (Ibid).

1.2. Problem Statement

It has been over a decade and half years since community-based education (CBE) was adopted as a mission, core educational philosophy by Jimma University (JU). The university started and has deeply entrenched civic engagement with in the field of health. The university is working toward making CBE the main strategy for linking the university and the community. The university has attempted to share its resources of knowledge and facilities with others, as well as to present to the public an image of a cooperative endeavor that benefits the various constituents of the community.

However, Jimma University's paradigm shift in higher education cannot be a guarantee for provision of quality education, one of the major challenges in higher education system of Ethiopia. Its success depends upon the extent to which research has become an integral function (Desalegn, 2006; Berhanu, 2006).

Moreover, although research is by no means one of the functions of higher education institutions in a university, which claims CBE as its leading educational philosophy and strategy, the very importance of CBR is not questioned (Strand et al., 2003).

However, as far as the researcher's knowledge is concerned the overall state of community research in the university is not known despite a call for a systematic study by Sori (2000). This invites the investigator of the study to ask about the state of the CBR field in the university. The investigator of the study, therefore, sought to ask and address the following questions:

1. To what extent is community-based research is given due attention at Jimma University?
2. What is the level of involvement of various groups in research?
3. What are the barriers and facilitators to conducting community based research?

1.3. Significance of the Study

The researcher anticipates that this research will be relevant to University key decision makers, university research office staff, academic staff, practitioners and others. It will provide systematic data on the state of CBR in Jimma University. It helps to promote and support the use of CBR to develop strategies, advance CBR and to explore the use of CBR as a resource for policy makers to help guide their program development. It may serve as a springboard for further study in the area.

1.4. Delimitation of the Study

The study was delimited to investigate the state of community-based research in Jimma University. The researcher confined the study into two faculties: Public Health and Education. Public Health was selected for it

initially adopted the CBE and is expected to be a prototype for others while education faculty was chosen in which the researcher had his initial experience. Analysis of data focuses on place of CBR , involvement of various groups in research, and barriers and facilitators to conducting CBR.

1.5. Organization of the Research Report

This research report has 6 chapters. Chapter one is the introductory part. In chapter 2 the results of the literature about the topic under investigation are presented. Chapter 3 describes the methods employed including instrument development, data collection and data analysis. Chapter 4 deals with data presentation and analysis. Chapter 5 discusses the findings of the study. Chapter 6 offers the summary of major findings, conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter deals with the body of literature that is of direct relevance to the issue under investigation. It deals with inquiry paradigms, development of campus community partnerships, community based research principles, benefits of CBR, and barriers and facilitators of CBR. It also treats about research and higher education in Ethiopia.

2.1. Multiple Ways of Knowing: Alternative Inquiry Paradigms

In our pursuit of knowledge one basic question that is frequently raised is "How do we know about the world around us?" This question can be approached from different angles, as there are multiple ways of knowing or acquiring knowledge.

In relation with the above considerable discussion has been made about the construction of scientific knowledge although nobody really knows how one can best understand the world. Debates have centered on different paradigms.

The term "paradigm" derives from the work of the historian of science Thomas Kuhn (Maxwell, 2005:36), refers to basic set of beliefs about the nature of reality and what can be known about it, the relationship between the knower and what is known or knowable, and how the knower can find out what can be known (Israel et al, 1998:175).

As Punch (2000:35) put it paradigm means a set of assumptions about the social world, and about what constitutes proper techniques and topics for inquiring into that world. Put simply, it is a way of looking at the world. It

means a view of how science should be done and is a broad term encompassing elements of epistemology, theory and philosophy, along with methods. Likewise, Mertens (1998:6) cited what is identified by Guba and Lincoln (1994) as paradigm defining questions: 1) the ontological question asks, what is the nature of reality? 2) the epistemological question asks, what is the nature of knowledge and the relationship between the knower and the would be known?, and 3) the methodological question asks, how can the knower go about obtaining the desired knowledge and understanding?. Guba and Lincoln (1994) describe three alternative inquiry paradigms, "postpositivism," "critical theory et al" (a blanket term for several alternative paradigms, e.g., feminism, participatory inquiry), and "constructivism". And CBR mainly depends upon the latter two paradigms (Israel et al, 1998).

2.2. The Development of Campus – Community Partnerships

Contrary to higher education's inequitable and unresponsive relationship with the community the latter years of the twentieth century saw a dramatic increase in the involvement of higher education institutions in their surrounding communities. Three forces were echoed for this to happen (Strand et al, 2003).

The first force was related with a historical chorus of voices weighing in about the nature and purpose of knowledge, from Bacon's concern about the "true ends of knowledge" to John Dewey's warnings about the importance of linking knowledge with social inquiry rather than leaving it disconnected from action and isolated and mired in academic culture Benson, Harkavy, & Puckett (2000); Maurasse (2001) cited in Strand et al, 2003. Strand et al (2003) further strengthened the relevance of these ideas with what is prevailing in the neighborhoods adjacent to many college and university campuses struggling with greater and greater challenges that that

university resources could help to address: urban decay, environmental threats, growing economic inequality, and the unmet needs of vulnerable children, families, and communities in areas such as education, health care, housing, criminal and juvenile justice and employment. The idea behind this force of change can be briefed with the question: what is the purpose of higher education if not to reach out so as to provide something useful to society, starting with the communities that surround them?

Increased public demands for the work of professorates to be more responsive to the public goods was the other. A strong supportive argument was made by Ernest Boyer's criticism of the narrow definition of scholarship as research in pursuit of new knowledge and took issue with how the "science of discovery" serves as the key, if not the only, kind of acceptable scholarship for faculty, especially those at research universities (Edwards & Marullo (1999) cited in Strand et al. (2003)). Boyer's was concerned what other forms of scholarship – the scholarship of integration, of application, and of pedagogy–were undervalued and neglected with regard to both faculty roles and institutional credibility. In particular, Boyer, in his widely cited book" Scholarship Reconsidered" (1990), argued that the scholarship of application is best suited to address society's problems, and he challenged institutions to rethink their faculty reward systems and redirect their efforts by developing the resources needed to address the ills that confront society.

The third force for change was the growing realization on campuses that higher education is largely failing in its efforts to prepare students for lives of social responsibility and civic and political engagement. Colleges and universities were challenged by educators to move beyond their traditional courses and curricula and prepare students for their civic engagement. Increasingly, the most widely strategy for citizenship education has been

some form of students' involvement in communities, most typically in the form of volunteering and service learning.

It is as the result of the above three forces that a dramatic increase in the involvement of HEIs in their surrounding communities was seen. Today, a growing number of institutions are forgoing connections with the communities that often lie just beyond their campuses. Many colleges and universities are gathering with schools, social service agencies, businesses, neighborhood organizations, and health care providers, with government, corporate or foundation support.

Finally but not least, Strand et al. (2003) emphasized that a particularly promising activity to come out of these academy – community partnerships is community based research (CBR) ... a partnership of students, faculty, and community members who collaboratively engage in research with the purpose of solving a pressing community problem or effecting social change. CBR, by placing larger questions of social, political, and moral purposes at the center of higher education's historical missions of teaching, scholarship and service, addresses in a direct way higher education's public mandate to serve some larger public purpose as a citizen within a civil society.

2.3. Defining CBR

Israel et al. (1998:177) in their review of CBR identified that the term "CBR" is used in many ways, and other terms such as "community – wide research," "community-involved research," and "community – centered research" are sometimes used interchangeably. These terms are not the only terms. Different terms are used to describe CBR and these terms are a reflection of the long and diverse history of CBR.

Just like the different terms used to describe CBR, different definitions of CBR are offered. Warwick-Booth (2005) in her analysis of the literature regarding the issue, echoed different definitions of scholars which tend to overlap in terms of similarity. For example, Sclove (1997) argues that CBR can be defined as research rooted in the community, serving communities interests, and frequently encouraging citizen participation at all levels (P.3). Hills and Mullet (2000) describe CBR as collaboration between community groups and researchers to create new knowledge to bring about knowledge" (P.3). Here, the value of the contribution that the community groups make in the development of knowledge about the community is implied.

Minkler and Wallersten (2003) describe CBR as "... a collaborative approach to research that involves all partners in the research process and recognizes the unique strengths that each brings" (P.3). That means Minkler and Wallersten recognized the fact that CBR builds on the unique strengths that all partners bring about in the research process.

Flicker and Savan (2006:3) in their survey of "A Snapshot of CBR in Canada" used the definition developed by the Loka institute (2002) that states that CBR is "...conducted by, for or with the participation of community members... Community based research aims not merely to advance understanding, but also to ensure that knowledge contributes to making a concrete and constructive difference in the world." From this definition one can suggest that CBR, apart from the creation of knowledge, aims to bring about a constructive change and improvement.

From the above it is possible to say that definitions and their emphases vary despite their commonalities. Regarding this, Israel et al (1998:177) noted that consistent with constructivist and critical theory paradigms and their emphasis on the socially created nature of scientific knowledge, a fundamental characteristic of CBR is the emphasis on the participation and

influence of non-academic researchers in the process of creating knowledge. A critical distinction, according to them, is the extent to which CBR emphasizes conducting research in a community as a place or setting – in which community members are not actively involved versus conducting research with a community as a social and cultural entity with the active engagement and influence of community members in all aspects of the research process.

Hence, as the above evidences it, there are diverse ways of defining CBR. Perhaps, trying to define CBR strictly would hamper the richness of its meaning and purpose. Accepting the diversity of such definitions likewise creates problem to understand many of the factors involved in effective CBR, which is rarely fully achieved. As the result, it would be good to present and examine a set of characteristic that seek to capture the key elements of this approach – principles of CBR – based on the present state of knowledge in the field. This helps, us to understand CBR better and develop our own philosophy of the CBR process and its implications.

2.4. CBR Principles

Literally, the term 'principle' refers to something that holds true most of the time, or a rule according to which certain things happen. The principles of CBR refer to those guiding elements or features for the CBR process to operate. They are important considerations, a set of beliefs in CBR and guide the CBR process to contribute successfully to intended outcomes. In the literature they are characterized as follows:

- The key principle of CBR remains both characteristic to the approach and unchanging.
- The principles of CBR will continue to evolve as future CBR is conducted and evaluated.

- The extent to which any endeavor can achieve anyone or a combination of the principles will vary depending on the context, purpose, and participants involved in the process.
- CBR is an integration of the different principles of CBR.

If the above highlight certain common characteristics of CBR, then what are its principles? In the literature, several principals are put forth by various scholars such as Israel et al (1998), Warwick-Booth (2005) and others.

Principles of CBR

Recognizes Community as a Unit of Identity

Community based approaches to research attempt to identify and to work with existing communities of identity and/or to strengthen a sense of community through collective engagement. As Chitere and Mutiso (1991) cited by Chikozho (2006:15) put it the extent to which residents of a community have a sense of community identity affects their involvement in community development.

Builds on Strengths and Resources with in the Community

CBR seeks to identify and build on strengths, resources, and relationships that exist within communities of identity to address their communal concerns. In other words, CBR explicitly recognizes and seeks to support or expand social structure and social processes that contribute to the ability of community members to work together and bring about change/ improvement.

Partnership – Working

CBR, aiming to integrate knowledge and to produce benefits to all partners involved in the research process, facilitates collaborative partnerships in all phases of the research. All parties participate as equal members and share control over all phases of the research process, e.g. problem definition, data collection, interpretation of results, and application of the results to address community concerns.

Integrates Knowledge and Action for Mutual Benefit of all Partners

CBR, apart from building a broad body of knowledge integrates that knowledge with community and social change efforts that address the concerns of the communities involved. Information is gathered to inform action, and new understandings emerge as participants reflect on actions taken CBR may not always incorporate a direct action component, but there is a commitment to the integration of research results with community change efforts with the intention that all involved partners will benefit.

Promotes a Co-learning and Empowering Process

CBR is a co-learning and empowering process that facilitates the reciprocal transfer of knowledge, skills, capacity, and power. According to Gebbie cited in Ahmed et al (2003) it is recognizing the limit of academic that leads to embracing cooperative learning where information and knowledge flow back and forth.

Involves a Cyclical and Iterative Process

CBR involves a cyclical, iterative process that includes partnership development and maintenance, community assessment, problem definition, development of research methodology, data collection and analysis,

interpretation of data, determination of action and policy implications, dissemination of results, action taking (as appropriate), specification of learning's, and establishment of mechanisms for sustainability.

Disseminates Findings and Knowledge Gained to All Partners

CBR often requires innovative, user–friendly approaches to the dissemination of findings and knowledge gained to all partners using understandable and respectful language and acknowledging ownership of knowledge. The ongoing feedback of data and use of results to inform action are integral to this principle. This dissemination principle also includes researchers consulting with participants prior to submission of any materials for publication, acknowledging the contributions of participants and, as appropriate, developing co-authored publications.

2.5. Benefits of CBR

So, when the approach is put in practice what is likely to occur? In fact, here it is worth mentioning to recall the foregoing discussion of the literature review about CBR. That is, CBR processes differ fundamentally from mainstream research in being coupled relatively tightly with community groups that are eager to know the research results and to use them in practical efforts to achieve constructive social change. Here again it is good to emphasize that CBR is not only usable, it is generally used and, more than that, used to good effect. Many advantages to CBR are not perceived as being achieved with traditional research methods (Israel et al., 1998). Several beneficial results relating to involvement within CBR are illustrated within the literature (Flicker and Savan, 2006; Viswanathan et al., 2004).

- Despite conventional research and development has many social benefits and periodic successes, it also bears some responsibility for such negative consequences or effects... pollution, ethical breaches and the creation of weapons of mass destruction. But, not only does CBR tend not to produce such consequences, it often contributes directly to preventing, mitigating, or remedying them.
- Participation in CBR may result in the development of skills, confidence and employability amongst community members. Stakeholders can gain knowledge, training, experience and inslights into the technical of the research whilst simultaneously developing an appreciation for the usefulness and meaningfulness of the data generated. Participation in CBR can also develop new social efficacy. Individuals via their involvement can learn by sharing their personal experiences as well as going out into the community to gather information. Personal development is also there through the learning of specific skills like computer skills, planning skills and process skills. Involvement in research potentially creates leaders at different levels who represent a range of skills and functions. Therefore, CBR can create more sustainable improvements within the community by enhancing the position, skills and knowledge of people within the research process.

The above detailed discussion is mainly based on the analysis of published case-studies. Even some have tried to categorize into certain broad categories. For example, Viswanathan et al (2004) in their evidence report of community based participatory research (CBPR) pointed out improved research quality outcomes, community capacity outcomes and health outcomes.

