THE STATUS OF TEACHERS ENGAGEMENT IN ACTION RESEARCH IN HIGH SCHOOLS OF NORTH SHAWA ZONE OF OROMIA

BY:

DEREJE BUSHU DADI

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

May 2011

ADDIS ABABA

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE ATUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDCUATIONAL PLANNING

AND MANAGEMENT

THE STATUS OF TEACHERS ENGAGEMENT IN ACTION RESEARCH IN HIGH SCHOOLS OF NORTH SHAWA ZONE OF OROMIA

BY:

DEREJE BUSHU DADI

May 2011

ADDIS ABABA

THE STATUS OF TEACHERS ENGAGEMENT IN ACTION RESEARCH IN HIGH SCHOOLS OF NORTH SHAWA ZONE OF OROMIA

BY:

DEREJE BUSHU DADI

A THESIS SUBMITED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES OF ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSTY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND PLANNING

May 2011

ADDIS ABABA

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE ATUDIES

THE STATUS OF TEACHERS ENGAGEMENT IN ACTION RESEARCHIN HIGH SCHOOLS OF NORTH SHAWA ZONE OF OROMIA

BY:-

DEREJE BUSHU DADI

Signed Approval Sheet by the Board of Examiners

1.	Yekunoamlak Alemu(ph.D)	Yekunoa	07/06/11
	Chairman, Dept. of Graduate Committee	**Signature**	**Date**
2.	Ambissa K.		07/06/11
	Advisor's Name	**Signature**	**Date**
3.	Tilaye Kassahun (PhD)		June 1, 2011
	Examiner	**Signature**	**Date**

May 2011

ADDIS ABABA

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to record special notes of thanks and sincere appreciation to my advisor Dr. Ambisa Kenea for his insightful comments and valuable suggestions, generous advice, devoted assistance and persistent encouragement without which this study wouldn't have been realized. The comments given were indispensable in giving the thesis its present form.

I have to express my sincere appreciation to my beloved brother Endalkachew Bushu for his support and encouragement. Also my special gratitude goes to my friend Ato Chali Guteta for his moral, material, financial support and sympathetic encouragement.

I have also indebted to all teachers in high schools of North Showa Zone for their genuine cooperation in undertaking this study. I am greatly thankful to the principals and vice-principals of the above mentioned schools and Woreda Education Office experts of the Zone for their committed responses in undertaking interview to this study.

I am indebted to School of Graduate Studies of Addis Ababa University financing my Research study.

Finally, I would like to extend my heart felt thanks to all my colleagues, family and friends for giving me moral support in the course of study.

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES

Page

ABBREVIVATIONS AND ACRONYMS

WEO	Woreda Education Office
MoE	Ministry of Education
CPD	Continuous professional Development
NSZORS	North Showa Zone Oromia Regional State
ICDR	Institute of Curriculum Development and Research
CBPE	Capacity Building and Primary Education.
AAU	Addis Ababa University
PMU	Project Monitoring Unit
ESDP	Education Sector Development Program
TGE	Transitional Government of Ethiopia
BA	Bachelor of Art
BSc	Bachelor of Science.
FGD	Focus Group Discussion

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to explore the status of teachers' engagement in action research work among the high schools of Northern Shawa Zone of Oromia Regional State. The study was conducted in six high schools which were selected based on the number of the staff they constituted and their proximity to transportation. The subject of the study were 112 teachers drown from the sample schools proportionally based on their work experience, ten school principals were selected which includes the deputy directors, six CPD committee members and five WEO experts were also included in the study. Observations of documents were also made to validate and triangulate information from different sources. Descriptive statistics like mean, percentage, and average mean and grand mean score were used to analyze quantitative data. The results of teachers' questionnaire, principals and WEO experts' interview and CPD committee discussion were found to be consistent on the issue at hand. Teachers' skill and competence on action research was found to be on promising condition though their practical involvement looks very low. A number of impeding factors including absence of action research trend and low emphasis by school management were identified. Efforts find a solution to curb these impediments was found to be very low. Finally, it was recommended among other things that the school principals and CPD committee with WEO experts should work together to inculcate strong research culture in the school.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

This chapter deals with the problem and its approach and consists of background of the study, statement of the problem, objective of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, operational definition of key terms and phrases and organization of the study.

1.1. Background

At the end of 20th century in Ethiopia, public policies, especially in education is formulated to bring radical change in the country providing quality education for citizens so as to equip them with necessary skills, experience attitudes and knowledge. The major focus of equipping the new generation with the abovementioned qualities is to enable them adjust themselves in the world they are living, to solve problems they face in their daily life in particular and the problem of the society in which their life is built in general. That is to state education is a fundamental one in the progress of human being. The 1997 World Bank report confirmed that education is the foundation of social progress. It is the basic and effective instrument by which human being adapt nature according to their needs. Without education development will not occur (World Bank, 1997: V). From this it could be concluded that education become the cornerstone of economic and social development in today's dynamic worlds.

Even though education is the corner stone for social and economic development of any nation, it is seriously problematic for it deals with human being. The sources of the problems arise due to a number of reasons. But it could be solved scientifically conducting research in the school by practitioners.

One of the scientific method of research in solving problems, improve instructional quality or performance is action research. In line with this idea Elliott states the fundamental aim of action research is to improve practices rather than to produce knowledge This writer further illustrates that action

research improves practice by developing the practitioners capacity in judging the human situation, and support the development of persons in their professional role (ELLIOTT, 1991: 52).

In educational activities the state of the school interactions between the school society and instructional quality of the school is understood by the status and quality of research undertaken in the school for which participants examine their own educational practice systematically and carefully (CBPE, 2005:6), using techniques of research. To show the importance of action research in developing teachers self –efficacy Schmuck (1997:28) as cited in Alebachew (2008:2) stated

> *Action research helps to study a real school situation with a view to improve the quality of actions and results within it. It aims also to improve one's own professional judgement and to gain insight into how better to achieve desirable educational goal. Action research also offers a means for changing from current practice towards better practice.*

Further, the practices and studies of different scholars' have given support for the role of action research on the processes of education, on the competence of teachers' and in the long range on the lives of the learners. Carr and Kemmis (1986) stated in easy and clear words saying "Action research is simply a form of self-reflective enquiry undertaken by participants in social situations in order to improve the rationality and justice of their own practices, their understanding of these practices, and the situations in which the practices are carried out" Carr and Kemmis, (1986: 162).in Smith M. K. (1996; 2001, 2007) at www.infed.org/research/b-actres.htm..).

In addition to this, action research increased the understanding of an immediate school condition with the emphasis on the complexity of school setting to develop strategies that are relevant to that particular school situation. It also helps teachers to understand changes in the school system so as to cope up with the changes that are taking place.

The other author Andrew cites from the works of Dinkelman to mention importance of action research by saying "Teachers are constantly challenged with various problems for which they are required to develop solutions. Teachers who are engaged in action research projects become more flexible in their thinking, more respective to new idea, and thus better able to solve problems as they arise Andrew (2002: 21)".

In the process of teaching, schools have a number of issues concerned with identify areas that need improvement to develop a process in providing groups or individual's commitment engage action research. The reasons schools concerned on issues (Gebeyehu, 2007:22) said that "teaching needs to be integrated with research conducted at the class room level" to explain that in order to achieve school as well as national objectives of educational success teachers are expected investigating all the possible methods that is applicable in teaching learning practices to solve problem they face in the school or in the class room in group or individually.

In addition, it is understandable from the definitions of scholars' 'action research' is the simplest and the smallest form of applied research which is directed towards searching an immediate solution and improvement of practices on the job. Concerning its implementation, Corey (1953:6) as cited in Gemechu (2006:11) indicates

> *the process by which the practitioners attempt to study their problems scientifically in order to guide correct and evaluate their decisions and actions" which shows that an action research is the application of fact finding to the practical problem solving in any classroom conditions with the aim of improving the quality of the measures to be taken or to increase the involvement of the collaboration of colleagues and staffs in the schools.*

"Teaching is a dynamic act of a teacher where the instant challenges are given tentative solutions intuitively and actively and letter driven to a long lasting solution. So, teaching has no fixed scheme of action as a result (Villar, 1994:6215 cited in Alebachew 2008:3)." According to him, teaching and learning activities are dynamic process that needs deep understanding of the processes through rigorous analysis of the events that have been happening

and giving them solutions generated by the observer or observers of it now and then to scrutinize objectively as to the context and to bring forth for discussion for their validity.

From these, it is clear that teachers at any school level are not expected to wait for a solution given the top. Rather they need to conduct action research to their own problem and apply the solution that they reach upon.

Therefore, action research method is helpful to solve specific problems which cannot be solved by the routines of traditional research or by trial and error methods. Thus, it can be said it is one of the appropriate methods to classroom teachers in solving their instructional and contextual problem and thereby improve their own competence.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Action research plays great role in promoting the performance of practitioners in particular and improve the practices of education in general if carefully and systematically operated. It helps participants to examine their own educational practices by employing techniques of the research methods, focusing changes of something to better and to have a real effect on the situation.

In teaching learning process, the teaching methods applied, the school activity going on, teaching materials employed has to be appropriately investigated and improved if teachers are involved in understanding action research. As the result teachers could be employed to make professional decisions to the extent of measures they took. It is due to this role of action research (MOE, 2002:32) stated that

> *school directors and deputy directors are charged with the task or responsibilities of facilitating conditions for teachers to enable them engage in action research (i.e. in school- based studies and research) which could help improve the teaching learning process and other school practices and are supposed to evaluate the results of the studies, assists their realization and make use of them to improve school situations.*

However, studies showed that there exist problem of teachers' involvement in action research. Yibeltal (2007:5) stated that teachers who are the key role players in education distanced themselves from involvement in action research.

The problem seems to be related to the teachers' action research know-how, school principal attitude towards action research, resource availability and to other related issues. This problem is also common in high schools of North Showa Zone Oromia Regional state. Thus to alleviate this problem there is a need for the integral cooperation of every stake holders to involve in action research. Unless their involvement to these activities the improvement of educational activities will be hampered.

The main purpose of this study is to assess the status of teachers engagement in action research activities, explore the existing hindering factors and to coming up with some possible intervention and to overcame the mentioned problems of Northern Showa Zone of Oromia Regional State.

In order to address these issues, the study will be guided by the following basic research questions and used as a frame work for reference in this study.

1. To what are teachers involved in conducting action research in high schools of North Showa Zone Oromia Regional State?
2. How is the skill of secondary school teachers to conduct action research?
3. What is the attitude of NSZORS teachers towards conducting action research?
4. What are the factors that hinder/ promote teachers' involvement in undertaking action research in the setting?

1.3. Objectives of the Study

The main Objectives of this study is to investigate into the status of teachers engagement in carrying out action research to improving their competence in the high schools of North Showa Zone Oromia regional state and there by to provide possible recommendation about the practice to the concerned body. More specifically, this research was intended to achieve the following:

a/ explore the extent to which high school teachers of the setting area conduct action research aiming improvement of their competence.

b/ identify the status of teachers' action research competence in solving their instructional problems.

c/ indicate factor that hinder/ promote teachers involvement in action research activities that increase their competence.

d/ give possible and applicable recommendations that may help the conduct of action research.

1.4. Significance of the Study

Because educational action research is very important part of teaching learning process aiming to achieve certain values, solving class room problems and the like. Therefore, this study would have the following importance:

- to identify basic sources of problems that hinder or promote teachers involvement in action research activities.
- to inform that competence improving activities are the integral part of teaching learning processes to bring changes in professional competence.
- to raise the level of awareness on how teachers' engage in competence raising activities.
- And, finally this study will serve as one source of information for the researchers who wish to conduct research in the subject area

1.5. Delimitation of the Study

It would have been better if the study had covered more geographical areas of the Northern Showa Zone of Oromia Regional state. However, due to financial constraints it was delimited to only six high schools of the Zone which are three Preparatory and secondary schools (9-12) and three secondary schools (9-10. The zone is considered to be low in teachers' involvement and where much of its challenging factors had not been studied previously. Furthermore, the study dealt only with the status and hindering factors that affect the involvement of teachers in action research practices. The study includes WEO experts, High school principals and teachers, and CPD committee members in gathering reliable data.

1.6. Operational Definitions of Terms.

- Research: is the process of arriving at dependable solutions to problems thrugh the planned and systematic collection, analysis and interpretation of data(Cohen and Manion 1994).
- Educational Research: Is a scientific or systematic and objective actitvty aimed at solving an educational problem and improvement of educational process (Abogi 1995).
- Action Research :-Is a reflection and enquiry connected by teachers to improve the practice of teaching and learning in systematic way(Zubber 1991)

1.7. Organization of this Study

This study has been organized in to five chapters. The first chapter deals the problem and its approach in which introduction (background of the study), statement of the problem, the basic questions, significance of the study delimitation of the study and definition of the key terms are all included. Chapter two covers review of the related literature and explore some of the basic characteristics of action research. The third chapter meant for the research design and methods employed in the study. Presentation, analysis and interpretation off the data are treated in the fourth chapter. Finally, the summery, conclusion and the relevant recommendation are included in chapter five.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Related Literature

This chapter deals with the review of the related literature which comprises conceptual framework of research: Definitions and origion of educational action research, historical development and characteristics of action research, comparisons of action research versus traditional research method, the bases and role of action research in the school ,approaches of action research:- technical ,practical and emancipatory action research; steps in action research, teachers as researcher and their attitudes towards action research, conditions for action research and values of school culture in improving work environment and finally deals on impeding factors to conduct action research.

2.1. Conceptual Framework of Research

2.1.1. Definition of Research

Research is an activity that focuses on the solution of problems. Regarding its detailed definition Ayalew and Seyoum (1989:5) stated as it is the structured inquiry that utilizes acceptable scientific methodology to solve problems and create new generally applicable knowledge. The above author further explained that it is carried out only after all other sources of answers have been thoroughly investigated and its outcomes add to the existing knowledge providing new knowledge.

Based on the purpose satisfies research is divided into two main types i.e. 'basic and applied research. This is further stated by MoE (1999:147) as basic /fundamental/ research which directed towards discovering new knowledge, while applied or action research directed towards the solution of immediate, specific and practical problem.

> *When we come to the area of education, applied research i.e action research in the process of finding solution to problems in schools come into sight. Regarding this Charless (1998) discussed action research as it is simply a research related to issues in education to find reliable answer to questions, to discover the best way of doing things, to establish principles that can be followed with confidence.*

Thus, educational research involves a careful and thorough examination of educational problems that comprises of observable facts or events leading to verifiable facts, principles and relationship that are crucial to the systematic exploration or explanation and understanding of these problems (i.e. problems around education system). Regarding these issue the other author Sukia (1983:3), discussed as follows

> *Educational problems like the quality and quantity of teaching material, assessment methods, and policy related troubles, physical facilities, methods of teaching e.t.c could be addressed in educational research for improvement.*

Therefore, educational research in general is an activity which directed towards the development of scientific methodology to solve problems and to create generally applicable best ways of doing especially in education system.

2.1.2. Historical Development of Educational Action Research

Educational research as discipline has passed through several stages before it could take the shape of modern movement for the objective study of educational problems by concerned practitioners. Regarding this (Sukhia et. al, 1974) stated that the earliest efforts aimed at improvement in the field of education may be label as the personnel experience method, whereby changes of some kind were introduced in educational practices as a result of the experience of certain experienced educators. Become

Thus, educational action research as it is known nowadays is becoming a relatively new branch of knowledge in education system to solve problem faced. Regarding its happening as a means of solving problems

in the world of education Sukihia, et.al, (1974:16) mentioned it is only in the last fifty or so years that educational researchers characterized by increasing readiness to apply methods of research to solution of educational problems. As to him the conditions for foundation to action research were the development of educational action research, the rise of democracy and continous expansion of education in various countries has been played a grate role invariably accompanied by more and more research work in education.

As reviewed by Corry (1953: 70) action research was believed that the scientific method in education and would bring about change for educators involved in both the research and the application of information. The writer summed up much of the thought behind this fledgling branch of inquiry stating the consequences of research practices in teaching are more likely to change and improve our practices than is reading about what someone else has discovered of his teaching.

In relation to the development measuring instrument to promote the scientific study of educational research practices, Abraham (2004) stated that "the widespread interest growth in exploration and development of measuring instrument needed by the researcher in the field of education and psychology through 1900 to 1920".

