# ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
# SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

## AN EVALUATION OF TEACHER PERFORMANCES IN IMPLEMENTING GEOGRAPHY CURRICULUM: THE CASE OF GORE SECONDARY SCHOOL



BY
ALEMAYEHU TEKLU

June 2005
Addis Ababa

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

# An Evaluation of Teacher Performances in Implementing Geography Curriculum: The Case of Gore Secondary School

A Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Curriculum and Instruction



By
Alemayehu Teklu

June 2005
Addis Ababa

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

# An Evaluation of Teacher Performances in Implementing Geography Curriculum: The Case of Teachers in Gore Secondary School

BY
ALEMAYEHU TEKLU

## Approval of the Board of Examination

Bizuneh Tesissa — Signature
Chairman, Department Graduate Committee

Amare Asgedom — Signature
Advisor

Dr Aklilu Dalelo — Signature
Examiner – external

Dr. USHA DEVI.B — Signature
Examiner – Internal

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to my advisor, Amare Asgedom (Associate Professor), for his unreserved guidance, insightful and critical comments to the realization of this thesis.

I would also like to extend my gratitude to Geography teachers and students in Gore secondary School, particularly to Ato Tadesse Dingat, for their kindly cooperation in providing the necessary information and materials.

I am also indebted to w/t Rahel Arefayne who sacrificed her leisure time to type the whole script of the thesis.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page


Acknowledgements ---------- i

Table of Contents ---------- ii

List of Tables ---------- iv

List of Abbreviations ---------- v

Abstract ---------- vi

**PART ONE Introduction ---------- 1**

1.1 General Backgrounds of the Study ---------- 1

1.2 Statement of the Problem ---------- 4

1.2.1 Objectives of the Study ---------- 5

1.2.2 Research Questions ---------- 5

1.3 Significance of the Study ---------- 5

1.4 Limitations of the Study ---------- 6

1.5 Organization of the Study ---------- 6

**PART TWO Theoretical Backgrounds of the Study ---------- 7**

2.1 The Concept of Implementation ---------- 8

2.2 The Status of Curriculum Implementation in Ethiopia ---------- 10

2.3 Evaluation of the Curriculum ---------- 12

2.3.1 Roles of Evaluation in Curriculum ---------- 14

2.3.2 Approaches in Evaluating Curriculum ---------- 15

2.3.2.1 Scientific/Positivistic Approaches ---------- 17

2.3.2.2 Humanistic/ Naturalist Approaches ---------- 20

**PART THREE Research Methodology ---------- 24**

3.1 Design of the Study ---------- 24

3.2 Data Collection Instruments ---------- 25

3.2.1 Observations ---------- 25

3.2.2 Interviews ----- 26
3.2.2.1 Teachers ----- 26
3.2.2.2 Students ----- 27
3.2.2.3 Instructional Leaders ----- 28
3.2.3 Documents ----- 28
3.3 The Research Setting ----- 28
3.4 Data Analysis Strategy ----- 30

**PART FOUR: Findings ----- 31**
4.1 The Formulation and Use of Instructional Objectives ----- 32
4.2 Covering Portions in Time ----- 35
4.3 Teaching Approach ----- 39
4.3.1 Teachers Lack of Commitment ----- 46
4.3.2 The Weak Collegiality ----- 48
4.4 Teachers Use of Instructional Materials ----- 53
4.5 Student Assessment ----- 58

**PART FIVE: Conclusion ----- 62**
References ----- 67

## LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table I: Bio data of Teacher Informants---------- 27

Table II: General and Specific Objectives in Teachers Instructional Plans -- 32

Table III: Proportions of Suggested Methods of Teaching in Geography Syllabi's---------- 42

Table IV. Activities/Methods in Five Successive Daily Lessons of Teachers ---------- 47

Table V: A Comparison between Objectives in the Syllabi's and Teacher Lesson Plans. ---------- 55

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| AL | Asseffa Lamesa (Student informant) |
| CA | Continuous Assessment |
| GIS/RS | Geographical Information System and Remote Sensing |
| IT | Information Technology |
| T1 | Teacher one (for teacher informants) |

## ABSTRACT

The focus of this study was an evaluation of teacher performances in implementing secondary school Geography curriculum. It attempted also to describe problems to implementation of the curriculum. The study used a qualitative case study design to understand the problem. The main data collection instruments were open observations, semi structured interviews and documents.

Findings indicate inappropriate formulation and use of instructional objectives, inability to cover portions in textbooks within available time, and not using a variety of instructional methods. In efficient use of instructional materials, and continuous tests not continuous assessments were also major areas of weaknesses observed.

Various problems to the implementation such as, discordance between contents and allotted time, large class size, students' inability to communicate in English and the loss of student interest were raised and discussed. Teacher lack of commitment, the weak collegiality among academic communities in the school, weak guidance and management on the part of instructional leaders were also observed as hindrances.

Finally the study forwarded some points of consideration that, all the implementation activities should not be left only to teachers. Subject specific support groups (panels) need to be established least at zonal level to support the system. Some content arrangements in student text books, particularly bringing the map reading section to the beginning part of the textbooks, and minimizing contents or extending periods allotted are among recommended points.