The literature illustrates the benefits of CBR not only based on the published, qualitative case studies. There are also efforts based on CBR participants survey. For instance, Flicker and Savan's (2006:15) survey of CBR practitioners in Canada evidenced CBR to foster societal outcomes which are not perceived as being achieved with traditional research methods (Israel et al, 1998). In particular from the project undertaken by respondents increased community capacity (62%), plans for future projects (60%), cordial working relations (51%), new coalitions (47%), changes in agency programming (38%) and changes in government policy (15%) were cited as concrete outcomes. The frequency of reported negative outcomes (e.g. increased polarization, increased mistrust and alienation from funders, etc) was low (under 2%).

Clearly, CBR offers many benefits to individuals and groups employing the methodology, as the literature illustrates, possibly applying the principles in the most effective manner. Furthermore, the benefits of CBR can be maximized via an enabling environment – through the use of support, training and the dissemination of models of good practice though all research is problematic. The next topic deals with related issues.

2.6. Barriers and Facilitators to Conducting CBR

The above discussion about the benefits of CBR revealed the very importance and promise of CBR for those who are applying the methodology. More and more, this is being understood by communities, universities, and funders although it is still under used for various reasons. Thus, it is very important to examine what barriers hinder the progress of CBR. Not only this but also what can be done to better facilitate this collaborative venture.

Reviews of the CBR literature have identified the major barriers and facilitators to conducting CBR (Israel et al, 1998; Viswanathan et al, 2004; Ahmed et al, 2004; Flicker and Savan, 2006). These reviews have been primarily based upon published case studies and a survey of CBR community and academic practitioners in part. For the purpose of making the discussion coherent, these challenges/barriers and facilitators are organized into certain broad, but not necessarily mutually exclusive categories. For example, Israel et al (1998) organized them as: Partnership Related, Methodological and Broader Social, Political, Economic, Institutional, and Cultural Issues. Ahmed et al (2004) classify them as Individual and Institutional.

2.7. Research and Higher Education in Ethiopia

2.7.1. Research and Higher Education: An Overview

Higher education and research contribute a lot to the overall development of a nation. Based on experience of different countries, Teshome (2004) strongly argues for that we need to develop HE provision and research in order to bring about a sustainable increase in economic and social development. Through research and higher education it is possible to ensure success in human development as they play a significant role to economic growth and poverty reduction. Successful implementation of development policies and strategies too is possible when HEIs through their functions of teaching, training and research and services play their essential role as a factor in sustainable development. They also have a critical role in developing democratic culture and good governance which ultimately enhance poverty reduction and sustainable development.

Hence, from the above we can see that research is a direct and indirect instrument of development. For this reason, various documents (World Bank documents (Matiru et al. (1995) and UNESCO (1998) proclaim for

research to be one of the key functions/contributions of HEIs or universities. Aspin et al. (1995) too stated that the advancement of knowledge through research is one of the foundations upon which university education and the value of the university stand, and from which it may move the community and the institutions that serve it. The others are the transmission and diffusion of knowledge through teaching and publishing respectively.

According to Mwapachu (1995) as cited by Derebssa (2004:87) research is the fulcrum of academia that enables them earn their professional mark as well as advance in their career. It distinguishes universities from other institutions in terms of nourishing, advancing and refining knowledge and skills imparted and sought for by students in the teaching-learning process. Derebssa (2004:87) further explained the very importance of research to the staff /teacher of HE in at least three major ways. (i) to enhance the quality of instruction, (ii) to be effective supervisors of students research, and (iii) to move up the academic ladder. However, Derebssa (2004:88) further argued that those who are entitled to carry out research need to possess high quality of expertise and experience. They need to be encouraged to be competent researchers as well as situations need to be prepared to value and recognize their research (p.87).

2.7.2. Research in Higher Education Institutions of Ethiopia

In relation to those world documents, legal documents in Ethiopia too recognize the role of research. The Education and Training Policy (ETP) of Ethiopia states as one of the specific objectives of education as to make education, training and research be appropriately integrated with development by focusing on research (p.9). One of the overall strategies of the ETP of Ethiopia for the attainment of the stated objectives–the nexus between Education, Training, Research and Development (p.25) is also

supportive of the above. Moreover, in Ethiopia, all the universities are vested with full powers under their charters to undertake research (Derebssa, 2004:89).

Hence, from the above we can observe that all universities of the country are expected to conduct research. The extent to which they have met their research expectations which is actually based on their research capacity, may help to describe their status/ state.

Regarding the state of research in HEIs of Ethiopia literatures evidence the various efforts that are being exerted in order to know and improve the situation. Studies conducted in the area include that of Amare (2000), Derebssa (2004), Belay (2006), Berhanu (2006), Amera (2005), Teshome (2004), Abdinasir (2000) and Nuru (2005). Most are concerned with teacher education/educational research while some like Teshome (2004) were concerned with research in general. Amare (2000) was strongly concerned with the quality aspect of educational research in Ethiopia while Nuru (2005) was concerned with some quality aspects of senior essays of senior undergraduates of Addis Ababa University. Other than these most tried to assess the research climate and involvement and productivity of HEIs/HE teachers.

Close examination of the findings of studies reviewed may reveal the following general characteristics: Like the many universities/university teachers in Africa which do not engage in research and even if they do, many seem to avoid empirical and longitudinal studies (Matiru et al, 1995:36), there are few research, practice related research with insignificant effect on decision and practice; critical problems of transparency (e.g. with regard to the selection of researchable topics participating researchers, fund utilization and modes of accountability); limited dissemination to the relevant community/stakeholders, scarcity of resources; and uncertain

status of research functioning in a milieu of insecurity and isolation. These prevailing problems essentially call for transformation for the very existence of university system. Variety of recommendations may be forwarded to alleviate the problem. From the studies reviewed, which seem to reflect the fact that CBR is a neglected area in Ethiopian HE and prevailing problems, the very importance and promise of applying the CBR methodology would be one route. What Teshome (2007:132) stated about the failure of Ethiopian Universities to tap knowledge and experience of members of the public would make this argument sound.

2.7.3. Jimma University and Its Research Undertaking

As it is virtually impossible to imagine present day universities without research, the universal acceptance of the research role of higher education too is reflected in the stated mission of JU i.e. to be a center of academic excellence, integrating training, research and service. This indicates that JU is not exception to those primary missions of any university/HE system. However, the writer of this paper is not aware of any systematic efforts exerted to know the research activities of the university despite the call for systematic study by Sori (2000). Based on personal observation within a short period of time and the complaints of some academic staff of Jimma College of Agriculture, Sori (2000) tried to identify and list problems, though not in order of importance, which hamper but if positively solved, have significant input towards the improvement of the research atmosphere of the college, now under Jimma University.

Henceforth, as progress in education (CBE in this case) is possible through research (CBR in this case - a promising activity to come out of campus – community partnerships (Strand et al. 2003:3)), there is a need for a study to provide systematic data and have meaningful understanding of the state of CBR in the university. This study somehow extends the literature in the area.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODS

This chapter is a descriptive presentation of the procedures used to collect the research data and perform the analysis. It is organized into three sections. The first section deals with instrument development. The second one is about data collection and the third section deals with data analysis.

3.1. Instrument Development

Drafts of the questions in the questionnaire were developed based on prior research and writings on CBR (e.g. Flicker and Savan, 2006; Ahmed et al., 2004; Israel et al., 1998). Then my advisor reviewed the instrument and his feedback was incorporated to refine the questionnaire.

The questions in the questionnaire were divided into two major parts. Part 1 dealt with personal data of the respondents. Part 2 consisted of 3 sections, namely: (2.1) information on participation and involvement, 2,2) information on barriers, and (2.3) information on facilitators.

Barriers: A Likert type scale was used for assessing factors that hinder CBR practice. The scale consisted of 20 closed ended items of these 5 under the partnership related issues, 8 under the methodological issues category and 7 under the broader social, cultural, institutional, economic and cultural issues (see Appendixes 1 & 2). At the end of the barrier scale was an open-ended question for respondents to describe if any, other barriers to conducting CBR. For the scale Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.846 was obtained.

Facilitators: Just like the barriers, a Likert-type scale was used for the facilitators. The scale consisted of 12 items that were broadly classified into three categories. One item was treated under partnership related, 5 items were under the methodological issues and 6 items were under the broader social, economic, institutional and cultural issues category (see Appendixs 1 and 3). At the end of the facilitator scale was an open-ended question for respondents to suggest, if any, facilitators other than those listed in the scale. For the facilitator scale Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.95 was obtained.

1.2. Data Collection

A descriptive survey method was employed in the study since the major purpose was to look into the current state of CBR in Jimma University. For this purpose document review, questionnaires and interviews were used in order to solicit the required information.

A total of 67 questionnaires were distributed to the two faculties. FoE and PHF. Thirty five(35) for FoE and 32 for PHF. Of this 24(with response rate of 54.5%) was returned from FoE and 20(with response rate of 45.5) from PHF.

Two interviews were conducted with research and publication office (RPO) head and student research program (SRP) coordinator of Jimma University. The interviews were tape recorded with the permission of the interviewee and then transcribed.

3.3. Data Analysis

Both qualitative and quantitative methods of data analyses were used in this study.Qualitative data from interviews, documents and qualitative/ response of survey respondents were analyzed qualitatively. Quantitative data were exported to Microsoft Excel and SPSS for subsequent analysis. Univariate and bivariate statistical analysis were performed as needed to examine variables and relationships of interest.

CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATON AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter is concerned with the presentation and analysis of the data collected through documents, questionnaire, and interview. Data are organized into: Sample Characteristics, Participation and Involvement, Barriers, Facilitators, and Additional Barriers and Facilitators.

4.1. Sample Characteristics

The sample included almost males (93.2%) and females (68%). 54.5% were from the FoE and 43.5 from PHF.

In terms of age half (50%) were between the ages 21-30, while 1/4th (25%) were with age range of 31-40. Those with age range of 41-50 and >50 accounted for 20.5% & 45% respectively. Regarding service/ experience of participants about 36.4% were relatively new with experience of 1-2 years. Those between 3-10 account 34.1% and those above 10 years of experience are 26.8% .The status/ educational qualification of the samples reveal that about 30% were bachelors, 65.9% were masters and 4.5% were medical doctors (MD). The samples are also diverse in terms of their academic rank. The lion share (63.6% were lecturers, 22.7% were graduate assistants & 6.8% were assistant lecturers. 2 (4.5%) assistant professors and 1(2.3%) associate professor too were part of the study.

Respondents were asked to reflect regarding their training on CBR. The information asked in terms of whether they have formal training or not and if they have attended other means. Regarding the former, i.e., formal training on CBR 81.2% does not have training and the rest said they have.

While 70.5% of the respondents didn't attend workshops, seminars, conferences etc on CBR, 29.5% have got the chance to attend.

From the above we can observe the staff research need in that the staff is at insufficient training and skill level of the CBR content, process and method. The fact that very few have undergone formal training to conduct CBR or have participated in seminars, workshops etc on the topic imply that most will need to develop new skills or modify existing skills. They seek resource and acquire education and training in CBR.

4.2. Participation and Involvement

Based on their recent research experience participants were asked to rate the level of involvement of each party involvement category in each stage of the research process as per the codes 3, 2, 1, and 0 each indicating High, Medium, Low and None respectively.

Table 1 below depicts the mean level of involvement of the four-parties/ involvement categories at the different stages of the research process.

Table 1: Mean Level of Involvement in the Research Process

Research Process	Involvement category			
	Community members	Faculty Instructors	Government/ Funders	Service Providers/ NGO
Supporting the project financially	0.39	0.88	2.38	1.543
Defining the research question	0.75	1.72	1.33	1.18
Developing methodology to answer the question	0.67	2.55	1.03	0. 89
Data collection (e.g. interviewing surveying etc)	1.72	2.45	1.20	1.00
Analysis and interpretation of the data	0.50	2.63	1.15	0. 85
Writing the final report	0.46	2.61	1.02	0. 89
Issuing recommendations	0. 89	2.58	1.10	1.10
Disseminating the results	0.79	2.25	1.47	1.43
Implementing initiatives	1.31	1.58	1.54	1.56

As can be seen in table 1 above except in supporting the project financially teachers (academics) were perceived to be the most involved at all stages of the research process. Government/ funders were perceived to be most active in supporting the project financially. They were also cited to be involved in defining the research question, disseminating the results, and implementing initiatives. Service providers were perceived to be involved in supporting the project financially, disseminating the results, and implementing initiatives. Community members were perceived to be the least involved in all areas of the research but in data collection. This implies that community members' participation is mainly limited to providing information in data collection. They are minimally involved during the research process while being excluded before and after the research process.

4.3. Barriers

Barriers represent factors that are antithetical to conducting CBR.
Survey participants were asked to rate the extent to which they feel that the 20 frequently cited barriers are significant using a Likert-type scale ranging from 5 indicating "very significant barrier" to 1 representing "not a barrier". Table 2 below summarizes the mean rating of each of the 20 barriers.

Table 2: Mean Ratings of Barriers

Issue code	Barrier	Mean	Rank
1a	History of bad feelings and mistrust between the institution and community	2.96	16
1b	Lack of representation or perceived tokenism among community members	2.53	10
1c	Lack of respect for community knowledge	1.98	20
1d	The history and presence of power differential among participants to realize the language of equal partners	2.23	14
1e	Difficulty finding appropriate partners	2.51	11
2a	Perception that CBR lacks validity, reliability and objectivity	2.23	14
2b	A CBR project takes much time to complete	2.16	16
2c	Belief that results will not be disseminated or acted upon	2.95	4
2d	Lack of knowledge or training in CBR	2.82	5
2e	Lack of skills and confidence to engage in CBR	2.73	6
2f	Lack of interest in CBR	2.25	13
2g	Difficulty to prove the success of a particular intervention in a CBR effort	2.73	6
2h	Few CBR researchers/role models	3.14	1
3a	Scarcity of funding to support CBR	3.00	3
3b	Time shortages to engage in collaborative research	2.70	8
3c	Lack of institutional support for CBR (e.g. reward structures)	2.70	8
3d	Lack of resources (e.g. computers)	2.38	12
3e	Challenges of getting project approved by ethics	2.11	18
3f	Promotion criteria within academia based primarily on quantity and caliber of publications	2.05	19
3g	Few grants/rewards/incentives for faculty	3.11	2

The respondents ranked lack of CBR researchers or lack of role models (2h) first. The second and third major barriers in order were few grants /rewards/ incentives given for faculty (3g) and scarcity of funding to support CBR (3a).

While the first major barrier is within the broad category of methodological issues, the second and the third are under the broader social, cultural, economic and institutional issues broad category (Appendix 2). Belief that result will not be disseminated or acted up on (2c) and lack of knowledge or training in CBR (2d) ranked next in order.