Thus, educational action research emerged as a base line to carryout inquiry in the process of solving school related problems and in school improvement by some influential people just after the end of the second world war (Schmuk,1997;Elliot,1991; Kemmis, 1983). Stephen Corey was among the first to use action research in the field of education. The historical development of action research process as stated by him was cyclical, involving a "non-linear pattern of planning, acting, observing, and reflecting on the changes in the social situations" (Noffke & Stevenson, 1995: 2).

2.1.3. Conceptual Definition of Action Research

Different authors define action research differently based on the time and bases of their view to it. Kemmis and McTaggart (1988) in Torsten (1994: 42) define action research as a form of collective inquiry undertaken by participants in social situations in order to improve the productivity, rationality, and justice of their own social or educational practices, as well as their understanding of these practices and the situations in which the practice are carried out. Further Kemmis and McTggart identified the practitioners as they are group participants that can be teachers, students, principals, parents and other community members of any group with a shared concern.

In other hand Reason and Bradbury (2001:1) define it as "a participatory, democratic process concerning with developing practical knowing in the pursuit of worthwhile human purpose grounded in a participatory world view which is emerging at this theoretical movement." to show as it is systematic inquiry which individuals or groups of practitioner involved to improve practices in pursuit of improving conditions for teaching and learning. In line with this concept Bell (1993) stated the aim of action research in education "is about the systematic study of attempts to improve educational practice by groups of practitioners by means of their own practical action and by means of their own reflection upon the effects of those actions (Bell, 1993:11)."

Torsten (1994), stated that "in action research teachers (and others) are encouraged to treat their own educational ideas and theories, their own work practices, and their own work setting, as objects for analysis and critique." The author further argued that on the basis of careful reflection, teachers may uncover theoretical ideas or assumptions that turn out to be unjustified and liable to lead them astray in their teaching i.e. if they hold too rigid assumptions about the nature of student innate abilities ; or similarly teachers may find ways in which practices shaped by habit or tradition have become irrelevant or useless e.g., finding that practice of classroom discipline, formerly seen as appropriate, may now be unacceptable or even

counterproductive; or teachers may discover how the structures of the setting may place obstacles in the ways of attaining educational goals e.g., the physical structure of the conventional classroom may hinder mixed ability grouping or the use of new technology, or the management structure of a school may mitigate against new forms of curriculum organization(Torsten,1994 :42).

Action research is therefore a practical way of looking at once own practice in order to check whether it is as you feel it should be. Since action research is done by practitioner, is often referred as practitioner research, or practitioner-lead or practitioner based research. It can also be called self-reflective practice. In action research practitioner are potential researchers and researcher are practitioner (France, 2003:3).

Thus action research is a form of applied research where its purpose not generation of report, articles or books on the problem, but lifting of the oppressive situation, the freeing of blockages and barriers to effective action, and in short the improvement in the practice. Regarding its practicabilit, Hitchock and Hughes (1995:72) states in a precise way as follows.

> *Action research is applied research done to answer specific practical problem, which results in action. Unlike traditional research which aims togeneralize its findings, action research is primarily conserned with relevance to the specific cite in which it occurs.*

Generally, action research is a means of tackling practically encountered problems in a systematic way. It is a means where teachers and school administrators learn from their practice and experience with the aim of improvement changing of practice in the school system. So it is a research with, rather than research on.

2.1.4. Characteristics of Action Research

Kemmis and Mctaggart(1988)out lined a number of features of action research:

(a) Action research is an approach to improve education by changing it and learn from the consequence of changes.

(b) Action research develops through a self reflective spiral of cycles of planning, acting (implementing plans), observing (systematically), reflecting, and then planning, further implementation, observing, and reflecting. It is systematic learning process in which people act deliberately, through remaining open to surprises and responsive to opportunities.

(c) Action research is participatory: it is research through which people work toward the improvement of their owns practices.

(d) Action research is collaborative :it involves those responsible for action improving it, widening the collaborating group from those most directly involved to as many as possible of those affected by the practices concerned. It establishes self- critical communities of people participating and collaborating in all phases of the research process.

(e) Action research involves people in theorizing about their practices-being inquisitive about circumstances, action and consequences, and coming to understand the relationship between circumstance, action and consequence in their work and live.

(f) Action research requires that people put their practice, ideas, and assumption about institutions to the test by finding out whether there is compelling evidence that could convince them that their previous practices, ideas , and assumptions were false or incorrect (or both).

(g) Action research is open minded about what counts as evidence (or data), but it always involves keeping records, and collecting and analyzing evidence about the contexts, commitments , conduct and consequences of the action and interactions being investigated. It involve keeping a personal journal recording progress in, and reflection about, two parallel sets of learning: learning about the practices being

studied, and learning about the process of studying them (the action process itself)

(h) Action research allowed participants to build records of their improvements: *records of changes in activities and practices; *records of changes in the language and discourse in which practices are described, explained, and justified: * records of changes in the social relationships and forms of organization which characterize and constrain practice; and * records of change and development in the action research process itself. It thus allow participants to provide reasoned justifications of their educational works because it allows them to show them how evidence and reflection have provided a basis for a developed, tested, and critically examined rationale for what is being done.

(i) Action research starts small. It normally begins with small changes which even a single person can try, and works towards more extensive changes; with small cycles of planning, acting, observing, and reflecting which can help to define issues, ideas, and assumptions more clearly so that those involved can define more powerful questions for themselves as their work progresses; and it begins with small groups of collaborators at the beginning, but widens the community of participating action researchers so that it gradually includes more and more of those involved in and affected by the practices in question.

(j) Action research involves people in making critical analyses of the situations (classroom, schools, systems) in which they work-situation that are structured socially, culturally, and institutionally. Critical analyses aim to recover how a situation has been socially and historically constructed, as a source of insight into ways in which people might be able to reconstruct it.

(k) Action research is a political process, because it involves making changes in the actions and interactions that constitute and structure social life (social practice); such changes typically have effects on the expectations and interests of others beyond the immediate participants in these actions and interactions (Torsten, 1994:43-44).

An important feature of action research is that the task is not finished when the project ends. The participants continue to review, evaluate and improve practice. Thus, action research is characterized by: self reflective spiral: a spiral of cycles of planning, acting (implementing plans), observing (systematically), reflecting ... and then re-planning, further implementation, observation and reflecting; cyclical: uses feedback from data in ongoing cyclical process (Ferrance, 2000:8).From the above discussion it is possible to understand that action research has its own characteristics that distinct it from conventional one.

2.2. Action Research versus Traditional Research Methods

Even if the shortest and most straightforward definition of action research is given by Elliott (1991:61) to show its essence stating as it is the study of social situation with a view to improve the quality of action within it; and it lies in the will to improve the quality of teaching and learning as well as the conditions under which teachers and students work in school, most of the time people confuse the difference between action research and other forms of research.

In the trials of certain civic groups and organs of education system in alleviating the confusion of practitioners the essence of different types of research were discussed. Accordingly, issue of action research was discussed in ICDR (2004:23) documents widely as it is designed to help practitioner identify what is happening in his /her classroom, use that information to take action for future improvement and put ideas into action as part of their professional development. Further the document show that action research does not provide necessarily new knowledge, but aims to improve practice.

Some scholars like McNiff, Lommax, Whitehead, (1996), and Woods,(1991) draw basic distinction between action research and 'pure' or 'basic' research. For example McNiff and Whitehead,(1996:14) draw three basic differences which make action research different from other form of research. According to them action research:

It requires action as an integral part of the research process itself. It is focused by the researcher's professional values rather than methodological considerations. It is necessarily insiders' researchers in the sense of practitioners researching their own professional activity.

Woods (1991) also gives comprehensive distinction between the main stream 'educational research' and 'action research 'under the following four points. Accordingly:

1) The main stream educational research" basis its data on the large number of samples where there is not always the case in action research.

2) Then, in the former type of research, theory comes first the practice where the reverse seems to hold true in the case of the latter.

3) Further the main stream educational research is usually carried out by outside-researcher who are distant in time and place from classroom practice where as the latter is undertaken by insider-researcher including teachers and other collaborators in the educational institutions.

4) Finally generalizations of research finding is the main objective of "pure-research" where as this is not necessarily concern of action research.

In addition to this action research is the process by which the practitioners attempts to study their own practice scientifically in order to guide, correct and evaluate their decision (corry, 1953:6). Action research is therefore, seen as a part of the job, that provides immediate feedback and encourages reflection for further development not an 'add on' to teachers.

On the other hand, traditional research has a goal of developing knowledge which is generalize able that gives emphasis on theoretical significance where action research emphasised on practical significance. Due to this, traditional research will end by indicating recommendations while action research results applied by the researcher in a particular classroom.

Nevertheless, action research has also some communality with the other research types. For example, Whitehead (1996) states that action research and other research share some characteristics as both type of research contribute to the betterment of existing knowledge, depending on the empirical evidence to justify knowledge, and make abridge between incoming knowledge and the already existing one.

2.3. The Bases and Role of Action Research in the School

2.3.1. The Bases of Action Research in School

Action research, as discussed above by different writers, is a process in which participants examine their own educational practice systematically and carefully, using the technique of research. It gives teachers, principals and supervisors work best on problems they have identified for themselves; become more effective when encouraged to examine and assess their own work and then consider way of working differently; help each other by working collaboratively and working with colleagues helps teacher, principals and supervisors in their professional development.

Thus, inline with this concept MoE (1999) discussed on the purposes of action research that base its significance in school and classroom classifying into five categories. These are:

1) It is a means of remedying problems diagnosed in specific situations, or improving a given set in some way.
2) It is a means of in-service training to equip the teacher with new skills and methods and sharpening his /her self-awareness and analytical power.
3) it is a means of injecting additional or innovative approach to teaching and learning into an ongoing system.
4) It is a means of improving the relationship between the practicing teacher and the academic researcher.
5) It is a means of providing a preferable approach to problem solving in the classroom (MoE, 1999:155)

Typically action research is a process undertaking in the school setting; requires being reflective, collaborative activities among colleagues searching for solution to real problems experienced in school and increase students' achievement. The process of action research assists educators in assessing needs, documenting the steps of inquiry, analyzing data and make decision that can lead to desired out comes (Ferrance,2000:2).

Generally, the significance of action research for teachers in general and school in particular as summarized by Elliott (1991:61), ICDR (2004:23), Corry (1953:6), MoE (1999:155) and Ferrance (2002:2) are:

- Makes them more proactive in relation to external authority;
- Boosts their self-esteem and confidence level;
- Narrow the gab between their aspiration and realization.
- Help develop an attitude and skill of self analysis which are applied to other situation;
- Leads to more learner centre classroom approach;
- Helps investigate professional experience which link practice and the analysis of practice into a single developing sequences;
- Offers practitioner robust and critical method of self-evaluation for ongoing development;
- Sustains the capacity to contribute to the development of professionalism in education are of the reasons why action research activity given more room by theorists of education around the world.

2.3.2. The Role of Action Research in School

It is clear that the teachers, principals, supervisors, and practitioners who are responsible to conduct action research so as to reflect the intended curriculum objectives. This may contribute for solving practical problems that teachers and principals/supervisors face during their day-to-day activities. As the result the curriculum that is being applied would be approved; teachers will gained knowledge about the effects of their practice and thus making the school as (Hopkins, 2003:32) pointed out as follows:

- possible and attractive as a centre of research;
- increase the bondage and interaction among staff members;
- reduce a belief which is often articulated that it is only trained and qualified staff but not the practitioners do educational research
- bring about changes in principals or teachers professional skills and roles;
- increase feeling of self-worth and confidence; increase awareness about classroom issues;
- serves as a means of in-service training and
- thereby equipping teachers and principals with new skills and methods and sharpening their analytical power and heightening their self awareness

Generally speaking, action research has the potential to generate genuine and sustained improvements in schools. It gives educators new opportunities to reflect on and asses their teaching, to explore and test new ideas, materials; to assess how effective the new approach was; to share feedback with fellow team members.

In the process of teaching learning in the school, the work of schooling or solving specific problems in teaching learning students, teachers or administrators could be designed different strategies. Of these strategies conducting collective or individual action research is one of the important methods to improve the problem faced. Collective action research is carried out when a group of teacher identifies a genuine problem in schools; to design ways to community to address the problem, and then evaluate this success through the research method (Sadker and Sadker, 2003:560, Lambert, 1996:86-87).

On the other hand action researcher are expected to facilitate the learning process, disseminate the results of the research, and contribute to teacher to be participant in the way that partners are working with and for those affected by the problems for the way in which the problem is tackled. The teachers also, as an action researcher should understand the nature and

level of the students so as to maintain the necessary balance between the external causes that affect structure and control by affecting students' freedom to be autonomous in their learning activities (Kolb,1984; Boud,1985).

It is obvious that the primary purpose of research is to discover some thing new or to increase contribution to the field of knowledge, and to clarify the concern of society and to test a method, program or policy for possible recommendation to solve the problems observed in schools. Thus, action research enables practitioners to be critical thinkers by employing different ways to improve the various constraints of the schools. Researchers are responsible to facilitate learning process and to disseminate the results of the action research. Action researchers contribute to the teachers to be participative in the way of that being partner working with and for those affected by the problem and the way in which it is talked. As an action researcher teachers should understand the level and the nature of students in order to maintain essential balance between external causes that affect structure and control by affecting students' freedom to be autonomous in their learning activity (Duffy and Janson, 1992; Kolb, 1984; Boud, et.al, 1985).

2.4. Approaches and Steps of Action Research

2.4.1. Approaches of Action Research

Part of the confusion we find when we hear the term "action research" is that there are different approaches depending upon the Participants involved. A plan of research can involve single teacher investigating an issue in his/her classroom, a group of teachers working in a common problem, or a team of teachers and others focusing on a school or district-wide issue (Ferrance,20003:3). Moreover, the confusion may arise from the range of definition given by different scholars could be applied to a variety issues (social issues) including educational context.

Grundy (1988:353), cited in kemmis and Mctaggart, 1988) discuss three modes of action research. These are technical, practical and emanicipatory action research. Similarly, Holter and Schworth-Barcott (1993:301) discuss three types of action research, that of technical collaborative approach, a mutual collective approach and an enhanced approach.

2.4.1.1. Technical Approach

The main aim of this type of action research is the testing of an intervention based on a pre-specified theoretical framework. The researcher is questioning weather the selected intervention can be applied in a practical setting (Holter and Schwartz – barcott, 1993). The researcher acts as an out-side expert who aims to gain the practitioner's interest in the research, agreement to assist in the implementation of the intervention (Kemmis and McTaggart, 1998).
Further technical action research is based on experience and observation, is positive and predictive, and tries to control human situation through rules based on empirical laws. The nature of the collaboration between the researcher and practitioner is technical and facilitator (Grundy, 1987).

2.4.1.2. Practical Action Research

Practical action research involves the researcher and practitioner coming together in order to identifies potential problems, underlying causes and possible solutions and interventions\the researcher encourages practitioners and self-reflection of practitioner (kemmis and McTaggartt, 1988).

The goals of practical action research understand teaching practice and solving immediate problems. It also aims towards generating understanding, and focus on human interpretation, interactive communication, deliberation, negotiation and detailed description (Mckernan, 1991).

2.4.1.3. Emanicipatory Action Research

Emanicipatory action research involves all participants equally with no hierarchy existing between the researcher and practitioner. The researcher aims to decreases the distance between the actual problems identified by the practitioner the theory used to explain and resolve the problem. The

researcher also facilitates reflexive discussion with the practitioner to identify underlying problems and assumptions. This assists the researcher to become a collaborative member of the group (kemmis and McTaggartt, 1988).

It is through the development of critique that the meditation of theory and practice is possible. Emancipated strategic action plan follows from the disposition of critical intent. Critical intent is disposition which motivates action and interaction at all stages of emancipatory action research and is particularly important in the development of theoretical perspective which informs and underpins a project (Groundy, 1982). The central purpose of critical theory is emancipation, which enables people to take control and direction over their own lives (Hopkins, 1996). This type of educational action research should aim to be socially responsive, democratic, equitable, liberation and enhancing (Mills, 2003).

Generally, action research is an alternative social science research approach which aims to link theory and practice in solving practical problems for practitioner in the field. And therefore, teachers have the alternative to conduct action research either individually on the problem unique to their classroom; or in collaboration with other teachers on common problem for all; or the whole school teacher working together on problems of the school like lack of community participation and apply the result practically.

2.4.2. Steps in Action Research

Action research is an activity undertaken in a process. The process in action research includes interrelated steps even if these steps are differing from writer to writer. For example, Hopkins 1993; Cohen,1980 in MoE 1999, described the process as it has eight steps in which each step has its own procedures in conducting class room bound action research.