# PART ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 General Backgrounds of the Study

In a changing world, there is no such thing as fixed curriculum. Every designed curriculum needs to pass through continuous process of evaluation. The strengths and weaknesses, the consistency between actual practices and intended purposes should be thoroughly studied so that continuous on-going modification is effected. Indeed, there are many curriculum claims every time in human development that, continuous evaluation and refinement of the curriculum and its implementation is a demanding task.

Evident that, several theorists have put forth their conceptions on the contribution of evaluation in the field of education. Townsend (1994: 42 –44), for instance writes, evaluation serves a range of purposes from helping to plan what to do next to providing an account of what is happening. Evaluation enables control the quality of the curriculum by identifying and detecting problems during implementation. Canglosi(1991:5) on his part also states, competently conducted evaluation has the potential of providing information on the quality, value, effectiveness, or impact of the curriculum.

Likewise, Madaus et al (1983:129), Patton (1997:203) and Calder (1994:18) state, curriculum evaluation enables identity or predict in process, defects in procedural design or its implementation; help decision makers identify how far from the ideal the program deviates; and support an organization in achieving its goals.

It has been stated also, evaluations in curriculum are classified in to two in terms of methods used during investigation – utilitarian and intuitionist. The utilitarian linked to the scientific/positivist paradigm is much concerned with outcomes. It is devoted to systematic observation and experiment, where standard procedure is used to generate prior hypotheses, to define operational categories of observation, develop objective methods of data gathering, and conduct appropriate statistical analysis.Intuitionist, to the contrary, is more about processes that result the outcomes . It is more interested in

understanding where description and interpretation of actual phenomena are more important than measurement and prediction (Ornestain and Hunkins, 1988:324-325).

Lewy (1977: 146) and Madaus et al. (1983: 129-132) similar to the intuitionist/ utilitarian paradigm classify evaluation, particularly important in implementation stage as, objective oriented evaluation approach and process oriented approach. The former giving priority to testing, grading, classification and measuring of student achievement – actual learner out comes. The latter emphasizes understanding about the processes of curriculum implementation, the quality of its implementation than outcomes. Process studies are more interested in the extent of teachers' knowledge of the subject matter, teachers acceptance of classroom activities, and understanding of aims and objectives. Process studies stress the general pattern of existing teaching activities, availability of materials and equipment, and other classroom activities.

Between the two approaches, outcomes and processes, the latter is gaining more attention among recent authors in evaluation. Critics state, in outcome evaluation, it is difficult to determine which outcomes were due to the student themselves and which were based on what the school had accomplished. Out come evaluations provide little effective input to the decision- making processes, assess without explaining, etc (Townsend, 1994: 14; Calder, 1994: 25; Stenhouse, 1975: 120).

Though much emphasis is placed upon the importance of evaluating curriculum and consequently, purposes and approaches are determined, and many evaluation reports produced, not few writers believe also, the nature of curriculum and its implementation in many countries has not been changed. Characteristics of schools and teachers have remained constant for decades. For instance, Lewy (1991: 3-4) argues, though educational research out puts had called the least contribution of memorization to student learning, most textbooks are still crammed with factual information. Textbooks provided little or no opportunity for students to engage in activities.

Similarly, Cohen and Cusick in Dawit (1999: 3) have demonstrated, due to least consideration given to evaluation reports of implementation processes, teachers are usually transforming meaningful, challenging tasks of an intended curricula into routine,

risk free tasks. Teachers mostly are found changing critical learning to simple memorization of facts. They note that in most cases curricula have had insignificant results and were not properly implemented.

Sarson (in Ornestein and Hunkins, 1988: 292) also comments, those in charge had little or a distorted understanding of the culture of schools that, effective implementation has not been effected yet. Ornestein and Hunkins added, the absence of a continuous uninterrupted interaction between those who have created the program (designers) and those who are charged to practice it as another area of inconvenience. They advise then, inviting stakeholders, especially teachers to participate in all curriculum development endeavors as crucial. They believe, any program must be acceptable to both teachers and students and as far as possible to every one else who is to affect it.
Further, Williams (1978: 177-178) contends, in evaluating the implementation of curriculum, many factors influencing the process such as people, program and organization have to be thoroughly investigated. If these factors respond to influences instead of intentions of another, even the most carefully developed curriculum is likely to fail, he adds.

As a result of weak coordination and least consideration paid to variables of effective implementation, thus, it is not contentious to believe that the quality of education, particularly, in poor countries is deteriorating. A case in point is Ethiopia.

In Ethiopia, studies made by Getachew (1994), Kindalem (1998), Dawit (1999), Solomon (2000) and many others explicitly show the prevalence of a wide gap between designed intents (the program) of the syllabus and what is actually in practice (people and organization). In all the studies teachers' classroom performances were found inefficient. Many teachers were not using techniques and strategies suggested in the syllabus. The reasons identified in most of the studies were large class size, shortage of curriculum materials, lack of qualified teachers, teachers' lack of competence to teach, and inadequate refreshment training for teachers.