Apart from an examination of the mean barrier scores of survey participants as a whole, variations in the mean barrier scores of participants between faculties of education and public health was observed (see Appendix 4). For example participants from faculty of education emphasized few grants /rewards/ incentives for faculty (3g), while those from public health faculty, on the overage, emphasized few CBR researchers(2h).

However, the Significance of the variations in the mean barrier scores of participants between EF and PHF was observed using t-test at 0.05 significant level (two-tailed). These ratings differed significantly on one of the 20 items. 3d-lack of resources. (Education M-2.000; Std. dev=.95346) (public health m=2.8421; std. dev=1.06787) the difference between these two mean ratings was -.84211(P=<.05) with public health rating this item as more serious than did education.

Analyses of relationships between respondents' experiences and what they consider to be barriers were also performed (see Appendix 6). The results revealed decrease in the influence of barriers as the respondents' experience increase. However, the persistence of methodological problems was observed even when the respondents experience increased. A statistically significant and positive correlation at the 0.05 level (2-tailed) was discovered with regard to lack of knowledge as a barrier.

4.4. Facilitators

Facilitators represent strategies for overcoming barriers but also factors that encourage CBR. Respondents were asked to rank the extent to which they believe that a list of frequently cited facilitators would indeed be helpful facilitators to CBR using Likert-type scale ranging from 1 representing "this is not helpful" to 5 indicating "very significant facilitator". Table 3 below shows mean ratings of facilitators.

Table 3: Mean Ratings of Facilitators

Issue Code	Facilitator	Mean	Rank
1a	Resources and supports for developing research partnerships	4.23	9
2a	Supporting faculty in the philosophy of the CBR approach	4.25	7
2b	Supporting faculty in the method of the CBR approach	4.18	10
2c	Development of community based research curricula	4.25	7
2d	Conduct educational forums and training opportunities	4.39	3
2e	Create interdisciplinary research teams	4.29	4
3a	Provision of financial and other incentives	4.41	2
3b	Increasing institutional supports (including promotion practices)	4.29	4
3c	Increased funding opportunities	4.44	1
3d	Increased funder awareness of the value of community based research	4.29	4
3e	Advocating longer term funding opportunities	4.16	12
3f	Promotional efforts that champion CBR credibility	4.18	10

The top first and second facilitating factors identified were related with funding. They are increased funding opportunities (3c) and provision of financial and other incentives (3a), conducting educational forums and training opportunities(2d) ranked third. This particularly fills the gap reflected in the personal data of the participants. That is, most do not have training on CBR (methodology). In addition to the above three facilitators were identified three facilitating factors with equal mean facilitator score: create interdisciplinary research teams (2e), increasing institutional supports (3b), and increased funder awareness of the value of CBR (3d).

Results in appendix 5 depict variations in the mean facilitator scores of participants between faculties of education and public health. For example, those from Faculty of Education focused on conducting educational forum

and training opportunities while those from public health, on the average, emphasized provision of financial and other incentives. However, the ratings differed significantly on one of the 12 items. 1a-resources and supports for developing research partnerships. (Education m=3.9583; std. Dev=.82558)(PHF m=4.5500;Std.dev=.8256). The difference between these two mean ratings was -.59167 with public health rating this item as more challenging than did education.

Moreover, in terms of facilitating factors to CBR versus respondents' experience, results were negatively related to the level of respondent experience. Three statistically significant relationships (all negative) were discovered for the sample as a whole: resources and supports for developing research partnerships (1a), increased funding opportunities (3c) and advocating longer term funding opportunities (3e) were all cited as less important factors as experience increased. However, for the rest negative relationships were observed but not statistically significant (see Appendix 6).

Hence, based on the above results and relating it with the personal data of the respondents, as the majority are relatively less experienced, we can infer that most of the survey items identified in the facilitator scale need to be taken into consideration in the efforts of trying to improve the state of CBR.

Barriers versus Facilitators

Further analyses of the relationships between what the respondents consider to be barriers and facilitators were also performed .The results depicted five statistically significant and positive correlations. Four correlations were significant at 0.05 level (2- tailed): history of bad feelings and mistrust between the institution and the community versus advocating longer-term funding opportunities, scarcity of fundng to support CBR versus conduct educational forums and training opportunities, and few CBR

researchers /role models versus increased funder awareness of the value of CBR .The other significant and positive correlation at 0.01 level[2 tailed]was few CBR researchers/role models versus Advocating longer term funding opportunities[see Appendix 6].

4.5. Additional Barriers and Facilitators Described by Survey Participants

Participants were asked to describe, if any, barriers and facilitators to conducting community based research (CBR) that were not included elsewhere in the survey under 2.2 (Barriers) and 2.3 (Facilitators) respectively. Five participants described one or more of the barriers whilst 3 participants provided one or more of the facilitator in a qualitative /text/ form. They are presented first barriers, then facilitators.

Additional Barriers Described by Survey Participants

The qualitative/ text responses provided by survey participants turned around the different facets of the issue under investigation. Two respondents' responses are related with funding from the point of view of the process to get fund for research project. One of these respondents described this as: "The very lengthy of the process to get fund for project."

Qualifying the above a survey respondent described the situation as: "I think fund processing in the university finance office is absolutely tiresome and discouraging to conduct different research works in the university."

The above survey respondent also commented lengthy process to accept or reject submitted research proposals as: "The process to submit the research work/proposal to the departments and faculties are problematical and takes almost 2 or 3 months to be evaluated by different scholars in the

department and to be approved by faculty academy commission and to process funding."

In the survey "Belief that results will not be disseminated or acted upon" was one of the items listed. Likewise, in relation with dissemination a survey respondent commented "most of the research results of the previous period were not disseminated to the community. As the result less interest of the community to be involved actively in the new research undertakings."

Hence, apart from identifying absence of dissemination as a barrier, the above respondent also claims the absence of dissemination of research results to community as a consequent event to reduce community interest to participate in future research.

Other survey respondent too cited "community fatigue." Perhaps, the above happens when the community is always information provider. A respondent further added barrier in relation with the experience of the academic staff as: "Lack of significant experience among staff on the validity of CBR."

The above idea may be examined from different angles. It may reflect the fact that most of the academic staff is less experienced. Actually the personal data of the participants may support this. And the fact that most are less experienced may lead to question issues specifically, methodological issues: "CBR lacks reliability, objectivity, validity."

Hence, the above mentioned barriers that are suggested by survey participants to be antithetical to CBR may well by summarized as:

- Poor dissemination
- Lack of significant experience among staff
- Community fatigue
- Long cycle time for funding
-Long cycle time for proposal review

Additional Facilitators Described by Survey Participants

Of those additional facilitators suggested by survey respondents most are in favor of the fact that the communities must benefit from the researches that are conducted within their midst. They emphasise the importance of implementing initiatives

- Facilitate implementation of recommendations
- Create forums to disseminate research results
- Publishing best results of CBR
- Implementing suggested solutions (recommendations) based on the study findings
- Emphasis should be give to the intervention phase so as to benefit the community
- Addressing problems identified within the community by research to increase the acceptance/ notion of the community members towards research

All the above imply that intervention is very weak and as the result identified problems are not addressed. This again impacts communities to participate in research.

A survey respondent suggested the very importance of increasing awareness of the community (providing incentives). The provision of incentives actually complements with one of the underlying beliefs that should exist in a (community based) CB institutions, i.e., sharing of benefits and risks.

Another contribution made by one survey respondent focused on research paradigm "Create paradigm shift about the value of research among acting parties in the area of research in general and community based research in particular."

Despite the above one respondent commented a seemingly pessimistic idea but can help the university to think about it critically. That is:

> *As far as my knowledge goes, no more facilitators to research work! And I think, conditions are discouraging to the issue raised! Even budgets are limited by office representatives to not conduct pilot study! An essential section of research work to maintain reliability and validity for appropriate instrument developments.*

Perhaps the above may reflect the unfavorability of the research environment in the university.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

5.1. The Place Given to CBR at JU

As can be seen, on paper, theoretically, the place given to CBR is promising. However, examining the promotion policy or criteria reveals an inherent bias against developing CBR. It is a clear disincentive to hinder the practice quite opposite to the oft- spoken institutional desire calling for better community relations and active involvement of the community when conducting research that affects them.

5.2. Participation and Involvement

Survey respondents suggested that except in supporting research projects financially, academics /teachers are the most involved in all stages of the research process. Government/ funders were most active in supporting the project financially. They were also reported to be involved in defining the research question, disseminating the results and implementing initiatives. Service providers were perceived to be involved in supporting the project financially; disseminating the results and implementing initiatives. Community members were the least involved in all areas of research. Interview data also shows that community members' participation is mainly limited to providing information in data collection.

Flicker and Savan (2006) in their survey research of CBR in Canada found least involvement of community members. This is in line with what is found in this study. However, while in this study community members participation is mainly limited to providing information during data collection, Flicker and Savan's (2006) study shows that community

members were most often involved in defining research questions, collecting data, and using the findings for advocacy purposes. That is, community members were involved before and after the research process.

Strand et al. (2003:11) contend that the full and equal participation of community members in every phase of the research may be somewhat problematic. However, at the very least, the community must be fully involved in the first phase of the research- identifying the research need and questions- and in the final phase, where the results are disseminated and implemented. These, as revealed by the findings of this study, are very minimal.

5.3. Barriers

This research shows that lack of CBR researchers is the first most important barrier to conducting CBR. It is put under the methodology-related issues. Perhaps, the lack of experience among staff might have contributed for this. According to a narrative comment by a survey respondent the influence of this was described as "the lack of significant experience among staff on the validity of CBR".

The literature also explains how the lack of significant experience is related with the first major barrier- few CBR researchers. Lack of experienced researchers in academic institutions translates to a lack of role models for junior faculty interested in learning about and conducting CBR (Ahmed et al, 2004:144). They also further added another ramification of the lack of experienced researchers. When experienced researchers lack, they are rarely found on Institutional Review Boards (IRB), Research, Faculty Development, Curriculum, or Promotion and Tenure Committees. As a result, knowledge about how to evaluate a CBR proposal or the effectiveness of researchers is limited and so is advocacy for curricular change, faculty development

activities that help educate faculty students in CBR, or promotion of CBR researchers.

In this study, it has also been found that few grants / rewards/ incentive for faculty is the other major barrier hindering the CBR practice. Information from interviews solicited lack of systems thinking as one major problem against institutionalization of CBR in JU. Document analysis, especially the academic reward structure or promotion criteria reflected a systematic bias against CBR. A preliminary analysis of research grant/ fund allocation indicates that there are a number of tiny research projects with few budgets. This means CBR is not given a fair place in the research system as well as research fund allocation of the university.

Flicker and Savan (2006) in their study discovered lack of institutional support and the existing reward structure as important barriers to scholars' participation in CBR. The tenure process actively militates against the collaborative, often multidisciplinary kind of work carried out through CBR projects like joint publication and teaching.

According to Polany and Cockburn (2003) as cited by Ahmed et al.(2004:144) it is few academic intuitions that offer seed grants for CBR similar to those that exist for basic, clinical or educational research. Additionally, most institutions consider community –related projects to be community service, which is not rewarded in the same way as other categories of academic achievement. As CBR involves relationship building and continuity over time, it often takes longer than clinical research, making it difficult for CBR practitioners to meet the scholarly expectations most academic institutions hold for numbers of publications (Gebbie et al., 2003) (ibid). Subsequently many CBR researchers have difficulty achieving promotion and tenure.

In this study issues related with funding were identified as the most important barriers as well as facilitators to CBR practice. Text response of survey respondents issued the lengthy process required to get fund. In the interview it has also been revealed that lack of funding and resource are barriers for CBR in the university.

Flicker and Savan (2006) in their research discovered results similar to the above. They have also underscored the fact that the scarcity of funding sources available to support CBR projects is well documented in the literature.

In this study belief that results will not be disseminated, lack of knowledge or training in CBR, and lack of skills and confidence to engage in CBR were the other important barriers. Partnership related barriers lacked in the top 6 or 10 ranks. Perhaps, this is related with the contribution of the different community outreach activities of the university.

The fact that partnership related issues are not the most important barriers and facilitators may be related with the contribution of the different community outreach activities Jimma University is undertaking.

The similarity among the barrier and facilitator ratings of faculties of education and public health surveyed is noteworthy. The ratings differed significantly in only 1 of the 20 barriers and 1 of the 12 facilitators. The result implies that the two faculties value the barriers as well as facilitators equally.

This study shows that as the respondents' experience rose, the influence or seriousness of the barriers tended to decrease. Exception to this trend was regarding lack of knowledge. A statistically significant and positive correlation was discovered at 0.05 significance level (2-tailed).

The above general trend-as levels of experience rose among respondents, the citation of most barriers seriousness tended to decrease is similar to what Flicker and Savan (2006) discovered in their survey study, indicating those who stick with CBR work in spite of the barriers it presents are able to develop strategies to overcome many of the barriers which deter less experienced researchers. Exception to their finding, however, is perception that CBR lacks objectivity, reliability and validity.

Exceptions to the findings of the studies-lack of knowledge and perception that CBR lacks validity, reliability and objectivity-both of which are within the methodology related issues broad category- perhaps may reflect the persistence of methodology related issues even for more experienced researchers.

Ahmed et al. (2004:147) contended that lack of knowledge or training in CBR and lack of interest in CBR (which may result in part from lack of knowledge) are among the chief individual barriers that militate faculty-performing CBR. Very few researchers have undergone formal training to conduct CBR and most practitioners involved in CBR have learned the process on their own.

The above situation, which calls for recognizing the need to learn how to conduct CBR, also prevails where this study was conducted from the personal data of survey respondents regarding their training on CBR. It was observed that very few have undergone either formal training or through other means like workshops and seminars to conduct CBR. This suggests that most will need to develop, new skills or modify existing skills.

Surprisingly, the influence of lack of knowledge or training in CBR on interest may be inferred from the rank order of barriers. Lack of knowledge or training in CBR ranked fifth followed by lack of skills and confidence to engage in CBR. Lack of interest in CBR ranked 13th.

What a survey respondent commented ' lack of significant experience among staff on the validity of CBR' also complements with the persistence of methodological problems even for experienced researchers let alone for those who lack significant experience.

5.4. Facilitators

Survey respondents suggested that the most important facilitators for CBR include increased funding opportunities provision of financial and other incentives, conducting educational forums and training opportunities. Fourth ranked create interdisciplinary research teams, increasing institutional supports (including promotion practices), and increased funder awareness of the value of CBR.

Financial dimensions of CBR in this study are, therefore, among the most important facilitators of CBR. This is also supported by literature and research as it has been indicated in the foregoing discussion.