Table 1. procedures in conducting class room action research

Steps	Procedures
1st step	Identification. evaluation and formulation of the problem in relation to day –to-day teaching situation.
2nd step	Preliminary discussion, among interested group (i.e. teachers, researchers, advisors, supervisors, etc.) for the draft proposal. These stages include statement of the problem, objectives, purposes and assumptions being clearly stated.
3rd step	Reviewing research literatures to learn from comparable studies, regarding to their objectives, procedures and problem treated.
4th step	Modification or redefinition of the initial statement of the problem at the first step. Here it may emerge in the form of testable hypothesis.
5th step	Selection of research procedures, sampling, administration, choice of materials, methods of teaching and learning allocation of resources and tasks etc.
6th step	Choice of the evaluation procedures to be used.
7th step	Embraces the implementation of object itself over varying period of time. It will include the conditions and methods of data collection (e.g. by weekly meetings, keeping records, reports, the sub mission of self evaluation, and group evaluation report etc); The monitoring of tasks and giving feedback to the research team; the organization and analysis of data.
8th step	Interpretation of the data; inferences to drawn; over all evaluation of the project; discussion on the findings on agreed evaluative criteria.

*Adopted from Teacher Education Handbook by ICDR (1999:156).

Again, in the same way McNiffe1996 in McNiffe2002, described the process as: to review our current practice; identify an aspect that needs to be improved; imagine a way forward; try it out and take stock what happen; modify our plan in the light of what we have found and continue with the 'action'; evaluate the modify action; and so on until we are satisfied with the aspect of our work.

Similar to the above discussion in McNift (2002) the person called Jack developed the following steps

1. What is my concern? ;
2. Why I am concerning ;
3. What do I think I can do about it?
4. What will I do about it?
5. How I will gather evidence to show that I am influencing the situation?

6. How will I ensure that any judgements I make are reasonably faire and accurate? What will I do then?

In the same way to that of Jack, Ferrance (2000:10-12) states the steps of action research as follows:

- Identification of the problem
- Collection and organization of data
- Interpretation of data
- Action based on data
- Reflection

Further more, action research is a cyclical that involves planning, action, observation and reflection as discussed by Mckernan (1996:29).

All the above discussions indicates that action research is a research that needs to action by the practitioners (teachers) themselves followed by evaluating their action weather the change has come or not in order to plan the next action research step effective. But, if these things are not performed, the research will become simply developing knowledge without improving the immediate problem at hand.

2.5. Teachers as the Researcher and Their Attitudes Towards Action Research

2.5.1. Practitioners (Teachers) as Researcher

Traditionally, it was believed that research is an activity carried out by the people in higher education in order to acquire a research degree, or in order to fulfil a contract made with different research organizations. But the curriculum movement in the 1960s and early 1970s introduced the idea that teachers could be involved in researching the issues around and in their classroom (Mitchell, 1985). Similarly, Hopkins (2002) discussed that professionals could enhance their own or a colleagues teaching, test the assumptions of educational theory in practice, or evaluate and implement the whole school practices, teachers' participation in educational research is highly recommended.

Thus teachers of any level institution have good opportunity to search solutions for different educational problems face in classroom. The school Setting, therefore, is best studied and researched by the participants (teacher, students, researcher from outside) experiencing the problem in the setting. Here, it is not to say desirable that the participants are best placed to conduct research into pressing professional problems. But the professionals must engage in carrying out action research to improve their practice in the setting; and personal knowledge and skill. And a research undertaken in this form is of self-critical inquiry.

Similarly, Kemmis and McTaggart (1988) discussed as teachers face varieties of problems in their daily activities while making teaching students or interaction with school community. To improve these problems and helping students learn better; to strengthen school culture teachers should engage in action research. To this end, teachers must have the skill and knowledge of research methods and techniques sufficiently. The skill and knowledge of research activities is happen if and only if they engaged in conducting action research or in research so that they will learn by doing, Thus, teachers should not hand over research to others rather press ahead with a commitment in seeking out a solution (Kemmis and McTaggart 1988 :30-31).

Therefore as practitioner teachers have grate role in conducting educational research and educational action research respectively in general and particular. So professional they are, expected to be researcher and contributors of curriculum development at national level through involving educational action research. Because Elliott (1991:52) it unifies inquiry, the improvement of performance, and the development of persons in their professional role.

2.5.2. Teachers Attitudes towards Action Research

However scholars believe teaching learning process needs to integrate with research conducted at the classroom level, most people think 'research' as something that can be undertaken only by naturally gifted persons. Also they

associate the word 'research' as to Bell (1992:2), with activities which are substantially removed from day-to-day life and which are pursued by outstanding gifted persons with unusual level of commitment. There is of course a good level of truth in this viewpoint, but we would argue that the pursuit is not restricted to this type of person and indeed can prove to be stimulating and satisfying experiences for many people with a trained and enquiring mind.

In addition to this, the majority of teachers perceived research activity as carried out by the researchers from other fields. In relation to this the interest of teachers towards carrying out action research as Nunan (1992) suggest most teachers do not able to undertake action research due to factors such as shortage of time, lack of research background and lack of experiences. The attitudes of teachers towards carrying out action research is therefore, fail because they are unable to do so or unwilling due to personal problems to carry out action research.

Beasley and Riodson (1981) in Nunan (1990) as cited by Gebeyaw (2007:26-27) to show that teachers and students rarely participate in doing action research; hence, teachers knowledge of the classroom has been neglected, teachers themselves do not read and employ action research to shape and inform their methods of teaching. Further more he argue that teachers are suspicious of the relevance of action research and little has been known how teachers perceive and undertaken action research.

Even if action research helps teachers in developing their profession, promote students learning and increase job satisfaction in the process of sharing knowledge among one's staff members, teachers' participation have reviled the existing gap between research and teaching in general, and action research in particular. The international Encyclopaedia of Education (1994) argues as teachers are highly resistant to do action research due to a number of reasons, Cohen and Monion (1994) discussed that the expectation and attitudes of the teachers resistant to the relevance of classroom action

research. Therefore, despite these misconception of practitioners about action research, McNiff (1988:xvii) defends the application of action research discussing :

> *Action research presents an opportunity for teachers to become uniquely involve in their own practice, to professionalize themselves and to give reasoned justification for what they are doing.*

Nevertheless the conception and attitudes of the practitioners looks this, the novice researcher believes that action research may be helps to classroom teachers to examine and build up their class room practice in justifiable grounds.

2.6. Conditions for Action Research

It is clear and essential to ask or know that what sorts of conditions are required to make the school a centre for action research; to accomplish educational action research, and to plan effective and efficient action. Swayer (2004) suggested that, there are two key components in general that facilitate or hinder educational research activities. These are an active components, mostly includes human (individual/team) capacity of research and environmental component which constituted by social, material factors.

Inline with this concept syoum (1985), stated as there are two major necessary conditions that needed to be considered to carry out educational action research. These are personal and institutional dimensions. Under personal dimension he mentioned variables like mastery of knowledge and skills research, interest, and an inquisitive and fertile mind and discipline. In the same fashion variable mentioned under institutional dimensions were research facilities, time, research fund, incentive, availability of data and culture (Syoum, 1998:28).

Good school culture is one of the important factors that enhance the involvement of teachers in conducting action research activities in the classroom. As to Little, (1982) (Hargreaves 1991:41) in the school where collaborative culture prevails teaches regularly engaged in professional

dialogue with colleagues, share ideas, knowledge, techniques, and participation in collaborative problem solving around classroom issues. Teachers work together to develop shared technical knowledge and discover common solution to challenging problems.

2.7. Research Culture to Improve Practitioners Activity

As to Deal and Peaterson (1990:7), discussed what people say and do, what the people believed on and assumed gives meaning for how people perform duties and accomplishes. Accordingly for them the value of school culture is explained as

> *A complex web of norms, values, believes and assumptions, and traditions and rituals that have been built up over time as a teachers, students, parents, and administrators work together, deal with crises, and develop un stated expectation for interacting and working together.*

Further they explained as culture constitutes stabled underlying social meaning that shape the `believe and behaviour of the society over the time. Therefore, school culture has a powerful impact on the designed and planned activities to attain the main goal as well as to recorded significant change effort. In line with this, Hasall (1998:2) mentioned in his work**** one of the most consistent messages from the school improvement literature is that school culture has a powerful impact on any change effort. Little (1982) and Hargreaves (1991:41) elaborate how the school culture exerts powerful effort to come to change in an institute stating the details as follows

> *In school where collaborative culture prevail, teachers regularly engage in professional dialogue with colleagues, share ideas, knowledge, techniques, and participate in collaborative problem solving around classroom issues. Teachers work together to develop shared technical knowledge and discover common solution to challenging problems.*

Therefore, in the school where strong collaborative culture prevailed among the teachers and the school community supports the improvement of the school developing shared group knowledge that solve complex problem, create good network of information in which professional knowledge transmit quickly, good job satisfaction and the like.

2.8. Factors that Constrain the Conduct of Action Research

In teachers' development program, conducting action research is given high priority as one of the most important activities in the system to bring change in education. However it is natural while performing an activity constraints become obstacle to do things smoothly. e.g. Poor knowledge and skills of doing action research, low culture in schools to conduct action research, lack of in-service training , organized seminars, etc. play negative role in the processes of carrying out action research.

Regarding those factors Day (1999) "said that lack of professional learning culture affects the research capacity. Promoting the culture of inquiry contributes the professional learning culture for students and teacher; hence, action research can be occurred. This nature of state continues to professional development of teachers."

As different research results reported, Research knowledge and skills of secondary school teacher was found insignificant/low (Ashenafi,2007; Yebeltal,2006; Abreham,2004; Yeshimebet, 2000; Hussen,2004;Yalew,2000; Desalgn,2009).Even if the study revealed that, teachers don't have know how to carry out educational action research and interest to practice in the process which is highly affect the involvement of teachers in research activities. But Desalegn (2009); and Hussen (2004) pointed that the majority of respondent teachers believed that; teachers can carry out action research at their own level irrespective of the limitations in research skill. Thus, action research is a part of teachers' professional development that requires teachers' reflection 'on' and 'in' action (Ashenafi, 2007: 26)

On the other hand, the factors that hinders activities of action research may be individual(personal) factors as knowledge or skills of the practitioner, self-esteem, Self confidence, the positive attitude and open mind in research, perseverance /discipline/, and training pattern could affects the effectiveness of teachers engagement in conducting action research et.al.

Concerning the secondary school teachers, McKerman (1996:44), Seyoum (1998: 1-18) there are many factors that hinder them to conduct action research at school or classroom level. Among these constraints, institutional and other teachers related problems could mentioned. School organizational features, Lack of time and lack of resources are of the school related problems. On top of these the understanding of teachers to conduct action research and skills they have on the area could be important.

As it could be deduced from the given discussion above, Teacher's research skill and their training situation in educational action research skill and methodology have significant relationship. In addition to this, the absence of conducive environment in and outside the school institutions, Lack of materials in the school, existence of bureaucratic administration absence of academic freedom in the policy to high school teachers' could be reasons given for not conducting action research.

To tackle the above mentioned problem, the government of Ethiopia has taken action research as one of the criteria for the teachers' career development, in which the fewer participants in research activities are not grow from one professional ladder to the next one.

In general, from the report of different studies it could be generalized to that the attention given for conducting action research in secondary school was extremely low in general. Beside this, as some realities indicate teachers participation in conducting action research and benefiting the teaching and learning process in the school is hindered (Befekadu, 2009).

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter treats research method, sources of data, sample population and sampling technique, data gathering tools, procedure of data collection and methods of data analysis.

3.1 Research Design

The researcher employed descriptive survey design to explore and reveal the current statusof teachers engagement in action research in NSZORS. In relation to this, Best (2003) stated that descriptive study describes and interprets what is. It is concerned with conditions or relationships that exist, opinions that that are held, processes that are going on, effects that are evident, or trend that are developing. It is primarily concerned with the present. In addition, Kumar (1996:94) described that this method involves large sample size and is oriented towards the determination of the status of a given phenomena. It has also a penetrating power to analyze realistic condition.

Thus, the Principal objective of this study mainly aimed at assessing the status of the involvement of teachers in competence (skill and knowledge) raising activities. It was also the purpose of this study to survey some of the factors that hinder teachers' involvement in action research. To realize this, the researcher used descriptive survey method. This method was selected for the very reason that it helps the researcher to obtain pertinent information concerning the current status of a phenomenon, as well as provides quantitative description of the trends of the phenomenon.

Generally, research design is the logically planned activities that tie together the empirical data to the studies with initial questions and conclusions of a research under study. According to Solomon (2008:28) a research design is the logical sequences that connects the empirical data to the studies initial research questions and, ultimately, to its conclusions. Though there are

different design in studying various cases, the researcher employed descriptive survey method.

3.2. Data Source

To get valid and reliable information, the use of appropriate data source is vital. Hence two sources of data were employed for this study.

3.2.1. Data Source

In order to achieve the objective of this study, both primary and secondary data were collected from various sources. Primary data were obtained from Northern showa zone sampled woredas high school teachers through questionnaires. Interview was applied to collect data from woreda education office Experts, CPD committee and school principals.

The secondary data were collected through document analysis from reports and documents of woreda education offices as well as from school records and other related publications.

3.2.2. Sample Size and Sampling Technique

To make the sample area manageable and representative out of 16 preparatory and high schools found in the setting (zone) 6 were selected on the assumption that they are relevant source of data for the case understudy. The rationale for choosing these 6 preparatory and secondary schools was because they have high number of qualified and experienced teachers than the rest schools. Teachers were chosen to serve as the main data sources because they are expected to engage in action research activities. Accordingly out of the total 727 preparatory and secondary schools teachers in the study area 337 were working in the sample schools and of these 337 teachers, 112 (33.23%) were selected using stratified random sampling technique. Inthis regard Cohen and Manion (1994:89-90) noted that a sample size of 30% from the population is appropriate if the number of population is known. Accordingly the sample was selected by the help of proportionate stratified sampling random sampling technique. In addition to teachers, 10 principals and their deputies of the school and 5 education experts from Woreda

Education office were taken purposefully so as to obtain relevant information about the existing situation in the school with regard to the conduct of action research.

Table 2:-list of sample schools with their respective subjects and sources of data included in the study and distribution of respondents who filled-in the questionnaire.

No	Name of school included in the study	Total number of teachers in each school	Total number of teachers selected as sample population from each school.	Teachers who filled in and returned the questionnaire.
1	Muketuri secondary & preparatory school	57	20 (35.1%)	18(90%)
2	Debretsige secondary school	27	9 (33.33%)	7(77.78%)
3	Fitche secondary and preparatory school	35	15(42.86%)	13(86.67%)
4	Abdisa aga secondary school	65	21(32.31 %)	20(95.24 %)
5	Degem Secondary school	39	12(30.77%)	10(83.33%)
6	Gebre gurach secondary and preparatory school	107	35(32.71 %)	29(82.86%)
	Total	328	112(34.15%)	97(86.61%)

3.3. Tools (instruments) of Data Gathering

To obtain relevant information for the study, questionnaire and interview tools were used for data collection from the sample population.

3.3.1. Questionnaires

In order to gather relevant information for this study, structured questionnaires were developed as the main tools in collecting the needed data. The questionnaires consists issues on the background of the respondents, the level of teachers involvement in competence raising activities (i.e. conducting action research), teachers attitude towards doing action research and other skill and knowledge activities, and factors hindering teachers from carryout and implementing action research.

The questionnaire comprised of close-ended and open-ended items. The close-ended items were used when the responses from the respondent are expected clear and easier to be analyzed. Furthermore, in close ended questionnaire respondents selected their opinion from lists of answers provided, it provides a high uniformity of responses among the sample respondent and to make the response easier to be processed.

The major purpose of the open ended item was to give the respondents chance to express their feeling, intentions, attitudes, problems, perceptions and understanding in conducting educational action research without restriction. It also allow the researcher obtain detail information on the status of action research in the schools concerned. Finally, every item of the questionnaire was explained in detail to the respondents using directions and instruction across each section of the questionnaire.

The questionnaires were pilot tested using the data obtained from 14 teachers of Degem secondary school which are not included in the sample. Reliability test was made using estimation of split-half method. The spearman-Brown formula was also utilized in calculating the correlation between (the two groups, odd and even numbered of 14 non-sampled respondents) in the SPSS program and the result was 0.78. Statistical literature reveals that a test result nearer to one is considered to be reliable. Therefore, the test indicated that the questionnaires were reliable.