The situations imply, though available research out puts have insistently urge attention to be paid for curriculum implementation, the use of them has not been strong in

Ethiopia. For decades findings of researchers portray that investigated teachers were found inefficiently implementing the curriculum. Thus, more studies are still required in order that policy makers' turn their attention down to the actual implementation process of the curriculum.

This study, as a result, is intended to contribute its part to improvement of the implementation process of geography curriculum. It is delimited to teacher performances, particularly weaknesses and problems they encounter during implementation. As different from previous investigations, stresses processes than out comes. It is a case study interested more in details, and intuitionist than utilitarian. The study is also the first of its kind for Geography curriculum.

## 1.2 Statement of the Problem

Previous discussions have explained, educational processes can be enhanced and its standard could improve through evaluation. Particularly, evaluating the implementation of curriculum helps to understand where weaknesses and strengths are observable, there by make necessary adjustment. And, any attempt to revise, improve, modify and change the syllabus needs to base itself on research findings.

Canglosi (1991: 10-12) states, a typical evaluation may focus on one of the variables: teaching competence, teaching performance and student outcomes. He comments further, evaluation of teaching performances are more likely than teaching competence and student out comes to provide accurate information on the learning process. Hargreaves in Lewy (1991: 61) also posits, the fact the teacher is a media between the centrally produced curriculum and its target population implies any evaluation study should stress teachers' classroom performances.

A host of writers like Amare (1996: 99), Early and Rehage (1999: 225) and Harlen (1978: 8) write also, teachers are by far the most important ones that affect the quality of curriculum implementation. Student achievement would not improve unless teachers understand the rationale and philosophy of each curriculum that evaluation studies should not neglect consideration of teachers' in schools.

In short, it is a common consensus that whether the curriculum is designed well or not, the teacher can make or break the program. It is the teacher who is the corner stone of curriculum implementation.

### 1.2.1 Objectives of the Study

The main purposes of this study are:

-To understand teacher performances in implementing appropriately instructional specifications set in geography curriculum.

-To describe problems to implementation functions of the teachers.

### 1.2.2 Research Questions

In an attempt to attain its purposes, appropriate answers for the following questions will be explored.

1. How teachers formulate and use instructional objectives? Why?
2. To what extent teachers are able to cover portions in time? Why?
3. To What extent the teachers are using a variety of instructional methods in classrooms? Why?
4. How much efficiently teachers' use instructional materials available in the school?
5. How much appropriate are teachers' assessment mechanisms?

## 1.3 Significance of the Study

The study is thought significant in the following areas:

1. Helps the teachers' identify their weak points and strengths. Makes them see whether they are implementing the curriculum as expected.
2. Enables, also with previous investigations, curriculum designers to see what is going on in schools in relation to their expectations and wakes them up for making necessary adjustment.
3. Helps curriculum designers of Geography to identify what parts of the curriculum are effectively implemented and what are not.

## 1.4 Limitations of the Study

Among the various problems encountered, the following were found to be the major ones.

1 Teachers' during interviews, considered the why questions posed as an instrument to challenge their teachings than I am only interested with understanding.
2 Qualitative case study evaluation studies have not been conducted at graduate master thesis level that it was difficult which trend to adopt.

## 1.5 Organization of the Study

The study is organized into five parts. The first part treats the problem and its approach. Part two presents the theoretical background of the study. Part three deals with the research methodology. The fourth part devoted narration of the findings, the last holding the conclusions.

# PART TWO

## THEORETICAL BACKGROUNDS OF THE STUDY

### 2.1 The Concept of Implementation

Ornentein and Hunkins (1988:291) assert that, 'the most appropriate valued school curriculum goes for naught if it is left on the shelves after its development. ... It must be implemented if it is to make any impact on student learning.' This implies, the process of curriculum development should not neglect its concurrent implementation. Similarly, Pratt (1980:426) posits, the success of the developed curriculum is highly determined by the degree to which it is workable in practice- its implementation.

The statement of good behavioral objectives, selection and organization of valuable contents and experiences, suggesting a variety of media materials and a number of evaluation mechanisms have no guarantee unless appropriately implemented.

Many writers in curriculum implementation contend, for designers limit their horizons to development of curriculum, paying little consideration to the implementation process and consequently the staffs have not been trained, implementation effects of many countries have not been successful (Fullan, 1991:65; Sarson, in Ornestein and Hunkins, 1988: 192; Hord, 1995:95). They contend, effective implementation requires designers and implementers to grasp the context in which the new curriculum is to be introduced-the structure of organization, sacred tradition, power relationships, and how members define themselves and their roles. The behavior of all players in the curriculum game needs to be defined. Curriculum designers, administrators, teachers, supervisors and also students and parents must be clear about the purposes and intents of the program-feel part of the process (Anderson, 1990:224; Early and Rehage, 1990: 206; Shiundu, 1992:177). It is a common belief that success in implementation depends largely on how well those who have planned its development and implementation perceive the needs of students, teachers and the school.