Identification of conducting educational forums and training opportunities as an important facilitator of CBR in this study too is very sound. It fills the gap reflected in the personal data of the research participants. That is, most do not have training on CBR in that it is important to recognize the need to learn how to conduct CBR [Ahmed et al, 2004; 148). It can also contribute to overcome problems associated with the first major barrier- few CBR researchers.

It is also possible to justify with the existing reality and research the importance of creating interdisciplinary research teams and increasing institutional supports.

Interview data as well as document analysis depicted that lack of systems thinking and promotion criteria are important barriers to conducting CBR. There is a systematic bias against CBR. The academic reward structure is against collaborative, interdisciplinary and practitioner oriented research. In other words, there is lack of institutional support. Lack of institutional support, however, is a critical factor in deterring researchers from pursuing CBR (Flicker and Savan, 2006). The above magnify the very importance of increasing institutional supports and creating interdisciplinary research teams.

Facilitators Vs Experience

In this study, it was discovered that as the respondents' experience rose the importance of those facilitating conditions tended to decrease. This has been evidenced by the negative but statistically negative correlations between level of experience and mean facilitator score except the three statistically significant but still negative relationships discovered: resources and supports for developing research partnerships, increased funding opportunities and advocating longer term funding opportunities. The findings suggest that experience may help researchers learn the process on their own.

Just like the trend of relationship discovered between respondents' experience and what they consider to be barriers, the trend of relationship discovered between respondents' experience and what they consider to be facilitators was supported by a survey study conducted by Flicker and Savan (2006).

From the foregoing analysis and discussion of the relationships between respondents' experience and what they consider to be barriers and between respondents' experience and what they consider to be facilitators it is

possible to infer that the former results mirror the later and vice versa. This, however, can be evidenced by what has been discovered in the analyses of the relationship between barriers and facilitators. These results may also help to observe effective strategies that could help to surmount the influence of a certain serious barrier in line with the above.

This research depicted five statistically significant and positive correlations in the analysis of the relations between barriers and facilitators. They were history of bad feelings and mistrust between the institution and community versus advocating longer term funding opportunities at 0.05 level (2-tailed), scarcity of funding to support CBR versus conduct educational forums and training opportunities at 0.05 level (2-tailed), few CBR researchers /role models versus increased funding opportunities at 0.05 level (2-tailed), few CBR researchers /role models versus increased funder awareness of the value of CBR at 0.05 level (2-tailed) and few CBR researchers/ role models versus advocating longer term funding opportunities. By having a look at the rank order of both barriers and facilitators, however, it is possible to state that all the barriers and facilitators are among the most important barriers and facilitators.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter summarizes the major findings, presents the conclusions, and sets out the recommendations that emerged from the study.

6.1. Summary

The aim of the study was to look into the state of CBR in Jimma University. For this purpose data was obtained through questionnaire, interview and document review. Percent, rank, mean, unpaired test and Pearson Correlation were used to analyze quantitative data.

The Place of CBR

On paper, the place given to CBR is promising. The oft- spoken institutional desire calls for better community relations, acknowledges the value of community ideas and active involvement of the community when conducting research. However, in practice, the promotion policy or criteria creates an inherent bias against developing CBR.

Participation and Involvement

Except the financial dimension, teachers (academics) are the most involved in all areas of research. Community members, on the other hand, are the least involved in all areas of research but in providing information.

Barriers and Facilitators

Among the most important barriers identified in this study were:

- Lack of CBR researchers
- Few grants/rewards/incentives
- Scarcity of funding to support CBR
- Perception that results will not be disseminated or acted upon
- Lack of knowledge or training in CBR

The following were identified as the most important facilitators

- Funding
  - Increasing funding opportunities
  - Providing financial and other incentives
- Conducting educational forums and training opportunities
- Creating inter disciplinary research teams
- Increasing institutional support (including tenure and promotion practices)

The seriousness of most barriers tends to decrease as experience increases. However, the persistence of methodological problems is revealed by the significant and positive correlation between experience and lack of knowledge.

As experience increase the mean facilitator scores tend to decrease.

Partnership- related issues were not perceived as most important barriers as well as facilitators. Perhaps this may indicate the role of the community outreach activities Jimma University is undertaking.

Participants from education and public health faculties did not differ in their mean barrier and facilitator scores.

6.2 Conclusions

Based on the above findings of the study it can be concluded that although philosophically JU clams to practice CBR, CBR is not a legitimized field practically and is not effectively implemented. Communities are the least involved in all areas of study. As research is an integral function of any higher education system for quality education JU would be in problem to get fruit of the CBE philosophy without really integrating and developing it with research that calls for active involvement of the community before during and after the research process. JU should be in a position to enhance and provide quality education through a research approach that meets the challenges of traditional research approach. Of course CBR is not a magic solution to all problems. However it is CBR that can effectively help JU to identify promising practices, effective partnerships and successful curriculum. Therefore the trend of research had to change.

To this effect this study somehow provided a snapshot of barriers and facilitators to conducting CBR effectively. These with their strategic and practice implication could help to improve the situation.

6.3. Recommendations

Based on the above findings and conclusions the following recommendations have been forwarded:

- Although there is an oft- spoken institutional desire for community involvement in research, there is lack of institutional support, for example, in promotion practices. This calls for actions promoting policy changes on promotion and reward to be more supportive of CBR. Policies could be more CBR friendly by rewarding collaborative research and publications in the advancement process; supporting applied research and publication in interdisciplinary and non - traditional research organs; and recognizing importance of dissemination of information to non-academic audiences.
- The study shows that community members' participation in research is very limited. However, the involvement of community members in the actual conduct of the research enhances the quality of the process and the results (Israel et al., 1998: 189). Thus, the researcher strongly suggests involvement of community members in research. This may include, for example, hiring and training community members as interviewers for a community based (CB) survey.
- The research has depicted that very few have undergone through training on CBR methodology. Given that CBR is a different approach than many are accustomed to, the conduct of educational forums that address both process and methodological issues, as well as advantages and limitations of this approach can be useful.
- As funding issues were the most important barriers as well as facilitators to conducting CBR, the researcher strongly recommends the support of the CBR field through reform of the funding process. This may include, for example, hosting educational fora on CBR for staff, for university research office staff and for faculty to increase

awareness of CBR as a powerful research tool and setting aside CBR funding that recognizes the dual role of CBR (research and action).

- Given the methodological complexity and diverse skills needed to conduct CBR (Israel et al., 1998), the use of interdisciplinary research teams is suggested. This, however, doesn't mean bringing multiple disciplines together to individually and separately contribute their respective expertise. Rather an approach that integrates across disciplines in which the synergy involved results in a more creative and innovative approach to conducting research should be taken.
- The research has shown that perception that results will not be disseminated or acted upon was one major barrier. The researcher suggests involvement of partners in the publishing process in this regard. This can serve as a way to obtaining more in-depth discussions, reflection and increased understanding of the methodology, results and overall process of conducting CBR.
- The study shows that there is a lack of experienced researchers as well as few has undergone either formal or other trainings on CBR. As these are among the chief barriers divorcing academics from pursuing CBR, most will need to develop new skills or modify existing skills. It would be helpful if academics recognize the need to learn how to conduct CBR, seek resources and education and training in CBR.
- The investigator also recommends that further research should be conducted in the future for this study cannot address all areas of CBR. It should be examined from different perspectives. For example community and stakeholders at large.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahmed,S.M.,Beck,B.,Maurane,C.A.and Newton,G.(2004). Overcoming Barriers to Effective Community Based Participatory Research in US Medical Schools. Education for Health. 17(2), 141-51.

AHRQ (2003): The Role of Community Based Participatory Research: Creating Partnerships, Improving. Health, AHRQ Publication No. 03-0037, June 2003. Agency for Health are Research and Quality, Rockville, MD. Retrieved (13/3/2008) from http://www.ahrq.gov/research/cbprrole.htm.

Amare Asgedom. (1998). The State of Educational Research in Ethiopia. IER- Flambeau. 5 (2).

_____. (2005). Higher Education in Pre-revolution Ethiopia: Relevance and Academic Freedom. ***The Ethiopian Journal of Higher Education*** 2(2), 1-45.

Amera Seifu (2005) Personal and Institutional Factors that Contribute to Education Research Practices of Bahir Dar University Teachers. ***Bahir Dar Journal of Education***, 1(1), 23-44.

Aspin, D.N,Chapman,J.D.,and Wilkinson,V.R.(eds.) (1994). **Quality Schooling: A Pragmatic Approach to Some Current Problems: Topics and Issues.** London: Cassel.

Belay Kassa. (2006). Linkage of Higher Education with Agricultural Research Extension and Development in Ethiopia. ***The Ethiopian Journal of Higher Education***. III (1), 21 – 59.

Berhanu Mathewos (2006). Linking Educational Research and Quality of Education: The Case of Addis Ababa University: In Abstracts of the National Annual Conference on Teacher Education for Sustainable Development.

Chikozho, C.(2006). Institutional Evolution Under Water Sector Reforms: Lessons From the Mazowe Catchments, Zimbabwwe: In Mesfin Adinew and Abiye Daniel (eds). OSSREA – ***Social Science Research Report Series*** No. 33.

Desalegn Chalchisa (2006). Integrating Teaching and Research to Enhance the Quality of Education. ***Journal of Education for Development*** 1(1),111-132.

Galbraith M. W. (1995). **Community Based Organizations and the Delivery of Lifelong Learning Opportunities**. Retrieved (13/2/2008)from http://www-ed.gov/pbs/LLIconf95/com.htm/

Israel, B.A., Schultz, A.J., and Parker, E.A. et al (1998). Review of Community Based Research: Assessing Partnership Approaches to Improve Public Health. Annual Review of Public Health, 19, 172-202.

Keith F. (2000). **Developing Effective Research proposals**. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Matiru, B., Mwangi, A., and, Rulth, S. (1995). **Teach Your Best: A Hand Book of University Lecturers**.

McGuire, K.B. (1988). **State of the Art in Community Based Education in the American Community College**. American Association of Community and Junior Colleges: Washington D.C.

Mekasha Kassaye (2005) Ensuring the Quality of Ethiopian Higher Education in the Face of the challenges of the 21st Century. ***The Ethiopian Journal of Higher Education***, 2(2), 103-131.

Mertens,D.M. (1998). **Research Methods in Education and Psychology: Integrating Diversity with Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches.** New Delhi: SAGE Publications, Ink.

Ministry of Education. (1994). Ethiopian Education and Training Policy. Addis Ababa.

Nuru Mohammed – Tahir (2005) Aspec ts of Quality in the Research Paper of Undergraduates: A Case Study IER – ***The Ethiopian Journal of Higher Education***, 2(1), 1- 21.

Sori,W. (2002). Some Research Problems in Higher Learning Institutions: A Case Study of Jimma College of Agriculture. IER Flambeau 10(1), 37-42.

Strand, Kerry et al (2003). **Community Based Research and Higher Education**. San Francisco: Jessy Bass.

Teshome Yizengaw (2007). **The Ethiopian Higher Education: Creating Space for Reform**. Addis Ababa: Mary's UC Printing Press.

Teshome Yizengaw. (2004). The Status and Challenges of Ethiopian Higher Education System and Its Contribution to Development. ***The Ethiopian Journal of Higher Education*** 1(1), 1-19.

UNESCO (1998). The World Declaration of Higher Education for the Twenty First Century "Vision and Action".

Viswanathan, M., Ammerman, A., Eng, E., Gartlehner., Lohr, K., Griffith, D et al. (2004). Community-based participatory research: Assessing the evidence (AHRQ Publication No. 04-E022-2). Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.

Warwick-Booth, L. (2005) Community Based Research and Evaluation Models: their Applicability to social regeneration programmes debated through an analysis of the literature.

Wood, F.Q. (1989). Assessing Research Performance of University Academic Staff: Measures and Problems. ***In Higher Education Research and Development*** 80 (2).

Appendix-1

Addis Ababa University

School of Graduate Studies

Institute of Educational Research

Department of Educational Research and Development

Questionnaire to be filed by Instructors,

Deans, RPO Heads and CBE Head Staffs

Dear,

This Study is intended to investigate an Aspect of the State of Community Based Research (CBR) in Jimma University. The information provided by you will be useful for the University to get feedback and improve the state of community based research in the university. You are not required to write your name on the questionnaire. Your responses are confidential and anonymous, and therefore, form part of the aggregated results on all the data gathered.

Thanks for your cooperation

NB:-'CBR' in the questionnaire represents 'Community Based Research'

Part I: Personal Data

For each statement or question, please tick (✓) the box which represents your situation or write in your own words when a space is given .

1.1. Sex ☐ Female ☐ Male

1.2. Your age (Yrs ☐ 21-30 ☐ 31-40 ☐ 41-50 ☐ 51 and above

1.3. Service/Experience (YRS): _____

1.4. Faculty _____

1.5. Department _____

1.6. Highest educational qualification

☐ Bachelor ☐ Masters ☐ M.phil/phd

1.7. Position held in the university

☐ Graduate assistant ☐ Associate Professor

☐ Assistant lecturer ☐ Assistant professor

☐ Lecturer ☐ Professor

1.8. Do you have a formal training on community based research? ☐ Yes ☐ No

1.9. Have you attended, if any, workshops, conferences, or seminars on community based research? ☐ Yes ☐

PART II. Research Data Questions

2.1. Based on Your recent research experience rate the level of involvement of each party /involvement category in each stage of the research process, as per the code below (please encircle the number)

3 = High
2 = Medium
1 = Low
0 = None

Research Process	Involvement category														
	Community members (part of the community being studied)				You yourself				Government /Funders				Service Providers/ NC		
Supporting the project financially	3	2	1	0	3	2	1	0	3	2	1	0	3	2	1
Defining the research question	3	2	1	0	3	2	1	0	3	2	1	0	3	2	1
Developing methodology to answer the question	3	2	1	0	3	2	1	0	3	2	1	0	3	2	1
Data collection (e.g. interviewing, surveying etc)	3	2	1	0	3	2	1	0	3	2	1	0	3	2	1
Analysis and interpretation of the data	3	2	1	0	3	2	1	0	3	2	1	0	3	2	1
Writing the final report	3	2	1	0	3	2	1	0	3	2	1	0	3	2	1
Issuing recommendations	3	2	1	0	3	2	1	0	3	2	1	0	3	2	1
Disseminating the results	3	2	1	0	3	2	1	0	3	2	1	0	3	2	1
Implementing initiatives	3	2	1	0	3	2	1	0	3	2	1	0	3	2	1

2.2. Below is a list of barriers that may hinder involvement and progress of CBR in the University. Rate the extent to which you feel that these barriers/challenges are significant using Likert-type scale ranging from 1-4 as per the code below. (Please encircle the number)

4= Highly significant barrier 2= Some what barrier

3= Significant barrier 1= Not a barrier

No	Barrier	Scale			
		4	3	2	1
1	Scarcity of funding to support CBR	4	3	2	1
2	Time shortages to engage in collaborative research	4	3	2	1
3	Lack of institutional support for CBR (e.g. reward structures)	4	3	2	1
4	Perception that CBR lacks validity, reliability and objectivity	4	3	2	1
5	History of bad feelings and mistrust between the institution and community	4	3	2	1
6	A CBR project takes much time to complete	4	3	2	1
7	Belief that results will not be disseminated or acted upon	4	3	2	1
8	Lack of knowledge or training in CBR	4	3	2	1
9	Lack of skills and confidence to engage in CBR	4	3	2	1
10	Lack of interest in CBR	4	3	2	1
11	Lack of resources (e.g. computers)	4	3	2	1
12	Lack of representation or perceived tokenism among community members	4	3	2	1
13	Lack of respect for community knowledge	4	3	2	1
14	Challenges of getting project approved by ethics	4	3	2	1
15	The history and presence of power differential among participants to realize the language of equal partners	4	3	2	1
16	Promotion criteria within academia based primarily on quantity and caliber of publications	4	3	2	1
17	Difficulty to prove the success of a particular intervention in a CBR effort	4	3	2	1
18	Difficulty finding appropriate partners	4	3	2	1
19	Few CBR researchers/role models	4	3	2	1
20	Few grants/rewards/incentives for faculty	4	3	2	1
Other barriers (please briefly describe any other barriers not listed above.)					