3.3.2. Interview

In descriptive Study, in addition to questionnaire, interviewing and focus group discussion; is the major source of data needed for understanding the phenomenon under study (Merriam, 1988:86).Thus, the second technique employed in the process of data collection for this study was unstructured and semi structured interview.

In the case of semi structured interview as Bell (1993:184) cited in Gebeyaw (2007: 45) its strength was stated as "Semi-structured interview tends to be the most favoured by educational researchers as it allows respondents to

express themselves at some length, but offer enough shape to prevent some aimless rambling. In addition, the two type interviews were believed to help gather information on the attitude and believes of the respondents and serve as crosscheck for responses of the respondents to the questionnaire.

Based on aforementioned concept the investigator carried out interviews of the two types with teachers, school directors and vice directors, and WEO supervisors while waiting for the return of questionnaire papers in organizing the necessary data for the study. The interviewing process was supported by audio-equipment (tape-recorder) so as to increase the reliability of the obtained data and to minimize loss of information by the interviewer nothing down the responses.

3.4. Procedures for Data Collection

The preliminary step in collecting the necessary data was started by making face to face contact with the directors ,vice directors, and teachers of the schools so as to inform them the purpose of the study. Then, the researcher arranged place and time with directors to get the respondents name and lists of the staff. After the number of teachers from each school was identified, based on the arranged agreements, the distribution of questionnaires consisting of 45 items was distributed to the teachers of the six schools and interviews were carried out step-by-step.

And so as to provide the necessary information and clarification for the questions raised by respondents while the distribution of the questionnaire, the questionnaires of the study were distributed by the researcher himself.

3.5. Methods of data Analysis

In this study, descriptive survey methods that make use of both quantitative and qualitative data analysis methods were employed. The collected data were organized in line with the basic research questions. To analyze the quantitative data, some statistical data analysis tools such as percentage, mean and grand mean and weighted mean scores and One-way ANOVA were used. Percentages were used to explain the characteristics of respondents,

the status of teachers' involvement in action research, and the extent of teachers' knowledge acquaintance in doing action research. The mean was calculated to identify the major factors that impede the participation teachers in action research in the zone. One-way ANOVA test used to know the whether or not the response give by the three group respondents show statistically significant difference.

The response given for open ended question items and interviews were also analysed qualitatively. First, the response of the close ended questionnaire were tallied, counted and computed. Second, responses of the open ended questionnaires and interviews were analyzed interpreted and described. The results obtained from interview, and document analyses were used to substantiate the data gathered through questionnaires. Then, based on the data analyzed, interpretation was made and the major findings were summarized. Finally, conclusions were drawn and feasible recommendations were made.

CHAPTER FOUR

Data Presentation Analysis and Interpretation

This chapter comprises two major parts. The first part of this chapter deals with the background information of the sample population involved in the study and the information gathered from them. Hence the study groups are discussed in terms of sex, age, academic qualification and work experience in the first section of the chapter. The second section of the chapter deals with the analysis of data that was gathered through questionnaire and interview on high schools and secondary school teachers, principals and WEO experts.

This part of the study-report deals with presentation, interpretation and analysis of the data extracted from documents and gathered from respondents through questionnaire and interview. This has been done under the following six headings: Teachers practical involvement in action research, teachers knowledge and acquaintance in doing action research, teachers current competence/skill of doing action research, teachers attitudes towards action research, factors associated with poor knowledge and skill of action research and the role of principals in encouraging action research activities.

4.1. Back ground Information of the respondents

4.1.1 Characteristics of Respondent Teachers for Questionnaires

Since the study was aimed at assessing the extent of teachers' engagement in action research activity in the High Schools of Northern Showa Zone of Oromia, a set of questionnaire was distributed to 112 secondary school teachers to fill in. Out of these 112 questionnaires, 91 (81.25 %) copies of questionnaire were appropriately filled in and returned; while 6 was filled inappropriate and rejected and the rest 18 were left unreturned. Apart from questionnaire, 6 high school Principals, 6 vice directors, 4 CPD committee members and 6 Woreda Education Office Experts were interviewed. Questions

with the rating scale and open-ended questions were provided to teachers while semi-structured interview was conducted with WEO education official, principals and school CPD committee.

As it is seen from the background part of the questionnaire and table here under with its detail analysis teachers of the sampling secondary schools were requested to provide information on one's own personnel profile like sex, age, service years in teaching, current academic qualification and number of periods thought per/week in school.

Table-3- Description of respondents by sex, age, qualification, service years and teaching load per/week.

Item No	Items	Responses		
1.			No	%
	Sex	Male	80	87. 91
		Female	11	12.09
	Total		91	100
2.	Age	20 years and below	5	5.49
		21-30 years	47	51.65
		31-40 years	20	21.98
		41 years and above.	19	20.88
	Total		91	100
3	Qualification	MA	-	
		BA/Bsc	89	97.80
		Diploma or certificate.	2	2.20
	Total		91	100
4	Teaching Experience	5 years and below.	28	30.77
		6-10	21	23.08
		11-15	5	5.49
		16- 20	5	5.49
		21-25	16	17.58
		26 and above	16	17.58
	Total		91	100
5	Teaching load	5-10 period/week	5	5.49
		11-15 period/week	13	14.29
		16-20 period/week	46	50.55
		21-25 period/week	21	23.08
		26-30 period/week	6	6.59
		31 and above period/week	-	-
	Total		91	100

As sown from the above table, the general back ground information of the respondent teachers under the study indicated that female respondent are only about 11(12.09%) of the total respondent in which 80(87.91%) of the respondents constitute male. This broad gap in number of male and female teacher respondents show that the exposure of female teachers in conducting action research in the secondary school of NSZORS seems very low.

Age wise, 5(5.49 %) teacher respondents are found in the range of 20 years of age and below. About 47 (51.65 %) of them are in the range of 21 to 30 years range. Combined together those respondents who were in the range of 21 to 40 years are 67 in number (72.83 %) and 19(20.88 %) of the respondents are included in age above 41 years of age. From the above description, possible it is to say that the majority of teaching staff in the setting area are at their active participation age group.

With regard to the years of teaching services in teaching, as indicated in the table 1 above, 28 (30.77 %t) of the respondents replied that they have served for about one to five years, which shows relatively high proportion of all the rest service year categories given above and followed by 21(23.08 % of the respondents that have served for about six to ten years. 10(10.98%) of the respondents comprise those teachers served for 11 to 20 years of age. The 16(17.58 %) have served in the range of 21 to 25 years and the rest 16(17.58 %) respondent have served for 26 years and above.

If we consider the teaching experience ranging 1 to 5 years as a lesser experience, small portion of the respondents are less experienced. On the other hand, if we consider 6 to 20 as high experienced staff, the number of respondents in this range constitutes reasonable work experience evaluating and responding to situations with matured judgement.

Concerning academic qualification of the respondents, 89(97.80 percent) of teachers are BA/Bsc holders, while 2(2.2 %) of the respondents are diploma. Logically the more qualified the staff of the school, the more they concerned to engaged in problem solving activity such as in doing quality action

research is one of the expected. And which all the respondents are believed that could make reliable and dependable responses for the items they requested.

With respect to teaching load, as table shows that 5(5.49 %) and 13(14.29 %) of the respondents reported that they are teaching 5 to 10 and 11 to 15 periods per week respectively. About 40(50.55%) of the respondents responded that they are teaching 16 to 20 periods per week while 21(23.08%) of them teach 21 to 25 periods per week. The rest 6(6.59 %) of respondents are teaching 26 to 30 period per week.

From the above table 1, it is possible to say the majority of teaching staff in the North Showa Zone of Oromia Regional State secondary schools are neither overloaded nor under loaded. 85(92.39%) of the staff are in a moderate position while few proportion 6(6.59 %) of the respondent are seems to be overloaded. Therefore, it is not difficult to see that teachers in the setting area have good time to engage in conducting action research even though their current participation rate is low.

4.1.2. Characteristics of the Interviewees and the Focus Group Discussant

The characteristics of the interviewees and attendants of group discussion were seen in terms of age, sex, services years and academic qualification. Table 2 gives detail information about the interviews and of those participants in focus group discussion. The participants of group discussion and interviewees all are male and most of them are lie in the age ranging of 21 years to 45 years. The majority of them BA/Bsc holders and almost all of whom served for 16 years and above.

Table 4: The general characteristics of interviewees and focus group attendants of their age, sex, service years and academic qualifications.

No	Items		Respondents	
1	Sex		No	%
		Male	21	100
		Female	-	
		Total		100.00
2	Age	20years and below	4	
		21-30	13	19.05
		31-40	4	61.90
		41 and above	-	19.05
	Total		21	100.00
3	Qualification	MA	-	
		BA/BSC	18	85.71
		Diploma	3	14.29
		Certificate	-	
	Total		21	100.00
4	Service	5 years and below.	-	
		6-10	4	19.05
		11-15	2	9.52
		16- 20	5	23.81
		21-25	4	19.05
		26 and above	6	28.57

4.2. Teachers' Practical involvement in Action Research

Action research has the potential to generate genuine and sustained improvements in schools. Hopkins (2002:32) discussed that action research gives educators new opportunities to reflect on and assess their teaching, to explore and test new ideas, and materials to assess how effective the new approaches to share feedback with fellow team member.

Thus, to extract the extent to which teachers reflect opportunity of exploring new ideas in solving the school related problems teachers were asked to report 'to what extent they engage in action research. For this the teachers were grouped into three based on their Career structure level developed by MoE (2004:29). That is Beginner and Junior teachers taken in group one, Fully registered teacher and Senior teacher grouped in group two and Associate lead and Lead teachers taken as group 3. Classifying teachers into

these groups was to identify and comparer their practical involvement in conducting action research. Accordingly, the sampled teachers were asked whether or not they practice to conduct action research.

Table 5a: Teachers' views on their involvement in action research

Item No	Item		G1		G2		G3	
			No	%	No	%	No	%
3.1a	Did you ever conduct action research?	Yes	19	67.86	18	58.06	25	78.13
		No	9	32.14	13	41.94	7	21.88
3.1b	Are you doing action research now?	Yes	7	25	5	16.13	4	12.5
		No	21	75	26	83.87	28	87.5

G1 = group 1(beginner and Junior Teacher with service years of 1 to 5)

G2= group 2(Fully registered and senior teacher with service years of 6 to 13)

G3= group 3(Associate Lead and lead teacher with service years of 14 and above)

As it can be seen under item 3.1a of Table 5a above, most of the respondents 19(67.86%) in group one were involved in action research work. Only 9 (32.14%) of this group respondents reported that they were not involved in carrying out action research. On the other hand out of 31 respondent teachers in group two and out of 32 teachers in group three 18(56.07%) and 25(40.63%) of respondent teachers respectively reported that they were involving in doing action research. Thus, the result shows that majority of the teachers in the study area were conducting action research.

As it is presented in Table 5a of item 3.1b, the majority 21(75%), 26(83.87%) and 28(87.5%) of respondents in group one, two and three respectively reported that they were not conducted action research now. On the other hand, 7(25%), 5(16.3) and 4(12.5%) of respondents from the three group respectively reported that they were conducting action research now. Thus, we can conclude that majority of teachers in the NSZORS were not involved in action research.

Research is an activity that focuses on the solution of problems teachers should practice this activity in order to solve school problems and to create new generally applicable knowledge. But teachers in the study area have

limited evolvement. Thus, it can be concluded that unless alternative measures are taken by the concerned body to improve the practice of action research in high schools of the study area the effectiveness of schools would be questionable.

Table 5b: Teachers' view on their involvement on action research

No	Items	Response N = 53						Mean	Grand Mean Mean	Comparing means One-way ANOVA	
		Group		4	3	2	1			F	Sig
3.2	Extent you involved In conducting action Research.	1	No	4	5	-	-	3.04	3.02	3.012	.058
			%	44.44	55.56						
		2	No	2	10	6		2.78			
			%	11.11	55.56	33.33					
		3	No	7	13	6		3.04			
			%	26.92	50	23.08					
3.5	Do your Colleagues in the schools conduct action research to solve their instructional Problems?	1	No	3	11	9	5	2.54	2.27	1.188	.310
			%	10.71	39.29	32.14	17.86				
		2	No		11	15	5	2.19			
			%		35.48	48.39	16.13				
		3	No	2	9	11	10	2.09			
			%	6.25	28.13	34.38	31.25				

Rating scale*4= Highly involved 3= moderately involved 2= Rerlely involvement 1= Not involved at all

*4= Yes, most of them 3= yes, some of them 2= Yes, few of them 1= None of them

Respondents who gave a positive response on item 3.1a above were also asked to rate the degree to which they carried out action research. As shown item number 3.2 of Table 5b, 4(44.44%) of respondents with service years of 1-5, 2(11.11%) of respondents with service years of 6-13 and 7(28%) of respondents with service years of 13 and above were responded that they have involved highly in action research work while 5(55.56%), 10(55.56%) and 13(52%) of the respondents with service years of 1-5, 6-13 and above 13 respectively responded that they have moderately involved in action research. The rest 6(33.3) and 6(24%) of the respondents with service years of 6-13 and above respectively were responded as they have low involvement in action research.

Similarly, as can be seen from that above table concerning teachers view about the involvement of teachers in action research was rated by both group one, two and three as moderate with the mean value of 3.04,2.78 and3.04 respectively. Even if the result implies that teachers involvement in action research as was not as expected by the system. i.e their practical involvement was limited.

Information related to this issue was also gathered through interview from selected discussants of WEO experts, school principals and school deputies and CPD committees. And their responses was became complement for the response obtained from the teacher. From this it was possible to conclude that the participation rate of high school teachers in action research was to be very much limited and needs immediate solution for the reason that today's dynamic world demanded an all rounded person who cope up himself with the existing condition. In producing such person, teachers are expected to make all their teaching learning activities research based and equip pupils with the right knowledge.

Although most (19 or 67.88%) and (13 or 41.94%) of the respondents from the two groups (with1-5 years of services and 6-13years) were not involved in action research work, 52(57.14%) of the respondents in the setting (in all group) have little involvement and there was also redundancy of idea in their action research work as listed answers for item 2.3 which was not as such helpful to improve and solve classroom instructional problem.

Further, to confirm the status of teachers' practical involvement in school on action research activities, the respondents in all groups were asked to indicate the degree of their feeling at which their colleagues involved in action research work to solve classroom instructional problems. Majority of the respondents, 31(34.07%) and 35(38.46%) agreed that some of and few of their colleagues are involved in action research respectively. While 20(21.98%) of the sample respondents reported that none of their colleagues involved in action research. It was only 5(8.33%) of the respondents from group one and three responded as most teachers conduct action research.

Moreover, one-way ANOVA was employed to test if there was a discipancy among the response of the three groups. The ANOVA result shows that there was no significant mean difference among the the views of the group respondents at0.05 degree of freedom regarding the views listed in Table 5b which are considered to be hindering factors in teachers involvement in action research.

Thus, the above result obtained above showed that the practical involvement of teachers in action research work was found in a problem for which all the practitioners were responsible about it though a number of problems face them on their way. Therefore, the extent to which teachers practically involving in action research work in the setting was found to be very low which needs immediate solution to alleviate the problem.

Table 6: Teachers' views on the status of conducting action research

No	Item	Group 1 (N=28)			Group 2 (N=31)			Group 3 (N= 32)			Weighted mean
3.6	The current status of teachers'participation in action research	N°	%	Mean	N°	%	mean	N°	%	Mean	
	Very high	2	7.14		-	-		-		2.09	
	high	5	17.86		1	3.23		2	6.25		
	Moderate	6	21.42	2.5	13	41.94		3	9.38		
	Low	7	25.00		10	32.26	2.56	23	71.88		2.38
	Very low	8	28.57		7	22.58		4	12.5		
	Total	28	100		31	100		32	100		

Rating Scale 5= Very high 4= high 3= Moderate 2= Low 1= Very low

Regarding the current status of teachers involvement in action research as it was shown in the above table, majority 69(75.82%) of the respondents reported as moderate and below on the rating scale. The calculated mean value of the three groups responses (2.50, 2.56, and 2.09 for group one, two and three respectively) also indicated that the current teachers' practical involvement in action research was found to be low.