Johnson (1994:54) and Dublin and Olghtun (1988:32) depict three important strategies, in this respect, to effect successful implementation: changing ideas about the curriculum, changing the human dynamics, and resource support. That is, for effective implementation, an in service training, making aware of the clear intentions of the change among stakeholders, and the provision of materials, appropriate time and facilities during implementation are pre requisites. Policymaking is realistic if it takes into account the limitation of available resources.

Another important factor to effect successful implementation is related to its concept. The concept of implementation, which varies at present with philosophies of educators, needs consensus. That is, while some limit its concern only to putting what is developed into practice, stage where the curriculum plan is translated into practice through instruction or the process of effecting the new curriculum-only a fidelity perspective (Shiundu and Omulando, 1997:176; Fullan and Pomfret, 1977:336), others define implementation as interaction processes between those who have created the program and those who are charged to deliver it, the coming together of people, materials and program- a mutual adaptation perspective (Williams, 1978:177-178; Ornestein and Hunkins, 1988, 310). The former group providing no evidence for appropriate interactions between those developing the curriculum and practitioners, in spite, the latter underlines transparency-coming together of all players in the game.

Those advocating implementation as continuous interaction among stakeholders believe that, for implementation to be effective planning is a necessary requirement; the planning of people program and processes together. Being ignorant of one of the aspects, results in failures even to a well-developed curriculum. For instance, Ornestein and Hunkins (1988: 294) write that, many curriculum development programs have emphasized the planning of program and processes ignoring the people aspect that they usually failed to effect changes. Ornestin and Hunkins argue, explicitly stating,' it is too difficult to play 'new games' of curriculum in traditional spaces with traditional time frames'. This means, in new curriculum, the initial character of schools and teacher behaviors should be altered. The school should be ready in all its aspects to accept the new innovations in a curriculum. And also, teachers have to get the necessary training

and/or staff development.

All the stakeholders are to feel comfortable with the new program. Working together, sharing ideas, jointly solving problems and cooperatively creating materials for implementation are necessary areas of emphasis. Individuals contribute their best talents when they accept the new program. The process of implementation entails changes in teacher- training program (both per-service and in service), obtaining support and cooperation, and changes in national examination systems (Early and Rehage, 1990: 206; Hord, 1995: 97)

However, in spite of the appropriate planning and execution among people, programs and processes are practiced, pre service and in-service trainings are carefully provided; teachers in many occasions are observed neglecting their roles. Many research findings indicate, teachers usually are found present oriented, conservative, individualistic and try to avoid team planning. Teachers are said to have difficulties in incorporating in their daily work continuous collaboration with others and often resist involvement in whole school decision-making. Stability, not change, is the dominant characteristics of teachers and schools. Teachers usually are transforming challenging tasks of intended curricula in to routine, risk free tasks. They are continuing to be involved in curriculum implementation in a manner identical to that which has occurred in the past (Hargreaven in Lewy, 1991:67; Rjada, 2001:51; Ballack in Early and Rehage, 1990:203).

To such insistent resistance of teachers to change/ innovation, Ornestein and Hunkins (1988:300-302) write five major reasons:

- Inertia: many teachers think it is easier to keep things as they are, being happy with the current school set up. They show unreasonable tendency to remain unchanged.
- Conformism: teachers who have succeeded in the school system tend to obey the established rules for uncertainty fosters insecurity.
- Rapidity of change: resisting change anticipating another change likely to occur.
- Lack of knowledge: not knowing at all, or they have little information about it, and
- Absence of financial & timely support.

Clearly, except the latter two reasons, the first three are related to teachers' purposeful negligence of an innovation, in spite of what possible may be provided for them. Ornestein and Hunkins remind, any effective implementation calls, above all, the teachers' authentic commitment, ethics and receptivity. Mere running behind appropriate planning of people and processes will not actually alter the character of schools and teachers.

## 2.2 The Status of Implementation in Ethiopia

In Ethiopian context, in light of the many requirements of effective implementation, it is difficult to believe that the curriculum development and implementation situations are at their right track. Research outputs indicate that change in the structure of traditional schools have not been effected, the curriculum is not manageable and feasible for teachers, students achievements are poor, and implementation still didn't emancipate itself from bureaucracy- teachers, students and the community have no place to contribute to the curriculum etc that one can state, the curriculum implementation process is ineffective in Ethiopia.

Though, recently, teacher education institutes are trying to adjust their training program with requirements of the new educational and training policy, still the supervisory staffs are incompetent to provide necessary support for subject teachers at schools, for supervisors at every level are not subject specific experts. Obvious that, such supervisors can evaluate teachers on the basis of prescribed criteria, but are unable to provide subject specific assistance. As major duties of supervisors, Canglosi (1991:5-6) posits, instructional supervision is helping teachers; concerned solely with improving the instructional practices of individual teachers. Canglosi stresses, the responsibility of supervisors is not to evaluate teachers but instruction. Evaluating teachers is rather threatening than developing self-esteem and stimulating change/innovation, he contends.

Further, national examinations are also among impediments to successful curriculum implementation in Ethiopia. For more than two decades national examinations have remained unchanged. A study made by Aklilu (1992) reveals, national examinations as

one of the factors that result little motivation for altering the focus of teachers' teaching in classroom. He asserts, instead of using a variety of teaching approaches and developing students' problem solving skills in classrooms, teachers are forced to pay more attention to questions likely to appear in national examinations. Since, national examinations are the major, perhaps in most cases the only, criteria to join higher institutions.