2.3 Below are lists of factors that are assumed to facilitate CBR. Rank the extent to which you believe that these factors/facilitators would indeed be "helpful facilitators to CBR", using a-scale ranging from 1-5 as per the code below. (Please encircle the number)

5= Very significant facilitator

4= Quite significant

3= Some what significant

2= Very little significance

1= this is not helpful

No	Facilitator	Scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Supporting faculty in the philosophy of the CBR approach	5	4	3	2	1
2	Supporting faculty in the method of the CBR approach	5	4	3	2	1
3	Provision of financial and other incentives	5	4	3	2	1
4	Development of community based research curricula	5	4	3	2	1
5	Conduct educational forums and training opportunities	5	4	3	2	1
6	Increasing institutional supports (including promotion practices)	5	4	3	2	1
7	Resources and supports for developing research partnerships	5	4	3	2	1
8	Increased funding opportunities	5	4	3	2	1
9	Increased funder awareness of the value of community based research	5	4	3	2	1
10	Advocating longer term funding opportunities	5	4	3	2	1
11	Promotional efforts that champion CBR credibility	5	4	3	2	1
12	Create interdisciplinary research teams	5	4	3	2	1

Other facilitators (please briefly describe any other facilitators not listed above)

Appendix-2

Survey Items: Barriers

Issue code	Issue
	Partnership related
1a	History of bad feelings and mistrust between the institution and community
1b	Lack of representation or perceived tokenism among community members
1c	Lack of respect for community knowledge
1d	The history and presence of power differential among participants to realize the language of equal partners
1e	Difficulty finding appropriate partners
	Methodological
2a	Perception that CBR lacks validity, reliability and objectivity
2b	A CBR project takes much time to complete
2c	Belief that results will not be disseminated or acted upon
2d	Lack of knowledge or training in CBR
2e	Lack of skills and confidence to engage in CBR
2f	Lack of interest in CBR
2g	Difficulty to prove the success of a particular intervention in a CBR effort
2h	Few CBR researchers/role models

	Broader social, economic, political, cultural and institutional
3a	Scarcity of funding to support CBR
3b	Time shortages to engage in collaborative research
3c	Lack of institutional support for CBR (e.g. reward structures)
3d	Lack of resources (e.g. computers)
3e	Challenges of getting project approved by ethics
3f	promotion criteria within academia based primarily on quantity and caliber of publications
3g	Few grants/rewards/incentives for faculty

Appendix-3

Survey Items: Facilitators

Issue code	Issue
	Partnership related
1a	Resources and supports for developing research partnerships
	Methodological
2a	Supporting faculty in the philosophy of the CBR approach
2b	Supporting faculty in the method of the CBR approach
2c	Development of community based research curricula
2d	Conduct educational forums and training opportunities
2e	Create interdisciplinary research teams
	Broader social, economic, political, cultural and institutional
3a	Provision of financial and other incentives
3b	Increasing institutional supports (including promotion practices)
3c	Increased funding opportunities
3d	Increased funder awareness of the value of community based research
3e	Advocating longer term funding opportunities
3f	Promotional efforts that champion CBR credibility

Appendix 4

Differences in the Mean Ratings of Barriers between FoE and PHF

Barriers	Respondents	Mean	Standard devaton	t	df	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Fund	education	3.0000	.8847	.000	42	.0000	.3099
	public health	3.0000	1.1698				
Time	education	2.6250	1.0555	-.450	42	-.1250	.2779
	public health	2.7500	.7164				
support	education	2.9167	1.0180	1.694	42	.4667	.2755
	public health	2.4500	.7592				
validity	education	2.4167	1.0598	1.173		.3667	.3126
	public health	2.0500	.9987				
bad feeling	education	2.1739	.9841	.076	41	2.391E-02	.3162
	public health	2.1500	1.0894				
takes time	education	2.1250	.9470	-.276	42	-7.5000E-02	.2717
	public health	2.2000	.8335				
not disseminated	education	3.0833	.9286	.947	42	.2833	.2993
	public health	2.8000	1.0563				
lack of knowledge	education	3.0833	.9743	1.954	42	.5833	.2985
	public health	2.5000	1.0000				
lack of skill	education	2.8750	.8502	1.279	42	.3250	.2541
	public health	2.5500	.8256				
lack of finance	education	2.4583	1.1413	1.417	42	.4583	.3235
	public health	2.0000	.9733				
lack of resource	education	2.0000	.9535	-2.699	40	-.8421	.3120
	public health	2.8421	1.0679				
lack of representativeness	education	2.4348	.8958	-.749	41	-.2152	.2873
	public health	2.6500	.9881				
lack of respect	education	1.9167	1.0180	-.447	42	-.1333	.2983
	public health	2.0500	.9445				
ethical	education	2.0000	1.0215	-.702	42	-.2000	.2849

problem							
	public health	2.2000	.8335				
power differential	education	2.2174	.7952	-.114	41	-3.2609E-02	.2851
	public health	2.2500	1.0699				
promotion	education	2.4783	1.1627	.539	41	.1783	.3306
	public health	2.3000	.9787				
no proof	education	2.7500	1.0321	.000	42	.0000	.2734
	public health	2.7500	.7164				
no partenership	education	2.5000	.8847	-.110	41	-2.6316E-02	.2385
	public health	2.5263	.6118				
few models	education	3.2083	.8330	.653	42	.1583	.2423
	public health	3.0500	.7592				
few grant	education	3.3333	.8165	1.959	42	.4833	.2467
	public health	2.8500	.8127				

P≤0.05

Appendix 5

Differences in the Mean Ratings of Facilitators between FoE and PHF

Facilitators	Respondents	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
facilitator 2a	Education'	4.0417	.9991	-1.684	42	-.4583	.2722
	public health	4.5000	.7609				
Facilitator 2b	education	4.0417	.9991	-1.140	42	-.3083	.2704
	public health	4.3500	.7452				
Facilitator 3a	education	4.1667	1.0495	-1.915	42	-.5333	.2785
	public health	4.7000	.7327				
Facilitator 2c	education	4.1250	.9918	-.989	42	-.2750	.2781
	public health	4.4000	.8208				
Facilitator 2d	education	4.3333	1.0901	-.427	42	-.1167	.2735
	public health	4.4500	.6048				
Facilitator 3b	education	4.1667	1.0901	-1.036	42	-.2833	.2735
	public health	4.4500	.6048				
Facilitator 1a	education	3.9583	.9546	-2.175	42	-.5917	.2720
	public health	4.5500	.8256				
Facilitator 3c	education	4.2609	1.0539	-1.243	41	-.3891	.3131
	public health	4.6500	.9881				
Facilitator 3d	education	4.0833	1.0598	-1.229	42	-.3667	.2983
	public health	4.4500	.8870				
Facilitator 3e	education	4.0417	1.1971	-1.604	41	-.4846	.3022
	public health	4.5263	.6118				
Facilitator 3f	education	4.0417	1.1602	-1.050	42	-.3083	.2936
	public health	4.3500	.6708				
Facilitator 2e	education	4.1250	1.0759	-1.215	42	-.3750	.3086
	public health	4.5000	.9459				

$P \leq 0.05$

Correlations Pearson Correlation Coefficients

Correlations

		experience	Fund	Time	support	validity
experience	Pearson Correlation	1	-.247	-.058	.241	-.048
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.120	.720	.129	.768
	N	41	41	41	41	41
Fund	Pearson Correlation	-.247	1	.303*	.099	.355*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.120		.045	.523	.018
	N	41	44	44	44	44
Time	Pearson Correlation	-.058	.303*	1	.134	-.012
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.720	.045		.386	.937
	N	41	44	44	44	44
support	Pearson Correlation	.241	.099	.134	1	.199
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.129	.523	.386		.195
	N	41	44	44	44	44
validity	Pearson Correlation	-.048	.355*	-.012	.199	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.768	.018	.937	.195	
	N	41	44	44	44	44
bad feeling	Pearson Correlation	-.210	.134	-.074	.052	.427**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.194	.390	.639	.738	.004
	N	40	43	43	43	43
takes time	Pearson Correlation	-.014	.259	.583**	.115	-.019
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.932	.090	.000	.459	.903
	N	41	44	44	44	44
not disseminated	Pearson Correlation	.080	.233	.009	.137	.352*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.618	.128	.952	.375	.019
	N	41	44	44	44	44
lack of knowledge	Pearson Correlation	.329*	.068	.112	.114	.220
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.035	.662	.469	.461	.151
	N	41	44	44	44	44
lack of skill	Pearson Correlation	.202	.354*	.096	.132	.371*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.205	.019	.534	.394	.013
	N	41	44	44	44	44
lack of finance	Pearson Correlation	-.004	.383*	.177	.214	.441**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.979	.010	.249	.163	.003
	N	41	44	44	44	44
lack of resource	Pearson Correlation	-.565**	.273	.063	-.096	.009
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.080	.691	.545	.954
	N	39	42	42	42	42
lack of represenativenes	Pearson Correlation	-.128	.012	.110	.161	.221
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.431	.941	.482	.301	.154
	N	40	43	43	43	43
lack of respect	Pearson Correlation	-.204	.424**	.306*	.146	.304*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.200	.004	.043	.344	.045
	N	41	44	44	44	44
ethical problem	Pearson Correlation	-.302	.319*	.117	.192	.360*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.055	.035	.450	.212	.017
	N	41	44	44	44	44
power differential	Pearson Correlation	-.184	.301	.199	.083	.282
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.255	.050	.202	.596	.067
	N	40	43	43	43	43

Correlations

		experience	Fund	Time	support	validity
promotion	Pearson Correlation	.032	.239	.061	.472**	.310*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.845	.123	.696	.001	.043
	N	40	43	43	43	43
no proof	Pearson Correlation	.031	.155	.072	.217	.144
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.850	.316	.644	.157	.349
	N	41	44	44	44	44
no partenership	Pearson Correlation	-.046	.016	-.062	-.029	.226
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.776	.920	.693	.856	.144
	N	40	43	43	43	43
few models	Pearson Correlation	-.058	.347*	.061	.024	.353*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.718	.021	.692	.876	.019
	N	41	44	44	44	44
few grant	Pearson Correlation	.158	.328*	.079	.163	.313*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.323	.030	.611	.291	.038
	N	41	44	44	44	44
facilitator 2a	Pearson Correlation	-.266	.150	.014	-.157	.079
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.093	.330	.928	.310	.609
	N	41	44	44	44	44
Facilitator 2b	Pearson Correlation	-.135	.128	-.013	-.157	-.125
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.399	.407	.933	.308	.418
	N	41	44	44	44	44
Facilitator 3a	Pearson Correlation	-.264	.170	-.115	-.176	.130
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.096	.271	.456	.252	.400
	N	41	44	44	44	44
Facilitator 2c	Pearson Correlation	-.195	.275	-.181	-.020	.177
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.221	.070	.239	.895	.250
	N	41	44	44	44	44
Facilitator 2d	Pearson Correlation	-.193	.334*	-.103	-.139	.144
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.225	.027	.507	.368	.351
	N	41	44	44	44	44
Facilitator 3b	Pearson Correlation	-.205	.229	-.053	-.143	.068
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.199	.135	.734	.355	.660
	N	41	44	44	44	44
Facilitator 1a	Pearson Correlation	-.316*	.245	-.132	-.135	.180
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.044	.108	.395	.383	.244
	N	41	44	44	44	44
Facilitator 3c	Pearson Correlation	-.317*	.287	-.046	-.080	.135
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.044	.062	.771	.610	.387
	N	41	43	43	43	43
Facilitator 3d	Pearson Correlation	-.140	.232	.142	-.145	.164
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.383	.130	.358	.347	.287
	N	41	44	44	44	44
Facilitator 3e	Pearson Correlation	-.429**	.256	.170	-.227	.183
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006	.098	.275	.143	.241
	N	40	43	43	43	43
Facilitator 3f	Pearson Correlation	-.059	.024	.014	-.222	-.139
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.713	.879	.926	.147	.370
	N	41	44	44	44	44
Facilitator 2e	Pearson Correlation	-.102	.022	-.146	-.126	.016
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.528	.885	.343	.415	.916
	N	41	44	44	44	44