In addition to the mean, weighted mean was also employed to see if there was any discrepancy between the groups' respondents the current status of teachers' participation in action research. The result of the weighted mean showed that there is no significance difference among the three groups of respondents by their view regarding the issue under discussion. Similarly, the interview carried out with the school principals, vice directors and CPD

committee for counter checks confirmed that the current teachers' practical involvement in action research works was low. In addition the CPD committee reported that except one school the other school teachers' were not involved in action research.

Therefore, from the above result it can be concluded that few teachers were engaged in action research to make their teaching action research based in the high schools of the sampled schools.

4.3. Teachers Knowledge and Acquaintance in Doing Action Research

To perform any activity, it is quiet necessary to have the overall knowledge about the activity to complete it very well. Therefore, to engage in action research activity, teachers are required to have the knowledge and acquaintance of doing action research. Based on this attempt has been made to assess teachers' knowledge and acquaintance of action research.

As indicated in Table 7 of item 2.1 below, the majority of respondents in group one, two and three i.e. 26(92.86%), 29(93.55%) and 31(96.88%) respectively reported that they have taken research methodology courses when they were a collage student indicating that they have acquire the knowledge of conducting action research.

Table 7: Teachers views on Knowledge and acquaintance in doing action research

Item no	Item	Characteristic categories	G1 N=28		G2 N=31		G3 N=32	
2.1	Have you taken research methodology course in your college training?		F	%	f	%	F	%
		Yes	26	92.86	29	93.55	31	96.88
		No	2	7.14	2	6.45	1	3.12
		Total	28	100	31	100	32	100
2.2	If "yes "to item one, is the course adequate to lay base to do action research?	Yes	23	88.46	24	77.41	25	78.13
		No	3	11.54	5	16.13	7	21.88
		Total	26	100	29	100	32	100
2.3	Have you participated in any seminars, workshops or training concerning action research issue/	Yes	7	25.%	8	25.81%	16	50%
		No	21	75%	23	74.19%	16	50.%
		Total	28	100%	31	100.%	32	100%
2.4	If your answer for item '2.3' to what extent it helps you in conducting action research?	A/very high	-	-	1	12.5%	2	12.5%
		B/High	5	71.43%	3	37.5%	3	18.75%
		C/Moderate	2	28.57%	4	50 %	5	31.25%
		D/Low	-	-	-	-	4	25%
		E. Very low	-	-	-	-	-	
		Total	7	100%	8	100%	14	100%

G= Group F= Frequency % = Percent N= Number

From this it is possible to understand that most of teaches in the high schools of the setting could practice action research in solving their classroom related problems. Furthermore, when they were asked for item 2.2 of Table 7 above, almost significant percent of them 23(88.46%), 24(77.41%) and 25(78.13%) have reported that the course they took in their college learning was found adequate to lay base for their research knowledge. On the other hand small proportion 3(11.54%), 5(16.13%) and 7(21.88 %) of the three groups respectively reported that the course they have taken in their college learning was inadequate to lay base for their knowledge to do action research.

From this it is possible to understand that most of teachers working in high schools of NSZORS have had base to conduct action research even if they are not engaged.

Regarding item 2.3 of Table 7 above, smaller proportion of the respondents 7(25 %), 8 (25.81 %) and 16(50 %) in all the three groups respectively reported that they have participated on different workshops, seminars or in service training to improve and rehearse their action research knowledge. While the majority of respondents from group one, two and three i.e 21(75 %), 23(74.19%) and 16(50%) reported that they have not participated on any seminars or workshops or in service training other than the course they have taken in college. This implies that may be the role played by WEO experts, School principals in provision of training and exerting efforts was week. Thus, the concerned bodies are expected to do a lot in provision of training for teachers in high schools of NSZORS.

From this we can deduce that majority of teachers have not participated on any seminars or workshops or in service training to empower their knowledge on how to do action research.

This finding seems to contradict with the finding obtained by Aster Alemu (2004) in her study conducted on primary schools of Sidama Zone assessing factors that affecting teachers' to carry out action research. Asters study

revealed the majority of teachers in the concerned study reported that the training they took in college /TTI was not adequate enough to enable them undertake research independently.

In addition, the respondents who participated in seminars and workshops were asked weather the training have helped them or not to carryout action research. Accordingly 56.8% of the respondents who have participated in seminar, workshop or in-service training have responded that only moderate or below that.

The interview response reviewed from school principals, WEO experts and CPD committee also revealed that no workshops, seminars or training conducted to teachers on action research issue which is to mean the issue is not given emphasis as to the policy said. But CPD committee has been tried to prepare training on school level however not carried out due to financial constraints and others.

Generally, the research course given for the teachers during their college learning was sufficient to lay base/knowledge on how to do action research even though it was not supported by seminars workshops and in-service training. And the majority of respondents from those who took seminars workshops and in-service training have responded that the training was not much helpful to conduct action research. Because as they have reported in open ended questions that the training was not supported practically due to lack of available research resources. More over some respondents in FGD from CPD committee suggests that the concerned body has to facilitate conditions in order to alleviate these problems. This indicates that action research activity in the study area found under problem. As a result the benefit of action research was not consumed.

4.4. Teachers' Skills in Doing Action Research

Even though the knowledge of any activity is very important, it is necessary to have the skill to accomplish a desired activity successfully. Based on this, the level of teachers' competence (in skill) in doing action research was

investigated in terms of their confidence to do action research. At the same time, questions were posed to examine conditions that impede teachers to have good skill in doing action research as shown in the following table.

As it was indicated in Table 8 of item 4.1 below, few of respondents 2(7.1%),1(3.2%) and 2(6.31%) reported very high, 11(39.3%), 13(41.9%) and 6(18.75%) reported high and 12(42.9%), 15(48.4%) and 14(43.75%) reported moderate respectively by group one two and three. Thus, the confidence of individual teacher to do action research keeping its basic procedure was found to be moderate and above that. In addition, 3(10.7%) of group one, 1(3.2%) of group two and 8(25%) of group three responded as it was found to be low, and 1(3.2%) of group two and 2(6.25%) of group three claimed as it found very low.

Table 8: Teachers' view on skill of doing action research.

No	Item	Scale	Group1	%	Mean	Group2		Mean	Group3		Mean	Weighted mean
4.1	Your confidence in carrying out action research keeping its procedure?	5	2	7.1		1	3.2		2	6.31	2.94	3.251
		4	11	39.3		13	41.9		6	18.75		
		3	12	42.9		15	48.4		14	43.75		
		2	3	10.7		1	3.2		8	25		
		1			3.43	1	3.2	3.39	2	6.25		
4.2	How do you rate your knowledge of doing action research?	5	2	7.1		1	3.23		2	6.25	3.00	3.275
		4	10	35.7		13	41.94		8	25		
		3	12	42.9		15	48.39		12	37.5		
		2	4	14.3		2	6.45	3.47	8	25		
		1	-		3.36				2	6.25		
4.3	How do you rate your colleagues' Action research skill?	5	1	3.57		-		3.35	2	6.25	3.00	3.16
		4	7	25		9	19.36		6	18.75		
		3	18	64.29		20	64.52		14	43.75		
		2	-			4	12.90		6	18.75		
		1	1	3.75	3.14	-			4	12.5		

Rating Scale 5= Very high 4= high 3= Moderate 2= Low 1= Very low

The calculated grand mean value 3.25 for item 4.1 shows that the majority of the teachers in the study area have sufficient confidence as their grand mean value greater than 3. Therefore from this, one can realized that the low involvement of teachers in action research practice seems not related to lack of confidence.

As far as teachers skill of doing action research was concerned, still the data shows moderate and above moderate that supported by 2(7.1%), 10(35.7%) and 12(42.9%) of group one, 1(3.23%), 13(41.94%) and 15(48.39%) of group two and 2(6.25%), 8(25%) and 12(37.5%) of group three respondents reported very high, high and moderate respectively by each group. The rest 4(14.3%) of group one, 2(6.45%) of group two and 8(25%) of group three reported low. And still minority respondents of group three 2(6.25%) reported as very low.

The interview responses of WEO experts, school principals and CPD committee also confirmed that teachers have skill and confidence .But they did not involved in practice using action research.

The calculated mean value of the above item 4.2 for each of the three groups was above 3.00 which show that teachers of the setting have sufficient skill of doing action research activities. This finding seems to contradict Aster's (2004) investigation which reveals the view that the level of teachers' competence in the skill and knowledge to do action research is found to be unsatisfactory.

Regarding the skill of action research for teachers colleagues' as indicated in table 4.3, the majority of the respondents were found to be moderate and above moderate on rating scale, while 4(12.90%) of group two, 6(25.00%)of group three and, 1(3.57%) of group one and 4(12.50%) of group three respondents have reported as low and very low respectively.

As the weighted mean value 3.16 in Table 8 for item 4.3 showed that the skill of teachers' colleagues was found to be moderate and above moderate. This may be one of the advantages for sharing skills among teachers when co-ordinated by the leaders of the schools. Thus, from this data it is possible to understand that the action research skill and knowledge of teachers' colleagues were found to be high.

4.5. Factors Affecting Teachers in Conducting Action Research

4.5.1. Factors Associated with Poor Knowledge and Skill of Action Research

In order to probe internal impediments (on availability of resources), teacher respondents were asked to rate item 4.4.1 to item 4.4.5. And these items were analyzed as indicated in the table below.

With regard to the extent of influencing factors associated with poor knowledge and skill of action research as indicated in Table 9 below respondents for items 4.4.1.1 to 4.4.1.3 were reported as moderate and below that except for action research trend.

As indicated in items of Table 9, the majority of respondents i.e. 36 (55.39%) about lack of awareness, 35(53.85%) about lack of interest and 35(53.85%) about undermining the role of action reported that the variables were not influencing factors associated with teachers poor knowledge and skill of action research. In contrast to these, the absence of action research trend in school was the only factors rated by teachers that associated with teachers poor knowledge and skill of action research.

Thus, principals, WEO expert and other stake holders may not involved in organizing training and seminars so as to enable teachers using their potential to carry out action research.

Table9: Respondents view on factors associated with poor knowledge and skill of action research.

No	Factors	Respondents N=65					Mean value
		1	2	3	4	5	
4.4..1	Lack of awareness about the contribution of action research in improving instructional problem.	14	22	8	8	13	3.246
		21.54%	33.85%	12.31%	12.31%	20.00%	
4.4.2	Lack of research trend in the school	3	9	11	21	21	2.67
		4.62%	13.58%	16.92%	32.31%	32.31%	
4.4.3	Lack of interest to carry out action research.	13	22	14	4	12	3.308
		20.00%	33.85%	21.54%	6.15%	18.46%	
4.4.4	Lack of enough research skill.	8	11	16	14	8	2.585
		12.31%	16.92%	24.62%	21.54%	12.31%	
4.4.5	Undermining the role of action research in improving classroom activities.	7	12	12	11	24	2.539
		10.77%	18.46%	18.46%	16.92%	36.92%	

Rating Scale 5= Very high 4= high 3= **Moderate** 2= **Low** 1= **Very low**

As stated in Table 9 of item 4.4.1, the number of teachers who were given their view to insufficiency (low and very low) of awareness about action research was by far less than teachers who reported that they have sufficient(very high and high) awareness about the importance of action research in all the groups. The mean value 3.2 indicates that most teachers in all groups know the role of action research in solving school problems and this factor is not associated with teachers' poor knowledge and skill of action research.

The interview held on 16/01/2011 with school principals confirmed that teachers in their schools were not using action research to solve problem they faced. As one case, they said that the school management was not facilitating conditions such as provision of materials for doing action research.

On the other hand, The responses of the interview conducted with the CPD Committee who was included in the study for cross checking purposes presented as follows:

The aim of the interview is to assess challenges that hinder teacher involvement in action research. The majority of the CPD committee respondents in all sampled schools confirmed that the fragmented in-staff training they had offered teachers and their mentoring services as CPD committee was not adequate, the support given by school administration were insufficient, and stakeholders coordination for the development of action research work in the school was poor . Therefore, from the above data, one can concluded that absence of action research trend in school was a serious factor that hinders teachers' engagement in action research.

4.5.2. Barriers to Teachers' Engagement in Action Research

4.5.2.1. Availability of Resources in the School

Teachers' involvement in action research work can be influenced by a number of barriers. Concerning this Syoum 1998 mentioned that "variables like mastery of knowledge, skills, interest, discipline research facilities, time, research fund, incentive, availability of data and culture (Syoum, 1998:28)." were among the barriers needed to be considered and eliminated. Accordingly, some of the barriers to teachers' engagement in action research are discussed below.

Table10: Respondents views on barriers to teachers' engagement in action research.

No	Item	Rating scale										Weighted mean
6	Availability of	5		4		3		2		1		
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
6.1	Time	11	12.09	11	12.09	28	30.77	20	21.98	21	23.08	2.58
6.2	Books	6	6.59	10	10.99	20	21.99	25	27.47	30	32.97	2.17
6.3	News paper, journals,research paper e.t.c.	9	9.89	3	3.30	9	9.89	19	20.88	51	56.04	1.91
6.4	Financial assistance.	6	6.98	8	8.79	6	6.59	26	28.57	55	60.44	1.81
6.5	Extent of stationary materials	8	8.79	9	9.89	17	18.68	15	16.48	42	46.15	2.19
6.6	Room and place.	9	9.89	9	9.89	10	10.99	20	21.99	43	47.25	2.18

Rating Scale 5= Very high 4= high 3= Moderate 2= Low 1= Very low

Regarding the barriers indicated in table 10 below, majority of respondents, i.e.41(%),55(%), 70(%),71(%),57(%),and 63(%) respectively reported that all variables have high influence to teacher engagement in action research. In contrast some i.e.22(%),16(%), 12(%),14(%),17(%),and 18(%) of the respondents reported that the variables mentioned above have low influence to teachers engagement in action research. While the rest of respondents reported moderate.

In addition, the mean value for each items (6.1 to 6.6) in table 10 are below 3(average mean value) which reveals that the problems have high influence to teachers engagement in action research. Therefore, one can deduced that the above indicated variables were constraint for teachers' engagement in action research in the study area. So that the above problem should be improved to increase teachers engagement in action research in the study area of NSZORS.

4.5.2.2. Collaborative Culture of the School

It is important to consider that the major characteristics of collaborative school culture used in this study (as Teachers work together to develop shared technical knowledge and discover common solution to challenging problems (Little, 1982), (Hargreaves 1991:41).

Table 11: Teachers feeling towards collaborative doing of action research.

No	In our school	G		Rating scale					Mean	Average mean
				5	4	3	2	1		
7.1	Teachers do action research together	1	N	3	3	12	5	6	2.82	2.35
			%	10.71	10.71	42.86	17.86	21.43		
		2	N	2	3	9	7	11	2.39	
			%	6.45	9.68	29.03	22.58	35.49		
		3	N	2	1	8	13	8	1.84	
			%	6.25	3.13	25.00	40.63	25.00		
7.2	Teachers believes that action research is useful activity to improve school related problems.	1	N	5	13	6	1	3	3.57	3.50
			%	17.86	46.43	21.43	3.57	10.71		
		2	N	7	14	5	1	4	3.61	
			%	22.58	45.16	16.13	3.23	12.90		
		3	N	10	8	8	-	6	3.31	
			%	31.25	25.00	25.00		18.75		
7.3	Teachers are committed to do action research.	1	N	11	8	4	3	2	3.82	3.57
			%	39.29	28.57	14.29	10.71	7.14		
		2	N	9	11	1	6	4	3.48	
			%	29.03	39.29	3.57	19.36	12.90		
		3	N	7	10	8	4	3	3.44	
			%	21.88	31.25	25.00	12.50	9.38		

NB. 5=S. agree 4= Agree 3= Undecided 2=Disagree 1=S. disagree.
G= Group. N= Number of respondents % = Percent

Much of what occurs in school must be interpreted in the context of the school cultures. Because the shared believes of capacity and ability of teachers and administrative are among the important parts of the school culture.Regardin these Bolman and Terrence Deal (2003) show the importance the nature of interaction among the school community in changing the school stating "the analysis of schools in terms of culture calls attention to the symbolic nature of social interactions in the school". Based on this concepts respondents were asked whether they agree or not in the presence of collaborative school culture in secondary school of NSZORS.

As can be seen from the above Table 11 of item 7.1, 11(39.29%) of group 1 respondents disagreed that teachers do action research together while 12(38.71%) of these respondents reported that they did not decided. The majority 18(58.07%) of group 2 respondents also disagreed the idea. The majority of 3rd group of respondents also disagreed that teachers do action research together. The weighted mean for the 3 groups of the respondents was also found to be 2.35.