Supporting this, the unaltered stance of teachers, Dawit (1999:112), in his study of the implementation of seventh grade English syllabus arrived at:

> *…. What changed significantly are the textbooks and teacher guides. Teachers are expected to use very interesting methodologies that could not do where other things remain unchanged much. Teachers were not changed through training and there is poor supply of chairs, chalkboard, desks and textbooks….*

Similarly, studies made by student researchers (Ibid: p.4) and many others show that students learning situations didn't improve; teachers are still following the traditional procedures of teaching-explanation and Lecture. Instead of adopting merits of the new curriculum-inquiry/learner centered/problem-solving, etc. approaches, most classes in their study sites were undertaking traditional teacher talk student hear-not listen, methods. In all research out puts of student researchers at master thesis level, curriculum documents were found not manageable for teachers, time was scarce to cover contents. In availability of teaching materials, large class sizes, teacher incompetence, etc. were among problems of implementation cited.

Altering such desperate situations of teaching learning in the country requires voluntary commitment of all bodies accountable for the failure or success of education. The time is still not late for curriculum designers to read intuitively research findings and make necessary adjustments. For researchers to write more and influence those policy/decision makers in every occasion, and teachers to adjust themselves to the new changing situations of the world, of course not possible with out love for reading, is the responsibility.

## 2.3 Evaluation of the Curriculum

Once curriculum is put into effect, it is obvious that need arises to examine the strengths and weaknesses of the planned curriculum for improvement. The extent of congruency between actual practices and intended purposes, and the changes taking place as a result should be clearly determined, curriculum evaluation – a usual phenomenon in educational landscape.

Views on curriculum evaluation tend to vary to a certain extent pertaining to time changes and theoretical positions of authors in the field. In early years (before 1970's), definitions of curriculum evaluation were only bounded within evaluating observable changes in pupils' behavior; and are out come oriented. In spite, current approaches are different that they stress importance of the processes. Holistic evaluations intended to identify program effects not only on students but also on teachers, parents and perhaps on administrators is the most common trend nowadays. For instance, among early definitions is that provided by Stenhouse (1975:106) which read as, 'the collection and use of information concerning changes in pupils' behavior to make decisions about educational programs." Narrow in scope looking only into learners' achievements and where evaluation is anonymous with assessment. On the other end, Shiundu and Omulando (1992:179) put it as' the process of generating data which is used in assigning value to something and finally making a decision, either to accept improve or reject it" which is relatively comprehensive enabling evaluators consider all data related to the program implementation, interested in gaining greater understanding of the relationship between organizational forms and multiplicity of classroom transactions that they generate.

In theoretical positions, differences are also observable among those advocating the objectives model and the other extreme, process model, and those taking the middle position. Anderson (1990:165), in the objectives/outcome oriented paradigm, puts evaluation as 'one good way of assessing whether or not what we are doing is achieving what it is intended to achieve." Not restrictive in contrast, Townsend (1992:43), in support of the process model, writes evaluation as, ' A continuous process of collecting

information and supplying feed back on what is being implemented and then to improve the program than passing judgment'.

The objectives model is important to look into the differences between intended plans and observed results. Nowadays, however, out come based interpretation is criticized for it is difficult to determine which out comes were due to the students' themselves and which were based on what the school had accomplished, and it caused evaluation to 'tagged onto' the end of the process- unable to tell us the internal merits or defects.

Outcomes orientation assesses without explaining, hence, the developer of curriculum cannot learn from it. It is unable to provide the kind of evidence from which curriculum development proceeds (McCormic and James, 1990:171; Kent, et al. 1996:133; Townsend, 1990: 44; Stenhouse, 1975: 120).

Nevertheless, not few educators are also in the third group, taking the advantages of the extremists. This group believes that evaluation is more informative if it includes both the objectives model, for it helps to determine whether the program has achieved its objectives- changes in student behavior, and process evaluation more advantageous to elicit strengths and weaknesses within the program.

Prominent advocates of the mixed are Ornestein and Hunkins (1988:320) who conceive definition of evaluation as:

> *... a process or cluster of processes that people perform in order to gather data that enable them to decide whether to accept, change or eliminate something, the curriculum in general or an educational text book in particular ... to determine whether the expected or the planned for has occurred or is occurring in relation to intended ...Serves to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum ...*

In sum, what commonly understandable from definitions cited are, firstly, views are complementary than absolutely contradicting. That is, current definitions are developed on the basis of the defects of their preceding theories. Secondly, merging ideas together, curriculum evaluation is for making decision involving data collection, systematic analysis and assigning values to the result. It can be said, wherever definition of evaluation is being produced there are phrases decision making and data collection.