Correlations

		bad feeling	takes time	not disseminated	lack of knowledge
experience	Pearson Correlation	-.210	-.014	.080	.329*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.194	.932	.618	.035
	N	40	41	41	41
Fund	Pearson Correlation	.134	.259	.233	.068
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.390	.090	.128	.662
	N	43	44	44	44
Time	Pearson Correlation	-.074	.583**	.009	.112
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.639	.000	.952	.469
	N	43	44	44	44
support	Pearson Correlation	.052	.115	.137	.114
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.738	.459	.375	.461
	N	43	44	44	44
validity	Pearson Correlation	.427**	-.019	.352*	.220
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.903	.019	.151
	N	43	44	44	44
bad feeling	Pearson Correlation	1	-.159	.241	.143
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.308	.120	.362
	N	43	43	43	43
takes time	Pearson Correlation	-.159	1	.141	.136
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.308		.361	.380
	N	43	44	44	44
not disseminated	Pearson Correlation	.241	.141	1	.362*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.120	.361		.016
	N	43	44	44	44
lack of knowledge	Pearson Correlation	.143	.136	.362*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.362	.380	.016	
	N	43	44	44	44
lack of skill	Pearson Correlation	.244	.090	.375*	.644**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.115	.561	.012	.000
	N	43	44	44	44
lack of finance	Pearson Correlation	.217	.273	.229	.444**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.161	.073	.135	.003
	N	43	44	44	44
lack of resource	Pearson Correlation	.088	.232	.167	-.073
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.581	.140	.292	.647
	N	42	42	42	42
lack of represenativenes	Pearson Correlation	.281	.149	.333*	.304*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.068	.340	.029	.048
	N	43	43	43	43
lack of respect	Pearson Correlation	.193	.407**	.385**	.370*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.216	.006	.010	.013
	N	43	44	44	44
ethical problem	Pearson Correlation	.304*	.178	.130	.238
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.048	.247	.399	.120
	N	43	44	44	44
power differential	Pearson Correlation	.237	.270	.374*	.298
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.126	.080	.013	.053
	N	43	43	43	43

Correlations

		bad feeling	takes time	not disseminated	lack of knowledge
promotion	Pearson Correlation	.112	.303*	.342*	.297
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.479	.049	.025	.053
	N	42	43	43	43
no proof	Pearson Correlation	-.005	.257	.277	.384*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.973	.092	.069	.010
	N	43	44	44	44
no partenership	Pearson Correlation	.229	.222	.206	.093
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.145	.153	.186	.552
	N	42	43	43	43
few models	Pearson Correlation	.117	.001	.334*	.233
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.457	.992	.027	.129
	N	43	44	44	44
few grant	Pearson Correlation	-.022	.255	.174	.215
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.887	.094	.258	.161
	N	43	44	44	44
facilitator 2a	Pearson Correlation	.161	.036	.115	.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.302	.818	.455	1.000
	N	43	44	44	44
Facilitator 2b	Pearson Correlation	.256	.021	.062	-.039
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.098	.891	.689	.800
	N	43	44	44	44
Facilitator 3a	Pearson Correlation	.152	.031	.169	-.090
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.330	.840	.272	.562
	N	43	44	44	44
Facilitator 2c	Pearson Correlation	.111	-.021	.141	.025
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.480	.890	.361	.873
	N	43	44	44	44
Facilitator 2d	Pearson Correlation	.165	.038	.020	-.049
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.289	.807	.896	.753
	N	43	44	44	44
Facilitator 3b	Pearson Correlation	.181	.085	.041	.060
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.246	.584	.789	.700
	N	43	44	44	44
Facilitator 1a	Pearson Correlation	.236	-.072	.011	.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.127	.640	.941	.898
	N	43	44	44	44
Facilitator 3c	Pearson Correlation	.159	.103	.031	.012
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.315	.511	.843	.939
	N	42	43	43	43
Facilitator 3d	Pearson Correlation	.219	-.020	-.036	.115
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.158	.898	.818	.456
	N	43	44	44	44
Facilitator 3e	Pearson Correlation	.312*	.032	.100	.109
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.044	.839	.524	.487
	N	42	43	43	43
Facilitator 3f	Pearson Correlation	.188	-.061	.033	.128
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.227	.693	.831	.406
	N	43	44	44	44
Facilitator 2e	Pearson Correlation	.227	-.053	.129	.120
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.143	.733	.406	.439
	N	43	44	44	44

Correlations

		lack of skill	lack of finance	lack of resource	lack of represenat ivenes
experience	Pearson Correlation	.202	-.004	-.565**	-.128
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.205	.979	.000	.431
	N	41	41	39	40
Fund	Pearson Correlation	.354*	.383*	.273	.012
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.019	.010	.080	.941
	N	44	44	42	43
Time	Pearson Correlation	.096	.177	.063	.110
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.534	.249	.691	.482
	N	44	44	42	43
support	Pearson Correlation	.132	.214	-.096	.161
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.394	.163	.545	.301
	N	44	44	42	43
validity	Pearson Correlation	.371*	.441**	.009	.221
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.013	.003	.954	.154
	N	44	44	42	43
bad feeling	Pearson Correlation	.244	.217	.088	.281
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.115	.161	.581	.068
	N	43	43	42	43
takes time	Pearson Correlation	.090	.273	.232	.149
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.561	.073	.140	.340
	N	44	44	42	43
not disseminated	Pearson Correlation	.375*	.229	.167	.333*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.012	.135	.292	.029
	N	44	44	42	43
lack of knowledge	Pearson Correlation	.644**	.444**	-.073	.304*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.003	.647	.048
	N	44	44	42	43
lack of skill	Pearson Correlation	1	.331*	-.074	.221
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.028	.642	.154
	N	44	44	42	43
lack of finance	Pearson Correlation	.331*	1	.085	.085
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.028		.591	.589
	N	44	44	42	43
lack of resource	Pearson Correlation	-.074	.085	1	.245
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.642	.591		.118
	N	42	42	42	42
lack of represenativenes	Pearson Correlation	.221	.085	.245	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.154	.589	.118	
	N	43	43	42	43
lack of respect	Pearson Correlation	.330*	.534**	.297	.530**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.028	.000	.056	.000
	N	44	44	42	43
ethical problem	Pearson Correlation	.091	.483**	.129	.346*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.557	.001	.416	.023
	N	44	44	42	43
power differential	Pearson Correlation	.266	.293	.126	.460**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.085	.056	.428	.002
	N	43	43	42	43

Correlations

		lack of skill	lack of finance	lack of resource	lack of represenat ivenes
promotion	Pearson Correlation	.217	.450**	.025	.418**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.162	.002	.877	.006
	N	43	43	41	42
no proof	Pearson Correlation	.216	.235	-.055	.307*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.160	.125	.731	.045
	N	44	44	42	43
no partenership	Pearson Correlation	.316*	.012	.275	.396**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.039	.941	.082	.010
	N	43	43	41	42
few models	Pearson Correlation	.368*	.257	.038	.120
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.014	.092	.812	.443
	N	44	44	42	43
few grant	Pearson Correlation	.372*	.249	.019	.189
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.013	.103	.904	.224
	N	44	44	42	43
facilitator 2a	Pearson Correlation	.240	-.041	.112	.156
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.117	.792	.482	.317
	N	44	44	42	43
Facilitator 2b	Pearson Correlation	.159	-.120	.093	-.021
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.302	.438	.557	.893
	N	44	44	42	43
Facilitator 3a	Pearson Correlation	.113	.079	.115	-.002
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.463	.608	.468	.987
	N	44	44	42	43
Facilitator 2c	Pearson Correlation	.150	.053	-.044	.073
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.332	.734	.783	.641
	N	44	44	42	43
Facilitator 2d	Pearson Correlation	-.011	-.030	.047	-.072
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.943	.846	.766	.645
	N	44	44	42	43
Facilitator 3b	Pearson Correlation	.017	.018	-.112	-.012
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.915	.908	.479	.940
	N	44	44	42	43
Facilitator 1a	Pearson Correlation	.139	.011	.047	.032
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.369	.941	.769	.838
	N	44	44	42	43
Facilitator 3c	Pearson Correlation	.089	.097	.170	.004
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.569	.535	.287	.982
	N	43	43	41	42
Facilitator 3d	Pearson Correlation	.194	.049	.035	.042
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.206	.753	.824	.788
	N	44	44	42	43
Facilitator 3e	Pearson Correlation	.192	.065	.221	.225
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.218	.680	.165	.152
	N	43	43	41	42
Facilitator 3f	Pearson Correlation	.147	-.111	.099	.190
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.342	.474	.532	.223
	N	44	44	42	43
Facilitator 2e	Pearson Correlation	.203	-.047	.018	.039
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.187	.761	.912	.804
	N	44	44	42	43

Correlations

		lack of respect	ethical problem	power differential	promotion	no proof
experience	Pearson Correlation	-.204	-.302	-.184	.032	.031
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.200	.055	.255	.845	.850
	N	41	41	40	40	41
Fund	Pearson Correlation	.424**	.319*	.301	.239	.155
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.035	.050	.123	.316
	N	44	44	43	43	44
Time	Pearson Correlation	.306*	.117	.199	.061	.072
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.043	.450	.202	.696	.644
	N	44	44	43	43	44
support	Pearson Correlation	.146	.192	.083	.472**	.217
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.344	.212	.596	.001	.157
	N	44	44	43	43	44
validity	Pearson Correlation	.304*	.360*	.282	.310*	.144
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.045	.017	.067	.043	.349
	N	44	44	43	43	44
bad feeling	Pearson Correlation	.193	.304*	.237	.112	-.005
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.216	.048	.126	.479	.973
	N	43	43	43	42	43
takes time	Pearson Correlation	.407**	.178	.270	.303*	.257
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006	.247	.080	.049	.092
	N	44	44	43	43	44
not disseminated	Pearson Correlation	.385**	.130	.374*	.342*	.277
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.010	.399	.013	.025	.069
	N	44	44	43	43	44
lack of knowledge	Pearson Correlation	.370*	.238	.298	.297	.384*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.013	.120	.053	.053	.010
	N	44	44	43	43	44
lack of skill	Pearson Correlation	.330*	.091	.266	.217	.216
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.028	.557	.085	.162	.160
	N	44	44	43	43	44
lack of finance	Pearson Correlation	.534**	.483**	.293	.450**	.235
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.056	.002	.125
	N	44	44	43	43	44
lack of resource	Pearson Correlation	.297	.129	.126	.025	-.055
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.056	.416	.428	.877	.731
	N	42	42	42	41	42
lack of represenativenes	Pearson Correlation	.530**	.346*	.460**	.418**	.307*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.023	.002	.006	.045
	N	43	43	43	42	43
lack of respect	Pearson Correlation	1	.512**	.503**	.324*	.207
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.001	.034	.178
	N	44	44	43	43	44
ethical problem	Pearson Correlation	.512**	1	.548**	.503**	.251
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.001	.101
	N	44	44	43	43	44
power differential	Pearson Correlation	.503**	.548**	1	.525**	.302*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000		.000	.049
	N	43	43	43	42	43

Correlations

		lack of respect	ethical problem	power differential	promotion	no proof
promotion	Pearson Correlation	.324*	.503**	.525**	1	.427**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.034	.001	.000		.004
	N	43	43	42	43	43
no proof	Pearson Correlation	.207	.251	.302*	.427**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.178	.101	.049	.004	
	N	44	44	43	43	44
no partenership	Pearson Correlation	.183	-.070	.213	.244	.365*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.239	.656	.176	.120	.016
	N	43	43	42	42	43
few models	Pearson Correlation	.334*	.108	.212	.261	.344*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.027	.485	.172	.091	.022
	N	44	44	43	43	44
few grant	Pearson Correlation	.258	.193	.208	.337*	.070
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.091	.208	.182	.027	.653
	N	44	44	43	43	44
facilitator 2a	Pearson Correlation	-.045	.054	.187	-.104	.192
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.770	.727	.230	.507	.213
	N	44	44	43	43	44
Facilitator 2b	Pearson Correlation	-.155	-.103	.155	-.217	.116
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.316	.504	.322	.162	.452
	N	44	44	43	43	44
Facilitator 3a	Pearson Correlation	-.065	.010	.245	-.017	-.014
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.675	.951	.114	.915	.929
	N	44	44	43	43	44
Facilitator 2c	Pearson Correlation	.006	.054	.215	.098	.163
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.967	.727	.166	.534	.290
	N	44	44	43	43	44
Facilitator 2d	Pearson Correlation	-.176	.068	.123	-.033	.240
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.253	.660	.433	.835	.116
	N	44	44	43	43	44
Facilitator 3b	Pearson Correlation	.034	.050	.205	-.067	.209
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.826	.747	.187	.669	.174
	N	44	44	43	43	44
Facilitator 1a	Pearson Correlation	.057	.029	.107	-.108	.014
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.715	.852	.493	.492	.929
	N	44	44	43	43	44
Facilitator 3c	Pearson Correlation	.127	.128	.219	.038	-.106
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.416	.414	.163	.810	.499
	N	43	43	42	42	43
Facilitator 3d	Pearson Correlation	.078	.100	.147	-.119	-.033
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.614	.517	.346	.449	.832
	N	44	44	43	43	44
Facilitator 3e	Pearson Correlation	.195	.146	.302	-.039	.153
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.211	.350	.052	.807	.327
	N	43	43	42	42	43
Facilitator 3f	Pearson Correlation	.029	-.147	.089	-.154	.081
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.852	.342	.569	.323	.603
	N	44	44	43	43	44
Facilitator 2e	Pearson Correlation	-.040	-.077	.131	-.016	.006
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.798	.619	.404	.919	.967
	N	44	44	43	43	44

Correlations

		no partenership	few models	few grant	facilitator 2a
experience	Pearson Correlation	-.046	-.058	.158	-.266
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.776	.718	.323	.093
	N	40	41	41	41
Fund	Pearson Correlation	.016	.347*	.328*	.150
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.920	.021	.030	.330
	N	43	44	44	44
Time	Pearson Correlation	-.062	.061	.079	.014
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.693	.692	.611	.928
	N	43	44	44	44
support	Pearson Correlation	-.029	.024	.163	-.157
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.856	.876	.291	.310
	N	43	44	44	44
validity	Pearson Correlation	.226	.353*	.313*	.079
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.144	.019	.038	.609
	N	43	44	44	44
bad feeling	Pearson Correlation	.229	.117	-.022	.161
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.145	.457	.887	.302
	N	42	43	43	43
takes time	Pearson Correlation	.222	.001	.255	.036
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.153	.992	.094	.818
	N	43	44	44	44
not disseminated	Pearson Correlation	.206	.334*	.174	.115
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.186	.027	.258	.455
	N	43	44	44	44
lack of knowledge	Pearson Correlation	.093	.233	.215	.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.552	.129	.161	1.000
	N	43	44	44	44
lack of skill	Pearson Correlation	.316*	.368*	.372*	.240
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.039	.014	.013	.117
	N	43	44	44	44
lack of finance	Pearson Correlation	.012	.257	.249	-.041
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.941	.092	.103	.792
	N	43	44	44	44
lack of resource	Pearson Correlation	.275	.038	.019	.112
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.082	.812	.904	.482
	N	41	42	42	42
lack of represenativenes	Pearson Correlation	.396**	.120	.189	.156
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.010	.443	.224	.317
	N	42	43	43	43
lack of respect	Pearson Correlation	.183	.334*	.258	-.045
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.239	.027	.091	.770
	N	43	44	44	44
ethical problem	Pearson Correlation	-.070	.108	.193	.054
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.656	.485	.208	.727
	N	43	44	44	44
power differential	Pearson Correlation	.213	.212	.208	.187
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.176	.172	.182	.230
	N	42	43	43	43