Thus, it can be concluded that there was no collaborative culture of doing action research among teachers of the study area though collaborative culture of doing research enables teachers to develop awareness and share experience of doing action research.

Regarding item 7.2 of Table 11 above, 18(64.29%) of group 1 respondents agreed that teachers believe action research is a useful activity. Similarly, 21(67.74%) and 18(56.25%) of group 2 and group 3 respondents respectively indicated that they agreed on the idea. The weighted mean of the 3 groups was found to be 3.5 indicating that respondents believed action research was useful activity.

Supporting the above idea Ferrance (2000:15) stated that action research worth while pursuit for educators for five reasons. i.e. to focus on school issues, form teachers professional development, increase collegial interaction, potential to impact school change ,for reflecting on own practices and improve communication.

Although there was the absence of doing action research in the study area, the data show that action research was believed to be important by high school teachers of the study area.

The finding under item 7.3 of Table 11 indicate that 19(67.86%), 20(64.52%) and 17(53.13%) of group1.Group2 and group 3 respondents respectively agreed that teachers were committed to do action research.

As it can be seen from item 7.4 of Table 12 below, 6(21.43%), 5(16.13%) and 7(21.88%) of respondent in group1, 2 and 3 respectively agreed that management bodies in schools encourage teachers to do action research. On the other hand, majority 16(57.14%), 23(74.19%) and 25(78.13%) of respondents from group one, two and three respectively disagreed with the opinion. While 7(25.00%), 3(9.68%) and 4(12.50%) of respondents from all the group were unable to decided on the opinion. This suggests that management bodies do not put efforts to encourage teachers to do action research. Therefore, teachers have limited engagement in action research.

Regarding item 7.5 of Table 12, respondents were asked whether or not teachers in the study area believe that employing action research enables to bring improvements on students' achievement. Accordingly, considerable percentage 22(78.57%), 21(67.74%) and 23(71.88%) of the respondents in group one, two and three respectively agree with the opinion. While 4(14.29%), 6(19.36%) and 7(21.88%) reported that they were undecided and small number 4(14.29%), 6(19.36%) and 7(21.88%) of the respondents in group one, two and three were respectively disagree with the idea.

Table 12: Believe of teachers in collaborative culture of the school.

No	In our school	Responses								
		Group		S. agree	Agree	Undecid	Disagr	S. disag	Mean	W. Mean
7.4	Management bodies in schools encourage teachers to do action research.	1	No	4	2	7	12	4	2.75	2.41
			%	14.29	3.57	25.00	42.86	14.29		
		2	No	2	3	3	10	13	2.07	
			%	6.45	9.68	9.68	32.26	41.94		
		3	No	6	1	4	17	8	2.44	
			%	18.75	3.13	12.50	53.13	50.00		
7.5	Teachers believes that employing (conducting) action research enables to bring improvements on students achievement.	1	No	5	17	4	-	2	3.82	3.78
			%	17.86	60.71	14.29	-	7.14		
		2	No	6	15	6	2	2	3.68	
			%	19.36	48.39	19.36	6.45	6.45		
		3	No	8	15	7	-	2	3.84	
			%	25.00	25.00	43.75	-	6.25		

5= s. agree 4= agree 3= undecided 2= disagree 1= s. **disagree**

Thus, the results of this finding showed that teachers believed that action research enables them to bring improvements on students' achievement. The weighted mean 3.78 for item 7.5 Table 11 was also supported the above mentioned response by the teachers.

From this one can conclude that high school teachers in NSZORS have believed to the importance of action research and as they required conduct action research in increasing the achievement of their students.

4.5.2.3. Role of Principals and Deputies in Facilitating Action Research

The attempt made by school principals on peoples understanding of their job accountability have its own impact on creating conducive environment to perform different work by teachers in the school. Principals skill of delegating duties, the way they are communicating issues with subordinate, the decision making they carry out is influential on the over all teaching and learning process in general and activities of action research in particular. Accordingly, to know the role of North Showa Zone Oromia Regional state secondary school principals ten questions was forwarded in the form of statement for the respondent to show their level of understanding of their principals in their

managerial skill and the role played by them to improve school activities such as encouraging action research work. While in filling the questionnaire they put an "X" mark in the columns about the statement using the five point likert scale 1= very low ,2= low 3=Moderate 4high 5.Very high. Finally the results are summarized in the table bellow.

Concerning item 8.1 Table 13 above, 20(71.43%) of group 1 respondents reported that Principals out look to share ideas on action research with teachers was found to be low. Similarly 20(64.52%) of group 2 and 20(62.5%) of group 3 respectively provided the same responses against the item 3. The weighted mean was found to be 2.47 which show that the sharing of idea between teachers and principals was low.

Under item 8.2 of Table 13 below, the majority 16(57.14%) of group 1 respondents reported that principals recognize the importance of action research. The majority 15(48.39) of group 2 respondents also reported high. Similarly, 16(50%) of group 3 respondents reported that principals recognize the importance of action research. The weighted mean was also found to be 3.24 indicating that principals recognize the importance of action research.

Regarding item 8.3 Table 13 above, 17(80.95%), 21(67.74%) and 19(59.38%) of group 1,group 2 and group 3 respondents respectively reported that principals provision of clear sense of direction for teachers to conduct action research was found to be low. The weighted mean also found to be 2.37. This shows that the provision of clear sense of direction on action research for teachers by principals was low.

Table13: The Role of Principals and their Deputies in facilitating Action Research

No	In my school, principals and Deputies	Responses Group		V. High	High	Moderat	Low	V. Low	Mean	Weighted mean
8.1	accept teachers action research plan	1	No	1	4	3	13	7	2.25	2.47
			%	3.57	14.29	10.71	46.43	25		
		2	No	2	4	5	15	5	2.58	
			%	6.45	12.90	16.13	48.39	16.13		
		3	No	2	5	5	17	3	2.56	
			%	6.25	15.63	15.63	53.13	9.38		
8.2	recognize the importance of action research.	1	No	2	14	6	3	3	3.32	3.24
			%	7.14	50	21.43	10.71	10.71		
		2	No	7	8	6	8	2	3.32	
			%	22.58	25.81	19.36	25.81	6.45		
		3	No	3	13	4	7	5	3.1	
			%	9.38	40.63	12.5	21.88	15.63		
8.3	Provide clear sense of direction for teachers to conduct action research	1	No	4	2	5	7	10	2.39	2.37
			%	14.29	7.14	17.86	25	35.71		
		2	No	-	3	7	14	7	2.19	
			%		9.68	22.58	45.16	22.58		
		3	No	2	6	7	9	8	2.53	
			%	6.25	18.75	21.88	28.13	25		
8.4	Do have plans to encourage teachers to do action research.	1	No	1	3	3	15	6	2.21	2.42
			%	3.57	10.71	10.71	53.57	21.43		
		2	No	4	4	5	14	4	2.68	
			%	12.90	12.90	16.12	45.16	12.90		
		3	No	2	4	4	15	7	2.34	
			%	6.25	12.5	12.5	46.88	21.88		

V. high =5 High =4 Moderate =3 Low=2 V. low =1

Regarding item 8.4 of Table 13 below, 21(75%) of group 1 respondents reported that principals did not have plan to encourage teachers to conduct action research. Similarly, 18(58.07%) and 22(68.75%) of group 2 and group 3 respondents respectively opposed the idea. The weighted mean was also found to be 2.42 which reveal that principals did not have planned to encourage teachers to do action research.

In general, the results in Table 13 showed that even if principals recognised the importance of action research, the way they planed to encourage teachers conducting action research, provide clear sense of direction on action research for teachers was found to be low. This may therefore, reveal that principals and their deputies didn't play role in facilitating conditions to conduct action research. This may in turn result in the loss of benefits of action research.

Thus, as to the responses from the majority i.e. 67.03%, 65.93% and 60.44% of the respondents, principals and school deputies were not played roles in planning, providing supports accepting teachers on issue and provide clear sense of direction for teachers in the process of conducting action research

respectively. Similarly, the calculated mean value for each issues in each group was found below the average rating scale of the items (i.e. < 3) indicating the effort done by principals as to leadership were found low.

Table14: Believe of teachers in principals and deputies role to encourage and participating in action research activities.

		Responses								
No	In my school, principals	Group		V. High	High	Moderate	Low	V. Low	Mean	W. Mean
8.5	Involves in action research activities	1	No	3	12	3	5	5	3.12	2.87
			%	10.71	42.86	10.71	17.86	17.86		
		2	No	-	5	11	11	4	2.55	
			%		16.13	35.48	35.48	12.90		
		3	No	5	5	8	9	7	2.94	
			%	15.63	15.63	25	28.13	21.88		
8.6	Make efforts to boost up teachers moral in disseminating research results carried out by teachers.	1	No	3	5	6	8	6	2.68	2.64
			%	10.71	17.86	21.43	28.57	21.43		
		2	No	2	3	9	10	7	2.45	
			%	6.45	9.68	29.03	32.26	22.58		
		3	No	5	4	4	8	11	2.50	
			%	15.63	12.5	12.5	25	34.38		
									Grand mean	2.86

V. high =5 High =4 Moderate =3 Low=2 V. low =1

Next, the respondents were asked about the effort done by principals to adopt conducting action research as one of the cultures in school. Regarding this respondents were reported as they were not reasonably satisfied with both stated items in table 14 above in group or individually.

Generally, the weighted mean values of items 8.5 and 8.6 of Table 14 above, were found to be 2.87and 2.64 respectively that were, less than 3 indicating that principals were not plan to encourage teachers, to give clear direction for teachers conduct action research and involve action research in any way. Thus, these may be the reasons behind for action research not to be cultured in the school.

4.6. Teachers Attitudes towards Action Research

Attitude is simply defined as a positive or negative evaluation of an object (Schumn, 1995) cited in (Stephen, 2000). Further, its components are stated in Stephen work "Attitude are made up of our believe about an object, our feeling about an object and our behaviour towards the object (Stephen, 2000:148). Thus, the attitude of individual or groups towards any activity is very important in performing it very well and the action of individual is influenced by his/her attitude about it. Based on this concept it is essential for teacher researcher to be familiar with the nature of research process and change their attitude before conducting any research work.

In this study an attempt was made to know the attitude of teachers towards class room action research posing questionnaires to the respondents in the form of statements to show their reaction by choosing one among the given five choices ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree".

4.6.1. Teachers Believe about Action Research

As it was indicated in item 5.1 of Table 15 below, the majority (89.3%) of group 1 respondents agreed the idea that teachers should conduct action research to seek solution for problems in teaching and learning process. Similarly, 23(74.2%) of group 2 respondents agreed this idea. This idea was also supported by group 3 respondents similarly. The grand mean value for the 3 groups of respondents was found to be 4.22. This indicates that teachers should conduct action research to seek solutions for problems they face in teaching and learning process. Supporting this Sadker and Lambert elaborate that

> *in the process of teaching learning in the school, the work of schooling or solving specific problems in teaching learning, students, teachers or administrators could be designed different strategies. Of these strategies conducting collective or individual action research is one of the important methods to evaluate the problem faced. Collective action research is carried out when a group teacher identifies a genuine problem in the school, classroom, district, or community; design ways to address the problem, and then evaluate this success through the research method.... (Sadker and Sadker,2003:560,Lambert,1996:86-87).*

As one can see in item 5.1 of Table 15 below , concerning teachers view or believe towards conducting action research to solve school problems, the majority 25(89.3%) of group 1 respondents agreed the idea that teachers should conduct action research to seek solution for problems in teaching and learning process. Similarly, 23(74.2%) of group 2 respondents agreed this idea. This idea was also supported by group 3 respondents similarly. The grand mean value for the 3 groups of respondents was found to be 4.22. This indicates that teachers should conduct action research to seek solutions for problems they face in.

Moreover, one-way ANOVA was employed to test if there was any discrepancy between the responses of the three groups. The result of ANOVA shows that there was no significant mean difference between the views of respondents at 95% level of significance regarding the view stated in the table that was considered to be impediments for teachers engagement in action research.

Concerning item 5.3 of Table 15 below, 21(75%) of the respondents disagreed that conducting action research is time taking activity. Similarly the majority 23(74.2%) and 22(68.75%) of group 2 and group 3 respondents respectively disagreed the idea. The grand mean value was also found to be 3.95 indicating that action research is not time taking. So it should be one of the routine task of teachers to solve problems in schools.

Table 15: Teachers' perception (believe) towards action research.

No	Items	Response						Mean	Weighted Mean	Comparing means One-way ANOVA	
		Group		5	4	3	2	1			F	Sig
5.1	Teachers believed that conducting action research solve school problem.	1	No	13	12	1	1	1	4.25	4.14	.386	.681
			%	46.43	42.86	3.57	3.57	3.57				
		2	No	16	7	4	-	4	4.00			
			%	51.61	22.58	12.90		12.90				
		3	No	16	7	6	1	2	4.19			
			%	50	21.88	18.80	3.13	6.25				
5.3	Teachers believe that Conducting action research is time wasting.	1	No	1	4	2	8	13	4.00	3.95	.179	.836
			%	3.57	14.29	7.14	28.57	46.43				
		2	No	1	2	5	11	12	4.00			
			%	3.23	6.45	16.13	35.48	38.71				
		3	No	2	4	4	9	13	3.84			
			%	6.25	12.5	12.5	28.13	40.63				
5.7	Teachers believe That Conducting action research should be criterion for their promotion.	1	No	6	16	3	-	3	3.79	3.82	.670	.514
			%	21.43	57.14	10.71		10.71				
		2	No	7	15	3	4	2				
			%	22.58	48.39	9.68	12.90	6.45	3.68			
		3	No	13	10	6	2	1				
			%	40.63	31.25	18.75	6.25	3.13	4.00			
5.9	Teachers have the behaviour(believe) of tolerating problems to do action research.	1	No	4	18	3	1	2	3.75	3.81	.118	.889
			%	14.29	64.29	10.71	3.57	7.14				
		2	No	3	21	6	-	1	3.81			
			%	9.68	67.74	21.43	-	3.23				
		3	No	12	10	6	2	2	3.88			
			%	37.5	31.25	19.36	6.25	6.25				
5.11	Teachers believe that action researcl should be conducted only in higher education institutions.	1	No	-	3	2	12	11	1.89	1.77	.712	.493
			%	-	10.78	7.14	42.86	39.29				
		2	No	2	3	1	7	18	1.84			
			%	6.45	9.68	3.23	22.58	58.07				
		3	No	-	2	2	9	19	1.59			
			%	-	6.25	6.25	28.13	59.38				

5 = Highly agree 4= Agree 3= Undecided 2= Disagree 1= Highly disagree

In addition to this, one-way ANOVA was also employed to test if there was any discrepancy between the groups' respondents concerning the time takingness of action research. The result of the ANOVA test and the

associated p-value show that there is no significance difference among the three groups of respondents at 95% level of significance. Therefore, it can be concluded that conducting action research to improve school related problems is not time taking activity.

Regarding item 5.7 of Table 15 teachers view towards action research, the majority 22(78.57%) of group 1 respondents agreed that action research should be considered as a criterion for teachers professional development. Among group 2 respondents 22(71%) agreed that action research should be considered as one of the criterion for teachers professional development. Similarly, 23(71.9%) of group 3 respondents agree the idea. The grand mean value 3.82 also revealed that action research should be taken as one criterion for teachers' professional development.

With regarding to item 5.9 of Table 15 above, the majority of respondents 22(76.8%), 24(77.4%) and 22(68.75%) of group 1, 2 and 3 have agreed that teachers should conduct action research tolerating the existing problems. While 3(10.1%), 1(3.2%) and 4(12.5%) have disagree on the above idea since facilities such as incentives, refreshment training etc have influence their moral. This shows that, teachers in the setting area has detail information about what and who perform action research at any level in the process of making a professional job research based scientifically.

Finally, on the issue of item 5.11 of Table 15 above, the majority 76(83.52%) of the respondents have disagreed the view that research should be conducted only in higher education though 10(10.99%) stand the opposite. While 5(5.5 %) were unable to decide on. Similarly the grand mean value of the groups 1.77 was also showed that all the groups believed as desired conducting action research at their own level to solve problems they faced in the school.

In addition to this, one way ANOVA test was used to confirm weather there is significant difference or not among the three group respondents regarding the level that action research was conducted. And the result of ANOVA test

showed that there is no significant difference among the groups of respondents for issue under discussion at 95% level of significance. Thus, all respondents confirmed that research could be conducted in lower education institutions so that it is the most important means to solve school problems they have to employ. Supporting this Trovers 1968 cited in Amare 2004 "Educational action research represent an activities directed towards the development of an organized body of scientific knowledge about the events with which educators are concerned (Amare, 2004:13)."