Worth noting, I believe, it is advisable to take an electric position than tied to any extreme. Though the process approach is obviously more advantageous than mere outcome based evaluation for it tells specific area of success and failures, effectiveness focused (evaluating whether goals are met or not) evaluations are also essential to determine to what extent educational objectives are realized. In this, Calder (1994:18) posits, the aim of evaluation in the case of any organization must be to support that organization in achieving its goals. Similarly, Canglosi (1991:10-12) stresses, the fact that schools are established to serve students, student achievement is the goal of instruction, therefore, lessons should be accountable for student achievements. Safely convincing, an educational activity not led by goals or objectives might be anonymous with gambling, relying on chance. It is also, when outcomes are evaluated without knowledge of processes, there is less probability for the results to provide a direction for action, as no information is obtainable regarding what produced the observed out comes.

### 2.3.1 Roles of Evaluation in Curriculum

Curriculum evaluation can be performed at different stages of curriculum development for different purposes. The aspects of a curriculum to be evaluated are numerous. Nunan, 1988 (in Solomon, 2000:53) identifies, three stages of curriculum development where evaluation could be performed-evaluating the planned syllabus, evaluating the implemented syllabus and evaluating the assessed syllabus. Arguing to the deficiencies of present test, instrument and scoring procedures on the other hand, Michael Scriven (in Onestein and Hunkins, 1988: 320) divides the intentions of evaluation into two: intrinsic evaluation and pay-off evaluation. Intrinsic to Scriven, refers to evaluating the curriculum document itself. It is similar to evaluation of the planned syllabus in Nunan's classification. In intrinsic, the basic worth of the curriculum is the major concern-how proposed objectives, contents, learning experiences, resources and evaluation mechanisms in the syllabus, teacher guides and student texts are consistent with the pedagogical and psychological principles is evaluated. Whilst, pay–off evaluation is

performed to determine the effects of the curriculum when delivered, the effect not only on the students but also on teachers, parents and perhaps on administrators is assessed. Whether what has been planned is appropriately implemented, and impediments encountered during implementation are also interests of pay-off evaluation.

Patton (1997:192-194) classifies roles of evaluation into four foci points: context focused, aims at determining answers for question like, what is the environment within which the program operates? How does this context affect program effectiveness? Effectiveness focused, searching answers for questions to what extent is the program effective in attaining its goals? How can the program be more effective? Implementation focused, understanding to what extent the program implemented is as designed? What issues surface during implementation that needs attention in the future? And, process focused, raising questions like, what do participants experience in the program? What are the strengths and weaknesses of day-to-day operation? How can processes be improved?

Another line of looking at curriculum evaluation is in terms of timing of evaluation. These are formative evaluation and summative evaluation. As to Scriven (in Stenhouse, 1975:104), formative evaluation encompasses those activities undertaken to improve an intended curriculum program, revising the program while it is being developed before fully implemented in school or district wide. It provides the opportunity for evaluator(s) to modify, reject or accept the program as it is evolving. Formative evaluation exercises serve as 'feed back and guide' influencing the shaping of a curriculum through the successive revisions of the developmental phase. Instead, summative evaluation aims at getting the total picture of the quality of the produced curriculum. It is usually undertaken after the project has been completely developed and after it has been implemented school wide or district wide-focusing on effectiveness of the total courses of curriculum development (Saylor and colleagues, 1980:317-318; Ornesten and Hunkins, 1988:326-27).

### 2.3.2 Approaches in Evaluating Curriculum

Educational researchers have developed a number of evaluation models. Most classified it into two broad categories pertaining the underlying views of researchers. For

instance, Lee Cronbac (in Ornestein and Hunkins, 1988: 322) classify as, the scientific/ positivistic evaluation approach and the Humanistic/ naturalistic approach. Major differences are in their focuses and design they adapt to the three dimensions of evaluation: methods, values and uses.

In the naturalistic-Humanistic paradigm, data collected are more qualitative; evaluation reports are less numbers than they are written description of what was found or what occurred. Naturalistic–Humanistic evaluation focuses more on human interaction than on outcomes, and more on quality than on quantity of classroom or school life. Emphasis is to processes than out comes. Observation is the best method-evaluators not only visit sites, but they are often personally involved in arguing their values and cases with colleagues, not separated from the system (Rippey in Bohla, 1979:18-19; Madaus etal., 1983:311; Cronbac in Ornestein and Hunkins, 1988: 323).

Madaus, etal (1983: 311) write, the distinguishing features of naturalistic inquiry as:

- It offers a context and relevance, and richness that is unmatched
- It displays sensitivity to processes virtually excluded in paradigms stressing control and experiment
- It is driven by theory grounded in the data- the naturalist does not search for data that fit a theory but develop a theory that explain the data.
- Take full advantage of the considerable power of the human as instrument.

On the contrary, the scientific/ positivistic approaches deal evaluation from a prescriptive or sequential orientation. They likely want to spell out specific entries or objectives so that they can enact procedures that will furnish them with precise indicators of whether students have achieved the intended out come of the program. The scientific/ positivistic approaches favor clinical or objective experimental methods of data collection. Accurate correlational evidences, operational categories of observation and checklists are the common methods in this paradigm (Mac Cormic and James, 1990: 179; Ornestein and Hunkins, 1988: 323).