Correlations

		no partenership	few models	few grant	facilitator 2a
promotion	Pearson Correlation	.244	.261	.337*	-.104
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.120	.091	.027	.507
	N	42	43	43	43
no proof	Pearson Correlation	.365*	.344*	.070	.192
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.016	.022	.653	.213
	N	43	44	44	44
no partenership	Pearson Correlation	1	.291	.016	.280
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.058	.918	.069
	N	43	43	43	43
few models	Pearson Correlation	.291	1	.394**	.271
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.058		.008	.075
	N	43	44	44	44
few grant	Pearson Correlation	.016	.394**	1	.053
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.918	.008		.734
	N	43	44	44	44
facilitator 2a	Pearson Correlation	.280	.271	.053	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.069	.075	.734	
	N	43	44	44	44
Facilitator 2b	Pearson Correlation	.223	.160	.003	.763**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.150	.299	.986	.000
	N	43	44	44	44
Facilitator 3a	Pearson Correlation	.075	.109	.057	.762**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.634	.480	.713	.000
	N	43	44	44	44
Facilitator 2c	Pearson Correlation	.097	.175	.143	.697**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.536	.255	.354	.000
	N	43	44	44	44
Facilitator 2d	Pearson Correlation	.131	.186	.126	.616**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.401	.227	.416	.000
	N	43	44	44	44
Facilitator 3b	Pearson Correlation	-.005	.201	.108	.609**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.976	.190	.487	.000
	N	43	44	44	44
Facilitator 1a	Pearson Correlation	.046	.207	-.063	.635**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.769	.177	.684	.000
	N	43	44	44	44
Facilitator 3c	Pearson Correlation	-.018	.314*	.212	.541**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.909	.040	.173	.000
	N	42	43	43	43
Facilitator 3d	Pearson Correlation	.059	.369*	.132	.645**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.709	.014	.391	.000
	N	43	44	44	44
Facilitator 3e	Pearson Correlation	.302	.430**	.070	.652**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.052	.004	.654	.000
	N	42	43	43	43
Facilitator 3f	Pearson Correlation	.173	.268	.060	.548**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.269	.078	.701	.000
	N	43	44	44	44
Facilitator 2e	Pearson Correlation	.146	.235	-.040	.612**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.349	.125	.797	.000
	N	43	44	44	44

Correlations

		Facilitator 2b	Facilitator 3a	Facilitator 2c	Facilitator 2d
experience	Pearson Correlation	-.135	-.264	-.195	-.193
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.399	.096	.221	.225
	N	41	41	41	41
Fund	Pearson Correlation	.128	.170	.275	.334*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.407	.271	.070	.027
	N	44	44	44	44
Time	Pearson Correlation	-.013	-.115	-.181	-.103
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.933	.456	.239	.507
	N	44	44	44	44
support	Pearson Correlation	-.157	-.176	-.020	-.139
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.308	.252	.895	.368
	N	44	44	44	44
validity	Pearson Correlation	-.125	.130	.177	.144
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.418	.400	.250	.351
	N	44	44	44	44
bad feeling	Pearson Correlation	.256	.152	.111	.165
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.098	.330	.480	.289
	N	43	43	43	43
takes time	Pearson Correlation	.021	.031	-.021	.038
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.891	.840	.890	.807
	N	44	44	44	44
not disseminated	Pearson Correlation	.062	.169	.141	.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.689	.272	.361	.896
	N	44	44	44	44
lack of knowledge	Pearson Correlation	-.039	-.090	.025	-.049
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.800	.562	.873	.753
	N	44	44	44	44
lack of skill	Pearson Correlation	.159	.113	.150	-.011
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.302	.463	.332	.943
	N	44	44	44	44
lack of finance	Pearson Correlation	-.120	.079	.053	-.030
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.438	.608	.734	.846
	N	44	44	44	44
lack of resource	Pearson Correlation	.093	.115	-.044	.047
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.557	.468	.783	.766
	N	42	42	42	42
lack of represenativenes	Pearson Correlation	-.021	-.002	.073	-.072
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.893	.987	.641	.645
	N	43	43	43	43
lack of respect	Pearson Correlation	-.155	-.065	.006	-.176
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.316	.675	.967	.253
	N	44	44	44	44
ethical problem	Pearson Correlation	-.103	.010	.054	.068
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.504	.951	.727	.660
	N	44	44	44	44
power differential	Pearson Correlation	.155	.245	.215	.123
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.322	.114	.166	.433
	N	43	43	43	43

Correlations

		Facilitator 2b	Facilitator 3a	Facilitator 2c	Facilitator 2d
promotion	Pearson Correlation	-.217	-.017	.098	-.033
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.162	.915	.534	.835
	N	43	43	43	43
no proof	Pearson Correlation	.116	-.014	.163	.240
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.452	.929	.290	.116
	N	44	44	44	44
no partenership	Pearson Correlation	.223	.075	.097	.131
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.150	.634	.536	.401
	N	43	43	43	43
few models	Pearson Correlation	.160	.109	.175	.186
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.299	.480	.255	.227
	N	44	44	44	44
few grant	Pearson Correlation	.003	.057	.143	.126
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.986	.713	.354	.416
	N	44	44	44	44
facilitator 2a	Pearson Correlation	.763**	.762**	.697**	.616**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	44	44	44	44
Facilitator 2b	Pearson Correlation	1	.677**	.452**	.606**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.002	.000
	N	44	44	44	44
Facilitator 3a	Pearson Correlation	.677**	1	.735**	.604**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	44	44	44	44
Facilitator 2c	Pearson Correlation	.452**	.735**	1	.729**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.000		.000
	N	44	44	44	44
Facilitator 2d	Pearson Correlation	.606**	.604**	.729**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	44	44	44	44
Facilitator 3b	Pearson Correlation	.621**	.670**	.721**	.804**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	44	44	44	44
Facilitator 1a	Pearson Correlation	.531**	.705**	.771**	.614**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	44	44	44	44
Facilitator 3c	Pearson Correlation	.420**	.701**	.676**	.524**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.000	.000	.000
	N	43	43	43	43
Facilitator 3d	Pearson Correlation	.576**	.606**	.543**	.492**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.001
	N	44	44	44	44
Facilitator 3e	Pearson Correlation	.575**	.535**	.543**	.517**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	43	43	43	43
Facilitator 3f	Pearson Correlation	.522**	.423**	.443**	.399**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.004	.003	.007
	N	44	44	44	44
Facilitator 2e	Pearson Correlation	.522**	.663**	.562**	.354*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.018
	N	44	44	44	44

Correlations

		Facilitator 3b	Facilitator 1a	Facilitator 3c	Facilitator 3d
experience	Pearson Correlation	-.205	-.316*	-.317*	-.140
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.199	.044	.044	.383
	N	41	41	41	41
Fund	Pearson Correlation	.229	.245	.287	.232
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.135	.108	.062	.130
	N	44	44	43	44
Time	Pearson Correlation	-.053	-.132	-.046	.142
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.734	.395	.771	.358
	N	44	44	43	44
support	Pearson Correlation	-.143	-.135	-.080	-.145
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.355	.383	.610	.347
	N	44	44	43	44
validity	Pearson Correlation	.068	.180	.135	.164
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.660	.244	.387	.287
	N	44	44	43	44
bad feeling	Pearson Correlation	.181	.236	.159	.219
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.246	.127	.315	.158
	N	43	43	42	43
takes time	Pearson Correlation	.085	-.072	.103	-.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.584	.640	.511	.898
	N	44	44	43	44
not disseminated	Pearson Correlation	.041	.011	.031	-.036
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.789	.941	.843	.818
	N	44	44	43	44
lack of knowledge	Pearson Correlation	.060	.020	.012	.115
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.700	.898	.939	.456
	N	44	44	43	44
lack of skill	Pearson Correlation	.017	.139	.089	.194
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.915	.369	.569	.206
	N	44	44	43	44
lack of finance	Pearson Correlation	.018	.011	.097	.049
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.908	.941	.535	.753
	N	44	44	43	44
lack of resource	Pearson Correlation	-.112	.047	.170	.035
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.479	.769	.287	.824
	N	42	42	41	42
lack of represenativenes	Pearson Correlation	-.012	.032	.004	.042
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.940	.838	.982	.788
	N	43	43	42	43
lack of respect	Pearson Correlation	.034	.057	.127	.078
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.826	.715	.416	.614
	N	44	44	43	44
ethical problem	Pearson Correlation	.050	.029	.128	.100
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.747	.852	.414	.517
	N	44	44	43	44
power differential	Pearson Correlation	.205	.107	.219	.147
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.187	.493	.163	.346
	N	43	43	42	43

Correlations

		Facilitator 3b	Facilitator 1a	Facilitator 3c	Facilitator 3d
promotion	Pearson Correlation	-.067	-.108	.038	-.119
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.669	.492	.810	.449
	N	43	43	42	43
no proof	Pearson Correlation	.209	.014	-.106	-.033
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.174	.929	.499	.832
	N	44	44	43	44
no partenership	Pearson Correlation	-.005	.046	-.018	.059
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.976	.769	.909	.709
	N	43	43	42	43
few models	Pearson Correlation	.201	.207	.314*	.369*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.190	.177	.040	.014
	N	44	44	43	44
few grant	Pearson Correlation	.108	-.063	.212	.132
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.487	.684	.173	.391
	N	44	44	43	44
facilitator 2a	Pearson Correlation	.609**	.635**	.541**	.645**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	44	44	43	44
Facilitator 2b	Pearson Correlation	.621**	.531**	.420**	.576**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.005	.000
	N	44	44	43	44
Facilitator 3a	Pearson Correlation	.670**	.705**	.701**	.606**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	44	44	43	44
Facilitator 2c	Pearson Correlation	.721**	.771**	.676**	.543**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	44	44	43	44
Facilitator 2d	Pearson Correlation	.804**	.614**	.524**	.492**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.001
	N	44	44	43	44
Facilitator 3b	Pearson Correlation	1	.715**	.642**	.538**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	44	44	43	44
Facilitator 1a	Pearson Correlation	.715**	1	.825**	.764**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	44	44	43	44
Facilitator 3c	Pearson Correlation	.642**	.825**	1	.764**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	43	43	43	43
Facilitator 3d	Pearson Correlation	.538**	.764**	.764**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	44	44	43	44
Facilitator 3e	Pearson Correlation	.597**	.753**	.791**	.776**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	43	43	42	43
Facilitator 3f	Pearson Correlation	.520**	.567**	.576**	.628**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	44	44	43	44
Facilitator 2e	Pearson Correlation	.506**	.752**	.733**	.704**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	44	44	43	44

Correlations

		Facilitator 3e	Facilitator 3f	Facilitator 2e
experience	Pearson Correlation	-.429**	-.059	-.102
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006	.713	.528
	N	40	41	41
Fund	Pearson Correlation	.256	.024	.022
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.098	.879	.885
	N	43	44	44
Time	Pearson Correlation	.170	.014	-.146
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.275	.926	.343
	N	43	44	44
support	Pearson Correlation	-.227	-.222	-.126
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.143	.147	.415
	N	43	44	44
validity	Pearson Correlation	.183	-.139	.016
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.241	.370	.916
	N	43	44	44
bad feeling	Pearson Correlation	.312*	.188	.227
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.044	.227	.143
	N	42	43	43
takes time	Pearson Correlation	.032	-.061	-.053
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.839	.693	.733
	N	43	44	44
not disseminated	Pearson Correlation	.100	.033	.129
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.524	.831	.406
	N	43	44	44
lack of knowledge	Pearson Correlation	.109	.128	.120
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.487	.406	.439
	N	43	44	44
lack of skill	Pearson Correlation	.192	.147	.203
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.218	.342	.187
	N	43	44	44
lack of finance	Pearson Correlation	.065	-.111	-.047
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.680	.474	.761
	N	43	44	44
lack of resource	Pearson Correlation	.221	.099	.018
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.165	.532	.912
	N	41	42	42
lack of represenativenes	Pearson Correlation	.225	.190	.039
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.152	.223	.804
	N	42	43	43
lack of respect	Pearson Correlation	.195	.029	-.040
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.211	.852	.798
	N	43	44	44
ethical problem	Pearson Correlation	.146	-.147	-.077
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.350	.342	.619
	N	43	44	44
power differential	Pearson Correlation	.302	.089	.131
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.052	.569	.404
	N	42	43	43

Correlations

		Facilitator 3e	Facilitator 3f	Facilitator 2e
promotion	Pearson Correlation	-.039	-.154	-.016
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.807	.323	.919
	N	42	43	43
no proof	Pearson Correlation	.153	.081	.006
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.327	.603	.967
	N	43	44	44
no partenership	Pearson Correlation	.302	.173	.146
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.052	.269	.349
	N	42	43	43
few models	Pearson Correlation	.430**	.268	.235
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.078	.125
	N	43	44	44
few grant	Pearson Correlation	.070	.060	-.040
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.654	.701	.797
	N	43	44	44
facilitator 2a	Pearson Correlation	.652**	.548**	.612**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
	N	43	44	44
Facilitator 2b	Pearson Correlation	.575**	.522**	.522**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
	N	43	44	44
Facilitator 3a	Pearson Correlation	.535**	.423**	.663**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.004	.000
	N	43	44	44
Facilitator 2c	Pearson Correlation	.543**	.443**	.562**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.003	.000
	N	43	44	44
Facilitator 2d	Pearson Correlation	.517**	.399**	.354*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.007	.018
	N	43	44	44
Facilitator 3b	Pearson Correlation	.597**	.520**	.506**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
	N	43	44	44
Facilitator 1a	Pearson Correlation	.753**	.567**	.752**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
	N	43	44	44
Facilitator 3c	Pearson Correlation	.791**	.576**	.733**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
	N	42	43	43
Facilitator 3d	Pearson Correlation	.776**	.628**	.704**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
	N	43	44	44
Facilitator 3e	Pearson Correlation	1	.657**	.684**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	43	43	43
Facilitator 3f	Pearson Correlation	.657**	1	.739**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	43	44	44
Facilitator 2e	Pearson Correlation	.684**	.739**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	43	44	44

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Appendix 7

Interview Guide

1. Is community based research being implemented in Jimma University?
2. What does the participation of different partners in research look like?
3. What are the barriers to doing community based research in Jimma University?
4. What conditions favor the conduct of community based research?