Therefore teachers in lower educational institutions such as high schools should conduct action research for the development of the education system and for them selves.

4.6.2. Teachers Feeling on Practicability of Action Research

The international Encyclopaedia of Education (1994) argued that teachers are highly resistant to do action research because of a number of reasons, Cohen and Monion (1994) discussed about the expectation and attitudes of the teachers resistant to the relevance of classroom action research. Despite this misconception of practitioners about action research, McNiff (1988) defends the application of action research discussing "Action research presents an opportunity for teachers to become uniquely involve in their own practice, to professionalize themselves and to give reasoned justification for what they are doing." McNiff (1988:xvii).

Based on this concept, the respondents of this study were asked to rate their attitude towards action research as follows.

Regarding item 5.2 of Table 16 below, the majority 23(82.14%) of group 1 respondents agreed that the contribution of action research over weight its expenses. Similarly, 23(74.19%) and 22(68.75%) of group 2 and group 3 respondents respectively agreed to the idea that the contribution of action research over weight its expenses. The weighted mean of the three groups was found to be 3.87 indicating that the contribution of action research weights over its expenses.

Table 16: The feeling of teachers towards action research .

No	Items	Response								weighted mean
		Group		5	4	3	2	1	Mean	
5.2	Teachers feel that the contribution of action research weighs over its expense .	1	No	10	13	2	-	3		3.867
			%	35.71	46.43	7.14		10.71	3.964	
		2	No	10	13	2	-	6		
			%	32.26	41.94	6.45		19.36	3.677	
			No	13	9	7	2	1		
		3	%	40.63	28.13	21.88	6.25	3.13	3.969	
5.5	Teachers feel That action research has less Contribution to solve educational problems.	1	No	9	6	1	7	5	3.25	3.684
			%	40.91	21.43	3.57	25	17.88		
		2	No	13	9	2	3	4	4.065	
			%	41.94	29.03	6.45	9.68	12.90		
		3	No	13	12	2	3	2	3.969	
			%	40.63	37.5	6.25	9.38	6.25		
5.6	Teachers believe that Action research is time wasting activity.	1	No	1	3	2	7	15		4.165
			%	3.57	25	7.14	25	53.58	4.143	
		2	No	-	2	1	8	20	4.419	
			%		6.45	3.23	25	64.52		
		3	No	3	1	4	12	12	3.938	
			%	9.38	3.13	12.5	37.5	37.5		
5.8	Teachers feel that doing action research enables them solve educational Problems.	1	No	19	5	2	2	-	4.643	4.446
			%	67.86	17.86	7.14	7.14			
		2	No	13	16	1	-	1	4.290	
			%	41.94	51.61	3.23		3.23		
		3	No	17	13	-	2	-	4.406	
			%	53.13	40.63	-	6.25	-		
					Grand mean					3.087

*NB. Responses under item 6 were analysed inversely.

Under item 5.5 of Table 16, 16(57.14%), 22(70.97%) and25 (78.13%) of group 1, 2 and 3 respondents respectively agreed that action research has significant contribution in solving educational problems. The weighted mean for the 3 groups was found to be 3.68 indicating that action research has contribution in solving educational problems.

Regarding item 5.6 of Table 16 above, majority of group 1 respondents, i.e.22 (78.57%) disagreed that action research was a time consuming. Among group 2 respondents, 28(90.32%) also disagreed the idea of the item. Similarly, the majority 24(75%) of group 3 respondents disagreed the idea that action research was a time wasting activity. The weighted mean for the 3 groups also found to be 4.17 indicating action researches is not a time wasting activity.

Regarding item 5.8 of Table 16, the majority 24 (85.71%), 29(93.55%) and 30(93.75%) of group 1, 2 and 3 respectively agreed the idea that action research enables teachers to acquire knowledge of solving educational problems. While 2(7.17%), 1(3.23%) and 2(6.25%) of group1, 2 and 3 were respectively stand to the opposite. The weighted mean for the 3 groups was found to be 4.45 indicating that involving action research enriches one's knowledge and skill.

In general, the results from Table 16 above revealed that benefits of action research overweighed its cost. It was also indicated that action research has contribution in solving educational problems. Furthermore teachers perceived that action research was not time wasting activity, rather as it enables them to acquire knowledge to solve teaching learning problems.

Thus, the data may reveal that even if action research was not conducted in the study area, the attitude of teachers towards action research was found to be positive. As a result it might be possible to say the less involvement of teachers in action research was due to absence of encouragement and supports from the side of school management and other concerned bodies. Therefore, all stake holders in the setting are expected to inculcate the possible mechanism solving the problem.

Table 17: The attitude of teachers towards action research position

No	Items		Rating scale							Weighted Mean
			Group		5	4	3	2	1	Mean	
5.4	Due emphasis should be given to action research .		1	No	4	17	2	2	3	3.607	3.973
				%	14.29	60.71	7.14	7.14	10.71		
			2	No	10	15	4	-	2	4.000	
				%	32.26	48.39	12.9		6.45		
			3	No	13	16	3	-	-	4.313	
				%	40.63	50	9.38	-	-		
5.10	Teaching learning Process should supported by action research		1	No	10	16	-	1	1	4.179	3.993
				%	35.71	57.14	-	3.57	3.57		
			2	No	11	11	6	1	2	3.903	
				%	35.48	35.48	19.36	3.25	6.45		
			3	No	13	9	4	2	4	3.781	
				%	40.63	28.13	12.5	6.25	12.5		
							Grand mean				4.063

NB. 5= highly agree 4= Agree 3= Undecided 2= Disagree 1= Highly disagree

Regarding the position of action research, the majority 21(75%) of group 1, 25(80.64%) of group 2 and 29(93.55%) of group 3 respondents agreed that high emphasis should be given to action research. While few 5(17.85%) of group1 and 2(6.45%) of group 2 and none of group 3 opposed the idea mentioned in item 5.4 of Table 17 above. The weight mean 3.97 also supports the idea that due emphasis should be given to action research being above the average mean 3.

For item 5.10 of Table 17, majorities 26(92.86%) of group 1, 22(70.97%) of group 2 and 22(68.0%) of group 3 of respondent agreed that the teaching learning process should be supported by action research. In contrast few 2(7.14%) of group 1, 3(9.68%) of group 2 and 6(19.36%) of group 3 respondents opposed the idea mentioned in item 5.10 of Table 17. Thus the data may reveal that the teaching learning process should be supported by action research.

CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation

This final chapter of the thesis presents summery of the major findings of this study, the conclusion drawn and on the bases of the finding the possible recommendations that are assumed to be contribute to alleviate the problems related to the work of action research.

5.1. Summary

Action research was undertaken to increase ones own understanding of an immediate school condition with the emphasis on the complexity of school setting to develop strategies that are relevant to that particular school situation. On the other hand it helps teachers to understand changes in the school system so as to cope up with the changes that are taking place.

The study was aimed at investigating how and to what extent secondary schools teachers in the North Showa Zone Oromia Regional State involve in conducting action research to solve classroom instructional problem. The study was also strived to identify the major factors that affect teachers' engagement in action research practice in the study area.

The study was conducted in six high schools of North Showa Zone. The sources of the data in the study were teachers, principals and WEO experts. The study employed questionnaires, interview, and focus group discussion to collect data. The data collected using these tools were being analyzed quantitatively using statistical tools frequency, percentage, mean (mean score and weighted mean). On the other hand, the data collected through observation and interviews were analyzed qualitatively.

In order to achieve the aforementioned aim of the study, the following basic questions were formulated.

1. To what are teachers involved in conducting action research in high schools of North Showa Zone Oromia Regional State?

2. How is the skill of secondary school teachers to conduct action research in NSZORS ?
3. What is the attitude of NSZORS teachers towards conducting action research?
4. What are the factors that hinder teachers' involvement in undertaking action research in the setting?

Based on the analysis made the following findings were obtained.

1. The result from the analyzed data showed that the knowledge and acquaintance of high school teachers in doing action research was found to be sufficient. More over, the result 26(92.86%), 29(93.55%) and 31(96.88%) showed that the adequacy of college course in laying base of action research. In addition 23(88.46%), 24(77.41%) and 25(78.13%) showed that teachers college learning was found important to lay base for their research knowledge.

2. The practical involvement of teachers in action research work was found to be low. The analyzed data showed 19(67.86%), 18(56.07%) and 25(40.63%) of respondent teachers were not involved in conducting action research.

3. Teachers' position towards conducting action research in the study area was found to be very low. As the analyzed data sowed only 4(44.44%) of group 1, 2(11.11%) of group 2 and 7(28%) of group 3 involved and were found in apposition of conducting action research keeping its procedural information.

4. The analyzed data revealed that teachers' skill to do action research was found to be sufficient. More over regarding their confidence in conducting research keeping its basic procedures as the calculated weighted mean value 3.25 showed that the low involvement of teachers in action research practices were not related to lack of confidence.

5. The study indicated that commitment of the school management bodies in giving concern for action research providing clear direction, creating awareness, and adapting action research as school culture were fond to be very low.

6. The interview made with school principal also showed that teachers in their school were not involved in action research. As one case, school management was not facilitating conditions such as providing of materials for action research.

7. The study revealed that the assumed major influencing factors i.e internal factors such as lack of interest, lack of awareness and undermining the role of action research were not associated with teachers' poor involvement in action research.

8. The study revealed that lack of encouragement, lack of school culture in the area of action research, absence of seminars; workshops, in-service training and school management emphasis to other routine office work than action research are the main constraining factors that related to poor action research performance in the study area.

9. The result of his study demonstrated that almost the majority of teachers have positive attitude towards action research in which 22(78.57%) of group 1 22(71%) group 2 and 23(71.9%) of group 3 indicated action research should taken as one criterion for professional development from one ladder to the next that showed teachers positive attitude towards action research.

10. The study also revealed that the attitude of teachers towards action research was found to be positive and this was indicated by the weighted mean result 3.87 from teachers response showing the expense of action research did not weights over its benefits.

Generally, the purpose of action research conducted in the teaching learning process schools has a number of issues to improve and to develop the system. To perform these school management or the leaderships of an institutions are expected provide groups or individual's clear sense of direction to do action research.

However, undertaking action research and its effective utilization in solving problems of teaching learning was influenced by a number of factors. The

major problem teachers of the school encountered to engage in action research practices include the absence of refreshment training, material and moral supports were among the mentioned reasons in the study area.

Again, though they accepted the importance of action research in solving educational problems, enriching ones skill of solving immediate problem and the like, teachers who are the key players in education distanced themselves from engagement in action research. As the result as mentioned above, no efforts were showed by teachers of secondary schools in North Showa Zone to engage in action research.

The other problems observed were that the extent at which teachers of high schools in the study area made attempt to involve in educational action research tolerating the problems were seems very low.

And finally, the attempt made by the concerned body to minimize the problem in the study area was found to be very low. The provision of refreshment training, seminars and workshops for the teachers was not done by stake holders of education system so as to enable them solve problems they face in the teaching learning using action research at all.

5.2. Conclusion

Action research is the means of tackling practically encountered problems in a systematic way. Specially, it is the means for teachers and school administrators learn from their experience to improve or changing the practices in the school. Therefore this study was discussed on the status of teachers' engagement in action research in high schools of North Showa Zone of Oromia . Based on the findings, the following conclusions have been developed.

The basic instruments for conducting successful action research such as the knowledge and acquaintance of stakeholders in high schools of NSZORS was found sufficient. But, the current status of participating action research was found to be weak. Further more, the study indicated that not only the current

practice of action research that found low but principals' commitment to facilitate meaningful action research practices in the school was also found low. Similarly, action research practices are necessary and obligatory to solve school problems in schools to this end the allocation of resources with the right amount is necessary. However, there were shortage of adequate facilities and motivational incentives throughout high schools of the studied zone. This makes practitioners less likely to engage in action research for solving problems in schools. In addition, the study found out that even though practitioners have positive attitude towards action research, their commitment and feeling sense of professionalism in implementing action research was poor.

Thus, the involvement of all stakeholders in action research is important and valuable to solve school problems and to improve students' achievement. In this finding it is indicated that the collaborative culture of school practitioners were inadequate in the sampled zone high schools. Therefore , it is possible to say that problem solving inquiry in the school system of the zone may not in a position to alleviate problems arise in the schools, to judge progress in student achievement and to ensure the teaching learning process of schools is on the track and to make any necessary corrections. From this, one can infer that relevant and timely solutions were hard to give the problems that faced classroom instructional and school related problems in the study zone.

5.3. Recommendation.

Based on the findings of the study and the conclusions made, the following recommendations are forwarded:

1. Teachers involvement in action research the study area was found low. This indicates that engagement of teachers in doing action research in study area requires great efforts. Hence NSZORS has to improve the practice of conducting action research through collaboration with all stakeholders.

2. Teachers should feel sense of professionalism to use action research as one of paramount means to increase the quality of classroom instruction and their competence about the area.
3. Involvement of teachers in action research has to be enhanced tolerating the material constraints in their school at their own level.

4. The government of the regional state in collaborating with other stakeholders are expected to plan ways for improving the professional competence of teachers, closely supervise and collaboratively engaged in action research, jointly organize ongoing workshops, seminars, conferences, and experience sharing program .This may increase the practice of conducting action research in schools and school improvement.

5. As a leadership and management of school institutions, school directors are expected to be a role-model to the school community so as to lead and address the general and specific objectives of the teaching learning institution. i.e. Quality education. Therefore, school directors:

a) Has to plan ways in which action research cultured in the school.
b) Has to involve directly or indirectly in action research activity to be the role model.
c) Has to give room for action research as one of the teaching learning ingredients to improve quality of education. So that, providing teachers clear direction so that teachers can be initiated.
d) Has to organize and conduct training at school level, give incentive for those who engaged in action research, so that teachers moral will boost up to conduct action research and take this evolvement as school culture.

Bibliography

Abrham Zelalem (2004). **Involvement of Secondary School Teachers' in Educational Research in Afar Regional State**. AAU

Alebachew Zewdu (2008). **Action Research on Reflective Teaching in the Plasma Context**. A.A.U.

Amare (2004). **Educational Research Practices of Bahirdar University Teachers:** The Case of Education Faculty. A.A.U.

Andrew P.Johnson.(2002). **A Short Guide to Action Research**. Minnesota State University, Mankato. Allyan And Bacon.

Ashenafi Tsegaye (2007). **Involvement of Preparatory School Teachers in Action Research**: - the case of Gelemso Secondary and Preparatory School. A.A.U

Alebachew Zewdu (2008). **Action Research on Reflective Ceaching in the Plasma Context**. .A.A.U.

Aboji, Okwach (1995). Understanding Social science research :An overview of the nature and Function of Educational Research In Mwaria, Kilemi and Sheila Wamahiu (eds). **Issues in Educational Research in Africa**.Nairobi: Fotoform Ltd.

Aster Alemu (2004). **An Assesment Of Factors Affecting Teachers to carryout Action Research**, With special Reference of The upper Primary Schools of Sidama Zone.

Ayalew Shibeshi and Seyoum Teferre (1989). **Fundamentals of Educational Research for Students and Beginning Researchers**. A.A.U. Dipa. Of EdAd. Faculty of Educ.

Beefekadu Zeleke (2009). The Status, Challenges and Prospect of Action Research in Secondary Schools of Addis Ababa. Tirusew Tefera, Aklilu Dalelo, and Mekasha Kassaye (eds). Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Educational Research for Development(I) 542-565.

Bell, J. (1993). **Doing Your Research Project: A guide for First time Researchers in Education and Social science.** Buckingham: Open University Press.

Bellon, (1992). **Teaching from Research Knowledge Base**. New York. Macmillan.

Best.J.W. and Kahn.James.D.(2003). **Research in Education** (9th ed.). New Delhi: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Bolman and Terrence Deal (2003). **Reforming Organizations**: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership 3rd ed. San Francisco : Jossey-Bass.

Boud, D (1985) Reflection: **Turning Experience into Learning**. London: Kogan Page.

Carr, Wilfred and Kemmis, S. (1986). **Becoming Critical: Education Knowledge and Action Research.** G.Britain the Flamer Press.

Charles,C.(1988). **Introduction to Educational Research.** New York: Longman.

CBPE. (2005). Capacity building and Primary Education Manual. Ethio-Italian Development Cooperation. ESDP Project Monitoring Unit (PMU).