For details, six different approaches to curriculum evaluations are described following. The first three represent the scientific-positivistic approach, while the rest are the naturalistic/ humanistic evaluation.

### 2.2.2.1 Scientific –Positivistic Approaches

***i) Provus's Discrepancy Evaluation Model***

Provus (In Patton, 1997:203) advocates 'discrepancy evaluation', involving the process of comparing actual practice with the ideal, emphasizing the implementation function of evaluation. He contends, evaluation to determine the degree to which programs are actually operating as planned and makes understood the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum.

According to Provus, process evaluation should ask questions like, what is happening and why? How parts of the program fit together? How do participants experience and perceive the program. The major advantage is the looking at how a product or out come is produced than at only the product itself.

Provus model combines evaluations with systems management theory, consisting of four components and five stages of evaluation. The components are:

1 Determining program standards
2 Determining program performance
3 Comparing performance with standards
4 Determining whether a discrepancy exists between performances and standards.

After discrepancies are already determined, the information is reported to decision makers who inturn must make decisions. The job of evaluator in the model is to identify problems and suggest what corrective actions are possible, and then report to decision makers.

Provous five stages of evaluation are; Design, installation, process, product and cost. In each of these, program performances are compared to program standards on the basis of criteria that have been already established. In the stages, Design involves a comparison of the program design with the prescribed standard or criteria. The program is examined to determine if it is internally (to the principles of curriculum) and externally (the context) sound. Any discrepancy, then, is reported to decision makers.

In installation, actual operation of the program is compared with the installation standard

or fidelity criteria. The characteristics of the program are evaluated including the facilities, media, methods, student abilities, and staff qualifications. Here discrepancy between program installation and installation criteria are noted and reported to the decision maker for appropriate action.

In process, student and staff activities, functions, and communication are evaluated. Still, if inadequate, it is reported to the decision makers. In product evaluation, the effect of the whole program is evaluated in terms of original goals. The information obtained enables to make final decisions whether the program is worthwhile and should be continued, modified or terminated.

Finally, in cost evaluation program products shall be compared to products of similar programs evaluated. It is also in terms of cost-benefits.

Provous claims that his evaluation plan could be used to make evaluation of ongoing program, in any stage, from the planning to the implementation. It could also be used at school level, school districts, and regional or state level. Though sure to enable undertake comprehensive evaluation at every level, handicapped it is to provide information on non – anticipated out comes, since obsessed with program standard that may not be generalizable. It is too fixed with criteria and checklists that, it ignores the dynamics of the school contexts. Believe also evaluation is only for decision makers, obsolete for it forgets practitioners role in decision- making (Ornestein and Hunkins; 1988: 327-29; Patton, 1997: 203).

***ii) Stake's Countenance (Congruence –Contingency) Model***

Robert stake (in Saylor, 1980:329), who is among those interested in formal evaluation procedures, developed countenance model in which data are arranged into three bodies of information: antecedents, transactions and out comes. Antecedents are any condition that exists prior to teaching learning that may influence out comes. They are entry behaviors or sometimes described as in puts. Include characteristics of students prior to lessons (like, aptitude, previous achievements, attendance, etc) and teacher characteristics (like, years of experience, type of education and teacher behavior ratings).

Transactions are interactions the students have with peers, teachers, and with resource people. It also includes students' relation with certain curriculum materials and classroom environments dealing with time allocation, space arrangements, and communication flow. It comprises the 'process' of teaching and learning.

Outcomes, similar to product evaluation in Stafflebeam CIPP model, are the measuring of mainly student achievements. Impact of the new program on teachers' perception of their competence and behavior of administrators also fall under this category.

Stake's model necessitates consideration of both process and objectives in implementation evaluation, brings the intended features of a curriculum and the corresponding relations while investigation. It also enables the gathering of data from different sources: antecedents, transaction and outcomes. However, infused with quantitative representation of occurrences, understanding the whole is impaired. And also noting could be said about factors affecting the program, or issues unrelated to out comes. The evaluator has usually pre-prepared criteria or categories to observe that un intended issues important to the process of evaluation are likely to be ignored.

***iii) Context, Input, Process, Product Model (CIPP Model)***

Developed by Daniel Stafflebeam (in Popham, 1993:31), CIPP model considers evaluation to be a continuous process corresponding to context, studying the environment of the program; input, school capability evaluation; process, congruency between planned and actual activities; and product evaluation, whether accomplished what was intended. As Calder (1994:24), CIPP model is more comprehensive than previous approaches.

Context evaluation, specifically, inquires the environment, its appropriateness for implementation. It describes the actual and intended condition of the program, identify unmet needs, and diagnose barriers that prevent needs from being met. Input evaluation, provides information and determine how to utilize resource to meet program goals. Process, determines the congruency between the planned and actual activities. And product evaluation provides data necessary to determine whether the curriculum now in use is accomplishing what had been intended.

All the above models emphasize objectivity, quantification and evaluations are too much concerned with observing and measuring routine specific behavioral changes. Critics to these models argue that they are obsessed with mechanistic view of the world that consists of competencies, checklists, and tiny behaviors, have noting to do with understanding of the whole. They represent quantitatively human ideas, the internal meanings of situations are obscured.