Appendix 8

AMMENDMENTS-SEPTEMBER 2000

Criteria for Appointments and Promotions

General Policy

The Institute shall appoint all faculty members of all levels on a two-years contract out of which one-year is a probational period. Should the performance of the candidate be unsatisfactory, his/her appointment shall be terminated after the initial one year period.

All Disciplines

1. Graduate Assistant-I

APPOINTMENT

A candidate with the qualification of a four-years Bachelor's degree or equivalent and with at least the level of a CGPA of 2.75. The CGPA requirement may be changed under special circumstances justified by a Department and approved by the Academic Commission and finally authorized by the Executive Director for Academic Affairs. However, the CGPA should not be less than 2.50.

AND

The candidate must be supported by a strong recommendation of the recruiting Department and approved by the Academic Commission of the Faculty regarding his/her future promise.

2. Graduate Assistant - II

2.1. APPOINTMENT

A candidate with the qualification of a five-year Bachelor's degree (such as engineering, law, etc.) or equivalent and with at least the level of a C.G.P.A of 2.75. The CGPA requirement may be changed under special circumstances justified by a Department and approved by the Academic Commission and finally authorized by the Executive Director for Academic Affairs. However, the minimum CGPA should not be less than 2.50.

AND

The candidate must be supported by a strong recommendation of the recruiting Department and approved by the Academic Commission of the Faculty regarding his/her future promise.

2.2. PROMOTION

A candidate with one year effective service as Graduate Assistant-I. **AND**
A minimum performance evaluation result by Department Head, Peers and Students as given in Annex.

3. Graduate Assistant - III

APPOINTMENT

A candidate with the qualification of a six-year Bachelor's degree (such as medicine, Veterinary medicine, etc.) or equivalent and with at least the level of a C.G.P.A of 2.75. The CGPA requirement may be changed under special circumstances justified by a Department and approved by the Academic Commission and finally authorized by the Executive Director for Academic Affairs. However, the minimum CGPA should not be less than 2.50.

AND

The candidate must be supported by a strong recommendation of the recruiting Department and approved by the Academic Commission of the Faculty regarding his/her future promise.

4. Assistant Lecturer

PROMOTION

A candidate with one year of effective service, normally as a full-time Graduate Assistant-II or Graduate Assistant III, AND
A minimum performance evaluation result by Department Head, Peers and Students as given in Annex.

5.1. APPOINTMENT

A candidate with the qualification of a Master's degree, or its equivalent OR M.D or DVM with specialization;

5.2. PROMOTION

A candidate with the qualifications of Bachelor's degree, MD/DVM with no specialization or its equivalent; AND

At least two years of effective teaching as an Assistant Lecturer; AND

At least one published article or one teaching material[1] for a specific course since becoming Assistant Lecturer. AND

A minimum performance evaluation result by Department Head, Peers and Students as given in Annex.

6. Assistant Professor

6.1. APPOINTMENT

The qualification of a Ph.D., degree or equivalent

6.2. PROMOTION

6.2.1. The qualifications of a Master's degree or its equivalent AND,

Four years of effective teaching as a Lecturer: AND,

At least ***one publication in a reputable journal*** Active participation[2] in the affairs of the Institute as well as in the enhancement of his/her profession; AND

Rendering active service[3] to the community at large.

OR

2,3,4,5
See Appendix B

with specialization, AND

A minimum of three years of effective teaching at least two of which as a Lecturer; AND

At least ***Two publication in a reputable journal***[4] ***OR one publication and a teaching material OR one Text Book or Reference Book*** OR in some fields as architecture, music and the fine arts two recognized and realized projects which demonstrate professional and creative talent (in fields such as architecture, music or fine arts) and which must have been critically and Positively evaluated by both internal and external assessors who are specialists in the area; OR Release of one technological package through a nationally accredited mechanism; since becoming lecturer. AND

Active participation[5] in the affairs of the Institute as well as in the enhancement of his/her profession; AND

Rendering active service[6] to the community at large.

6.2.3. The qualification of a Bachelor's degree, MD or DVM degree or its equivalent; AND

At least four years of effective teaching as a Lecturer; AND

Three publications in a reputable journal(s), OR Two publications in a reputable journal and One teaching material OR one Text Book or Reference Book OR two recognized and realized projects which demonstrate professional and creative talent; since becoming lecturer, AND

Active participation in the affairs of the Institute and in the enhancement of his/her profession; AND

Rendering active service to the community at large. AND

A minimum performance evaluation result by Department Head, Peers and Students as given in Annex.

---

[5]See Appendix B

7. Associate Professor

PROMOTION

7.1. A candidate with any of the qualifications listed in 6.1. and 6.2. above who has a minimum of four years of effective teaching experience as an Assistant Professor; AND

At least ***two publications in a reputable journal OR one Reference Book OR Text Book based on original research in one's area of specialization*** OR two recognized and realized projects which demonstrate professional and creative talent and evaluated as indicated in 6.2 above; since becoming an Assistant Professor, AND

Active prticipation in the affairs of the Institute as well as in enhancement of his/her profession; AND

Rendering active service to the community at large. AND

A minimum performance evaluation result by Department Head, Peers Students as given in Annex.

7.2. A minimum of three years of effective teaching experience as an Assistant Professor AND

At least three publications in a reputable journal OR two published article and one teaching material for a specific course since becoming an Assistant Professor, AND

Active prticipation in the affairs of the Institute as well as in enhancement of his/her profession; AND

Rendering active service to the community at large. AND

A minimum performance evaluation result by Department Head, Peers Students as given in Annex.

7.3 A minimum of three years of effective teaching experience as an Assistant Professor AND

Release of three technological packages through a nationally accredited mechanism since becoming an Assistant Professor; AND

Active prticipation in the affairs of the Institute as well as in enhancement of his/her profession; AND Rendering active service to the community at large. AND

A minimum performance evaluation result by Department Head, Peers Students as given in Annex.

8. Professor

PROMOTION

The qualification of a Ph.D. degree OR Masters degree OR MD or DVM with specialization or equivalent in the area of his/her specialization. AND

At least *four years* of effective teaching experience as an Associate Professor. AND

A minimum of four publications of undisputed professional merit in a reputable journal since becoming associate professor. ~~AND~~ Or

A book of undisputed professional merit based on original research in his/her field of specialization OR Two published articles and a text-book OR Release of two technological packages through a nationally accredited mechanism AND two solo-authored articles since becoming an Associate Professor; AND

Active participation in the affairs of the Institute and in the enhancement of his/her profession, AND

Rendering active service to the community at large. AND

A minimum performance evaluation result by Department Head, Peers and Students as given in Annex.

9. Criteria for Promotion of Technical Assistants

Technical assistants are not considered as members of the Institute faculty but are academic support staff. They shall normally assist in laboratory sessions and field demonstration, help in research activities of departments and undertake any help in research activities of departments and undertake any other assignments given by the concerned departmental staff.

9.1. Technical Assistant I

APPOINTMENT

A candidate with the qualification of two year diploma from a recognized Institute or College with a cumulative ***GPA of 2.75*** or above.

9.2. Technical Assistant II

9.2.1. APPOINTMENT

A candidate with the qualification of a three year diploma from a recognized Institute or College with a cumulative ***GPA of 2.75*** or above;

9.2.2. PROMOTION

Two years of effective service as a Technical Assistant I;
AND
Evaluation: Very good and above (≥80%); and community affairs.
AND
Active and effective service in the Institute.

9.3. Technical Assistant III

PROMOTION

Three years of effective service as Technical Assistant II;
AND
Evaluation: Very good and above (≥80%); and
AND
Active and effective service in the Institute and community affairs.

10. Extra-ordinary Cases

10.1. Should there be very exceptional candidates for any of the above ranks, appointments or promotions may be considered through extra-ordinary recommendations of the Departments and Academic Commissions concerned and the Senate's Standing Committee for Staff Appointments and Promotions (SAPC). The SAPC shall in these cases prepare a detailed description of the special merits of the candidate which would justify the Senate taking an extra-ordinary decision on the recommendation for his/her promotion.

10.2. Where a Faculty requires additional manpower with which to undertake normal teaching commitments and considers that a graduate students is of sufficient caliber with good academic record to fulfill the requirements, that person should be engaged as a regular faculty member, e.g. with the rank of assistant lecturer or higher.

APPENDIX

Appendix to The Criteria for Promotions

Definitions and Clarifications

I. Effective Teaching Experience

Effective teaching performance of Faculty members is assessed by:

1. Student Evaluation. Achieved by designing appropriate questionnaires and administering them on a regular basis, immediately after the completion of a courses and prior to the semester examinations.
2. Evaluation by Colleagues or peers
3. Evaluation by the Department Head and the Faculty Dean

But the following items should be applied wherever relevant and appropriate as routine additional points to assess a Faculty member's effective performance:-

a) Willingness to accept teaching assignments in one's area of specialization as well as in closely related areas;
b) Effectiveness in the discharge of regular teaching and other University assignments;
c) Active participation in advising students in all academic matters, specially in their research activities;
d) Regular attendance in scheduled classes as well as availability in office for consultation by students and colleagues;
e) Maintenance of high standards of general behavior becoming to a University staff members;
f) Preparation of mimeographed material for class use as well as employing teaching aids such as slides, films, charts, etc.; and
g) Organizing field trips, seminars, colloquia, or conferences and delivering papers or lectures in such meetings.

4. Contribution of each:

Evaluation by students	50%
Evaluation by head	35%
Evaluation by peer	15%

II. Publications

The following items may be submitted as constituting the publications of candidates being considered for promotions to academic ranks.

i) Articles published in reputable journals (reprints required) and articles extracted from thesis or dissertation are not accepted for promotion;
ii) Teaching Materials prepared for specific courses;
iii) Text or Reference Books published for use in specific courses; and
iv) Books published on the basis of original research

For the sake of clarification, attempt is made below to define the most essential characteristics of each of the above four items.

1. A Reputable Journal.–The reputability of a professional journal is best determined, in the first instance, by the relevant Department and/or Faculty or by the Standing Committee of the Senate/Academic Commission for Research and Publication. When there are dispute on the status of such professional journals the Executive Management shall decide on the issue. The following shall constitute the criteria on which reputability of journals is determined.
   i) The professional reputation and competence of the editor(s), the advisory board and editorial staff;
   ii) Sound editorial policy regarding selection and evaluation of articles submitted for publication;
   iii) Seriousness of the journal as judged by such factors as its regularity and continuity, and its maintenance of standards; and
   iv) The backing and respect given on the journal by relevant professionals and/or their association(s).

2. Teaching Material. This may be defined as a set of materials systematically organized for use in a specific course and emanating from the teaching experience of the candidate for promotion. For such material to be accepted as appropriate criterion for promotion it must have been evaluated, particularly as regards the organization of its contents, the approach followed by the author, and the effectiveness of the material as a tool for teaching, as follows:
   i) The teaching material must have been critically evaluated by the relevant department and endorsed by the Academic Commission of the Faculty as appropriate teaching material for a specific course or courses:
   ii) It must have been in effective use as teaching material for at least one year before being submitted for promotion; and in addition;
   iii) Where such a teaching material is the sole or major publication submitted as fulfilling a criterion for promotion it must be evaluated by two external and one internal speiclists in the field.

3. Books. Textbooks and Reference Books. These are major undertakings that represent the efforts of a Faculty member in putting together his/her teaching and research experience, normally over several years.

When these are submitted for promotion purposes they will have to be critically and favorably assessed by both internal (one) and external (two) evaluators.

These materials shall be submitted only for promotions to a senior rank.

III. Active Participation in the Affairs of the University

This is one of the major criteria for promotion.

1. The following constitute examples of what this criterion shall include:

i) Academic Administration. Willingness to accept and being very effective in positions of academic administration at Faculty and University wide levels.

ii) Committee Work. Willingness to participate effectively in the work of committees or other study groups whenever called upon to do so by the Department, Faculty, the Senate, and/or the University Administration at large.

iii) Professional Activities. Active involvement in the enhancement of one's profession, for instance, by helping organize and playing an active role in relevant professional associations. Organizing and participating in professional conference or seminars; and initiating, helping to edit, or contributing to professional journals.

2. Contribution of each:

Academic administration	60%
Committee work	20%
Professional activity	20%

IV. Rendering Active Service to the Community at Large

This criterion is also an important component in the package of services expected of all faculty members. The following constitute examples of community services:

i) readiness to participate effectively in local or national committees whenever called upon to do so;

ii) participating in community services such as extension works, consultancy, etc. which benefit the surrounding and larger community.

iii) running serious press, radio, and/or TV programs to elucidate to the public some basic problems of health, law, education, etc.; and

iv) making attempts in all ways to contribute towards the general welfare of the community at large beyond the limited call of one's academic duties.

V. Weighted Values of the Criteria for Academic Promotions

As indicated above, the criteria for promotions have four major components.

i) effective teaching,
ii) publications,
iii) active participation in Institute affairs, and
iv) rendering active service to the community at large

To standardize the process of granting promotions and to make it as objective as possible, it is imperative to give weighted values to each of the above four components. The following represent the weighted values given to the above four components for the various academic ranks.

1. For Promotion to the ranks upto Assistant Professor:
(Shall earn a minimum of 65%)

Criteria	Score
A. Effective Teaching	40 points (shall not be less than 26 points)
B. Publication	35 points
C. Institute Affairs	15 points
D. Community Service	10 points

2. For Promotions to the rank of associate professor and Professor
(Shall earn a minimum of 75%)

Criteria	Score
A. Effective Teaching	35 points
B. Publications	40 points
C. Institute Affairs	15 points
D. Community Service	10 points

VI. Miscellaneous Points

1. Co-authorships. It must be envisaged that faculty members could be engaged in a number of joint research and publications efforts. In such cases it becomes imperative to give appropriate merits to each of the co-authors to the level of his/her contribution to the joint work. Each co-author of an article published in a reputable journal shall be given an equal share as per the following:

No. of co-authors	Share of each co-author
2	0.70
3	0.50

4	0.40
5	0.35
6 or more	0.30

2. Release of Technology

The same rules as indicated in 1.1 to 1.4 shall apply in the case of technology released by a group of faculty members.

3. Need for Internal and External Assessment of Publications

All publications, submitted for promotion purposes, shall need to be positively evaluated by internal and external assessors if they fall under one of the following conditions.

i) If the reputability of the journal in which the publication has appeared is not well established, as indicated in II.1, above.

ii) If the publication is a teaching material, and

iii) If it is a Reference Book, Book or Textbook and has been submitted for promotion.

Statement of Declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other University. I also declare that all sources of materials used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name

Mekuria Abebe

Signature

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

Name

Firdissa Jebessa

Signature

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIES
P.O.BOX 1176
ADDIS ABABA ETHIOPIA