Corey, S.M. (1953). **Action research to improve school practices**. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cohen, L., and Manion, L.(1994). **Research Methods in Education.**(4th ed). London and New York: Rutledge.

Corry, Stephen Maxwell (1953). **Action Research to Improve School Practice.** New York: Horace Mann- Lincoln, Teachers College of Colombia University.

Day, C.(1999). Developing Teachers: **The Challenges of Life Long Learning**. London: Flamers.

Deal, T.E, and Peterson, K.D(1990).**The Principals Role in Shaping School Culture**. Washington, D.C : USA. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Duffy,T.M. and Jonassen, D.J., eds (1992). **Constructivism and the Technology of Instruction:** A conversation. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Eileen Ferrance ,(2000).**Themes in Education : Action Research** Northeast and Islands RegionalEducational laboratory at Brawon University.

Elliott,J.(1991).**Action Research for Educational Change**. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Elliot, J. (1997). **Action Research for Educational Change**. Philadelphia.

Ferrance,E.(2000) **Action Research**. New York. Brown University Press.

Fullan,M. and Hargreaves,A. (1991). **What's Worth Fighting for: Working Together for Your school**. Ontario: Ontario Public School Federation.

Gebeyaw Shitie (2007).**College Teachers' Involvement in Acton Research in Amhara Regional State** .A.A.U.

Gemechu Misso.(2006).**Assessment of Factors Affecting Teachers Engagement in Conducting Educational Research in Colleges of Teacher Education in Oromiya Regional State**. A.A.U.

Grundy,S. (1987). **Curriculum Product or Praxis**. New York: The Flammer Press.

Grundy, S. (1988). Three Methods Of Action Research in Ausrtalia: In Kemmis, S. And McTaggart, R. R.(Ed.). (1988). The Action Research Reader.(3rd ed). Geelong:Deakin University Press. **Three Methods of Action Research**. Geelong: Deakin University Press.

Hasall, R.(1998). **Teacher Research and School Improvement**. Bristo: St Edmundsbury press Ltd.

Hopkins, D. (1996). **A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research**. Buckingham: Open University Press.

_____(2002). **A Teachers Guide to Classroom Research**. (3rded.)London. Open University Press.

_____(2003). **A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research**. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Holter, I.M. and Schuratz-Barcott, D. (1993). Action Research? What is it? How has it been used and how can it be used in nursing?1993: 12; 298-304.

ICDR. (2004). **Action Research -Hand Book**. Addis Ababa: Master Printing Press.

Kemmis, S. and McTaggrat, R.(1988).**The Action Research planner**. Geelong: Deakin University Press.

Kemmis, S. and McTaggrat, R.(1990).**The Action Research planner**. Geelong: Deakin University Press.

Kolb. (1984) Experiential Learning. **Experience as the Source of Learning and Development**. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Kumar, R. (1996). **Research Methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners.** London; SAGE Publications.

Little,J.W.(1982). **Norms of Collegiality and Experimentation**: Work Place Condition of School Success. American Educational Research Jornal,19(3).pp.325-340.

Masson, E.J and Bramble, W.J. (1997). **Research in Education and the Behavioural Science Concepts and Methods.** Chicago: Brown and Benchmark Publishers.

McCutcheon, G and Jug, B.(1990). Alternative **Perspective on action Research**. Theory into Practice. Volume (29) (3), 144-151.

McKernan, J.(1996). **Curriculum Action Research**: A Handbook of methods and Researches for the Reflective Practitioner .London: Kong Page Limited

McKernan,J. (1991). **Curriculum Action Research**. A Hand Book of Methods and Resources for the Reflective Practitioner. London: Kogan Press.

McNiff, J. (1998). Action Research: **Principles and Practice**. London: Rutledge.

McNiff, J.(2002) **Action Research: Principles and Practice London**: Mackays of Chatam PLc.

McNiff,J., with J. Whitehead.(2006). **You and your action Research Project**. London and New York: Routledge.

Muyanda-Mutebi, P. (1993). "A Dictate of Research Effect in Ethiopia." In MuyandaMutebi,P. and Matovie, M.Y. (eds). **Educational Research for Development in Africa**. Dakar: Africa Social and Environmental Studies,PP.10-18.

Nunan, D. (1989**). Understanding Language Classrooms: A Guide for Teacher. Initiated Action Research.** London: Prentice Hall

_____ (1992) **Research Methods in Language Learning.** Cambridge: Cambridge University College.

Noffke, S.E., & Stevenson, R.B. (Eds.). (1995). **Educational action research: Becoming practically critical.** New York: Teachers College Press.

MOE, (1999). Teacher Education Handbook. Vocational and Special Education Curriculum Development Coordination Institute for Curriculum development and Research.

_____(2005), Education Sector Development program III(ESDPIII) 2005/2006 -2010/2011.Program Action Plan. A.A

_____ (2003) Teacher Education System Overhaul (TESO) Handbook. Addis Ababa.

Peter Reason and Hilary Bradbury (2001). Hand Book of **Action research**. Participative Inquiry and Practice. Sage Publication. London.

Reed, Carol. (2000). ***Teaching With Power: Shared Decision-Making and Classroom Practice***. New York: Teachers College Press.

Reason and Bradbury (2001). Hand Book of **Action research**. Participative Inquiry and Practice. Sage Publication. London.

TGE, (1994). Education and Training Policy. A.A. Transitional Government of Ethiopia. April.

Sadker, M.P. and D.M.Sadker (2003**). Teachers, School and Society**. Boston: McGrew- Hill Higher Education.

Sara jehi (2006). **The Quality of Secondary pre-service Teacher Education in Ethiopia**: the case of Bahir-Dar University. AAU

Sarantakos Sotirios.(2005). **Social Research**.3rd ed. Palgrave. Macmillan.

Sawyerr, A.(2004). African **Universities and the Challenge of research capacity development**. Journal of Higher Education in Africa, 2(1),pp213-242.

Seyoum Teffera, (1998). **The Current Status of Research Activities among Addis Ababa Senior Secondary School Teachers**. The Ethiopian journal of Eduucation,18(1), 1-18.

Solomon Araya (2008). **Policy Formulation Curriculum Development and Implementation in Ethiopia**. Published by : The Book Centre of AAU.

Sukia, S.P. (1983). **Elements of Educational Research**. New Delhi: Allied Publisher Private limited.

Torsten Husen,(1994). **The International Encyclopidea of Education**. 2nd edition. PERGAMON.

World Bank (1997). **Primary Education in India**. New York. A World Bank Publication.

Woods, H. (1991. **Action Research**. URL:http://www.site support.org/action research/ses2-act2-pay/-html.

Yibeltal Asefaw. (2006). **Assesmsent of factors affecting teachers to conduct action research in Ambo general secondary school**. AAU

Yalew Endawoke (2000). "Research Activities, Problems and Future Directions: An Investigation of Elementary and Secondary School Teachers' Involvement in Educational Research". **Proceedings Of National Conference on Current Issues of Educational Research in Ethiopia**. Addis Ababa: AAU Printing Press, PP.249-263.

Yeshimebet Mersha (2000). "Assessment of Secondary School Female Teachers' Involvement in Research Activities in the Amahara Region". **In Proceedings Of National Conference on Current Issues of Educational Research in Ethiopia.** Addis Ababa: AAU Printing Press, PP.265-277.

Zuber-Skerritt,O.Z.(1991) "Improving Learning and TeachingThrough Action Learning and Action Research". **Higher Education Research development**, Volume.12, No.1.

Appendix - A

Addis Ababa University

School of Graduate Studies

Faculty of education

Department of Educational Planning and Management.

Questionnaire designed to be field by secondary school teachers.

Dear respondent;

This questionnaire is prepared to get some insight in to the involvement of high school teachers in action research, teachers' action research competence (Skill and Knowledge) and factors that influence teachers' action research work at school level. Thus, the data obtained would be used for research purpose at the level of Masters of Arts in Educational Planning and Management. Therefore, your genuine responses to all the items in all the section of the questionnaire are of great importance. You do not need to write your name on any of the pages of this questionnaire. The researcher will also like to assure you of the anonymity of your response.

Dear respondent, to refresh your memory, action research is a research which is carried out in the context of classroom practices to give practical solution- specifically to the possibly manifested academic problem and developments as well. It is usually specific to particular problems and is not comprehensive like that of the "Pure" or "Basic research".

Thank you, for your kindly cooperation!

General Instruction:

* Please indicate your response putting (X) mark in a box provided
* Please provide specific answer whenever necessary.

Part I Personal details

Instruction:-Please, mark"X" to your response for each item in the box provided.

1. Region_____ 2. Name of the school_____

3. Sex A. Male ☐ B. Female ☐

4. Age A/ 20years and below ☐ B/ 21-30 ☐ C/ 31-40 ☐ D.41 and above☐

5. Educational status A/ MA ☐ B/ BA/BSC ☐ C / Diploma/Certificate ☐

6. Service years in teaching profession.

A/ 5 years and below ☐ B/ 6-10 ☐ C/ 11-15 ☐

D/ 16- 20 ☐ E/ 21-25 ☐ F/ 26 and above ☐

7. Your current professional qualification.

A/ Certificate ☐ B/ BA/BSC ☐ C/ MA/MSC ☐ D/ Diploma ☐

8. Teaching load per week.

A/ 5-10 period/week ☐ B/11-15 period/week ☐ C/ 16-20 period/week ☐

D/ 21-25 period/week☐ E.26-30 period/week ☐ F. 31 and above period/week ☐

Part II: - Action research Knowledge

Instruction:-Please, mark"X" to your response for each item in the box provided.

2.1. Have you taken research methodology courses in your university, college or I institute learning which are pertinent to conduct research?

A/ Yes ☐ B/ No☐

2.2. If your response to item number 2.1 is 'Yes' do you find these course adequate to enable you to carry out action research?

A/ Yes ☐ B/ No ☐

2.3. Do you participated in any seminars in-service training, or workshop training concerning action research related issues?.

A. yes ☐ B. No. ☐

2.4. If your answer for the above question, is 'Yes' to what extent it helps you in conducting action research?

A/ V. high B/ High C/ Moderate D/ Low E/ V. low

Part III:- practical involvement in action research.

Please read each item and mark "X" to your response for each item

3.1a. Do you ever conduct action research?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

3.1b. Are you doing action research now?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

3.2.If your answer to question number 3.1 is 'Yes', to what extent you were involved in conducting action research?

A/Highly involved ☐ B/ moderately involved ☐

C/Low involvement ☐ D. Not involved at all☐

3.3. Please, list the titles of the action research you have done? If any

No	Research title	Year conducted
1		
2		
3		
4		

3.4. If your answer to item number one is 'No', please state down the reasons._____

_____

_____

_____

3.5. Do your colleagues in the school conduct action research to solve their classroom instructional problems?

A/ Yes, most of them ☐ B/yes, some of them ☐

C/ Yes, few of them ☐ D/ None of them ☐

3.6. How you rate the current status of teachers' participation in action research activities?

A/ V. high ☐ B/ High ☐ C/ Moderate ☐ D/ low ☐ E/ V. low ☐

Part IV: - Research competence /skills of teachers

Please read each item and mark "X" to your response for each item.

4.1. The confidence you have in carrying out action research keeping its basic procedural information is:

A/ V. high □ B/high □ C/ Moderate □ D/low □ E/ V. Low □

4.2. How do you rate the action research knowledge you have to carry out action research ?

A/ V. high □ B/high □ C/ Moderate □ D/low □ E/ V. Low

4.3. How do you rate your colleagues' action research skill and knowledge?

A/ V. high □ B/high □ C/ Moderate □ D/low □ E/ V. Low □

4.4. If your answer for item number 3.1 or 3.2or 3.3 or all re rated moderate and below moderate, what problems hinders you/them to perform v. high or high? Please use the following rating scale to show the extent of the problem.

5= very high 4= High 3= Undecided 2= Low 1= Very low

No	Items	Rating scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
4.4.1	Lack of awareness about the contribution of action research in improving instructional problem.					
4.4.2	Lack of research trend in the school					
4.4.3	Lack of interest to carry out action research					
4.4.4	Lack of enough research skills					
4.4.5	Undermining the role of action research in improving school classroom activities					

Part V: - Attitudes towards action research.

Direction:- The following are statements that need your opinion about enhancing skill and knowledge of teachers through action research. Thus, for each statement please indicate your agreement or disagreement by putting " " mark rating 1- 5. Key of rating

5= highly agree 4= agree 3= Undecided 2highly disagree 1= disagree

No	Items	5	4	3	2	1
5.1	Teachers should study classroom educational problems and seek solution using action research.					
5.2	The expenses of educational action research out weight its contribution to educational improvement.					
5.3	Action research should not task of teachers.					
5.4	Due emphasis should be given to action research					
5.5	Educational research contributes less in solving practical classroom educational problems					
5.6	Research is a time wasting activity.					
5.7	Action research should be considers as criterion for teachers professional development					
5.8	Action research enables teachers to acquire knowledge of solving educational Problems.					
5.9	Teachers should conduct action research tolerating existing problems					
5.10	Teaching learning process should be supported by action research					
5.11	Research should be conducted only in higher education institutions.					

Part VI:-Potential barriers

Read the following item and mark "X" the response that best reflects your level of agreement on rating scale of:-

5= V. highly 4= High 3 = moderate 2.Low 1= V. low

No	How would you evaluate the availability of resources in your school to conduct action research	Rating scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
6. 1	Availability of time to conduct action research					
6.2	Availability of books in library					
6.3	Availability of news paper, journals , research papers e.t.c materials for teachers as a guide line.					
6.4	The status of financial assistance for teachers					
6.5	The extent of the availability of stationary and other materials					
6.6	The availability of research rooms and place for teachers					

VII. Collaborative school culture

Read the following item and mark the response that best reflects your level of agreement or disagreement on rating scale of:-

5= highly agree 4= agree 3 Undecided 2.highly disagree 1= disagree

No	Items In our school	Rating scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
7.1	Teachers do action research together.					
7.2	Teachers believe that action research is a useful activitie to improve school related problems					
7.3	Teachers are committed to do action research					
7.4	Management bodies in the school encourage teachers to do action research.					
7.5	Teachers believe that employing (conducting) action research Enables them to bring improvements on student achievement					

VIII. Principals and deputies role in encouraging action research.

The following questions are refers to how the school Principals and deputies role in encourage teachers to conduct action research. Please thick in the column which most nearly reflect the role of the principals about the statement using the following rating scale.

1= V. low 2= Low 3= Average 4= High 5=V. high

No	In my school principals and deputies	Rating scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
8.1	accept teachers action research plan					
8. 2	recognize the importance of action research.					
8.3	Provide clear sense of direction for teachers to conduct action research					
8.4	Do have plans to encourage teachers to do action research.					
8.5	Involves in action research activities					
8.6	Make efforts to boost up teachers moral in disseminating research resultscarried out by teachers					

Part IX

<u>Direction One</u>:-Please provide me your attitudes, Feelings, Opinion and Believes by writing on the space provided.

1. In your school, is teaching really supported by action research? If not why?_____

_____

_____

2. What are the most revealing problems or research constraints which you have possibly encountered in carrying out action research, if any? _____

_____

_____

_____

3. Please list down any further suggestion which you think would help to promote action research in schools? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____.

Thank you, once again for filling in the questionnaire!

Appendix - B

Addis Ababa University

School of Graduate Studies

Faculty of education

Department of Educational planning and Management.

Under Stream of Educational Policy and Planning

Interview to principals and vice directors and supervisors.

1. How do you evaluate teachers action research skill and knowledge of your high school?
2. What problem do you think that inhabit teachers from conducting action research at classroom level or at school level?
3. Are their sufficient materials like books, research copies or journals or other relevant materials that helps teacher to conduct action research at school level?
4. How about teachers teaching loads for research?
   Do you think the major factors that makes teacher busy to conduct action research?
5. Do your school or in coordination with WEO facilitates research based seminar or workshop that helps teacher to carry out action research?
6. Is research counted in teachers professional Promotion?
7. What can you suggest to promote action research in high school by teachers?
8. How do you conceptualize educational research?
9. How do you evaluate the research condition of your school i.e facilitating teachers' involvement in action research?

Thank you, once again for filling in the questionnaire!

Declaration

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis is my original work and has not been presented in any other university. The sources of materials used in this thesis are duly acknowledged.

Name: Dereje Bushu Dadi

Signature _____

Place: Addis Ababa University

Date of submission: _____

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

Name: _____

Signature _____

Data: _____