In effect, a new approach to evaluation has taken form, a thinking that places the evaluator in the center of things, rather than haphazardly filled and collected numerical data. In this paradigm evaluators are personally involved in arguing and are viewed as integral parts of the very process of evaluation- not detached from the system and appear as disinterested to he program.

The new evaluation models (Humanistic-Naturalistic) share common view, there are many realties not known that it is better if evaluation is influenced by researchers own values rather than prescriptive descriptions of others. They argue for more holistic engagement that presents one with much more details. As mentioned earlier, the new paradigm focuses on quality than the quantity of classroom or school life-Holistic understanding than routine, tiny incidents of classroom interaction. While the scientific–positivistic reveal data on 'what' people did, naturalistic attempt to add to the 'what' data' the 'how' and 'why' data, stress interpretive understanding rather than objective explanations. Though critics on the humanistic/naturalistic paradigm accuse its subjectivity, many writers have provided quite justifiable responses .For instance, Scriven and Kruthwohly (in Sadler: 1981:26) argue, subjectivity is a natural and necessary element of evaluation, which calls for no apology.

To Ornestein and Hunkins (1988: 333-36), the following curriculum evaluation models are set to fall in the humanistic- naturalistic paradigm.

#### 2.2.2.2 Humanistic- Naturalistic Approaches

***i) Eisner's Connoisseurship Evaluation Model***

Elliot Eisner has recommended educational criticism and connoisseurship approach that

relies on qualitative description of educational life. He posits, educators ask questions focusing on processes, on school life and school quality. Eisner's educational connoisseurship is the art of appreciating the educationally significant, where the appreciation is made public through criticism-the description, interpretation, and analysis of the whole teaching learning situations in the school.

Evaluators using this model, as listed in Ornestein and Hunkins (1988) are expected to involve in qualitative activities as:

- Being a participant classroom observer-analyzing student work in detail
- Watching, analyzing and interpreting information from films, videotape, photographs, and audiotape of both teachers and students in action.
- Noting what is done, what is said and perhaps more importantly, what is not done and not said.

Observation, subjective judgment, aesthetic approach, expert opinion, group corroborations are common terms related to Eisner's connoisseurship model.

***ii) Illuminative Evaluation Model***

Another naturalistic approach to evaluation is illuminative evaluation. Due to criticisms from many directions against positivistic/ scientific methods, like they are artificial and restricted in scope (Stenhouse, 1975: 112), pre-test-post-test approach as' a paradigm for plants not people" (Calder, 1994:25), an illuminative model was developed. The model advocates evaluators to intensively study the total program- its rationale and evolutions, its operation, achievements and difficulties. Parlett and Hamilton, developers of this approach, advise the importance of the process as well as the input and out come. They recognize also the importance of the context. It is similar to CIPP model in its comprehensiveness though it is criticized for it ignores the importance of generalizability and uses qualitative description than quantitative. In illuminative evaluations quantifications are considered supplementary as different from the CIPP model.

There are three stages in evaluation of curriculum when applying an illuminative model: observation, further inquiry, and explanation.

**Observation: -** is the first stage involving general looking at the program to Orient oneself and to describe the context. Attention at this stage is given to all factors that might influence the program. Data gathered might include, arrangement of school subjects, types of teaching and learning styles evident, materials being used, and even types of evaluation methods employed by the teacher.

**Further inquiry: -** evaluator attempts to separate the significant from the trivial, and brings focus to the evaluation. Tries to gain an understanding of the program through contact with individuals affected by it to know if the program works and why it works. Further inquiry or progressive focusing emerges out of the continually examining the program in action. This means that the evaluation spends extended time in the field, gather data by examining school document and portfolios of students' work, and form interviews and questionnaires with staff and parents.

**Explanation:-** the evaluation using this model is not attempting to pass judgment on the program, rather to furnish data on what is happening with the program and why.

Further, the illuminative model assumes an artistic perspective, insisting that education is a complex and dynamic set of interaction. The interactions observed and evaluated holistically and subjectively, not to be broken down into artificial ways of discrete categories for objective measurement. The evaluation process includes unintended categories and part, subtle aspects of the environment, the items that are often missed or discarded by objective observers. Illuminative evaluator tries to avoid taking sides. That is, which perspective is correct? They wish to accept the validity of both scientific and humanistic approaches to evaluation; they contend there are weaknesses and strengths in both approaches. Hence, other humanistic/naturalistic models become acceptable to the field.

***iii) Portraiture Model***

First developed by Sara Lawrence Lightfoot, from the field of anthropology (Ornestein and Hunkins, 1988: 335), the approach in portraiture is initially to observe what is occurring in the school-teachers, students, school documents as sources of information. It advises also to conduct interviews and employ questionnaires.

From the information obtained, the evaluator produces a thin description. Then, tries to create 'thick' description, which is an attempt to interpret what is recorded. Finally, the evaluator engages itself in the process similar to that of explanation in illuminative evaluation, creating reports (portrait).

In portrait, the evaluator is expected to capture the spirit of the school program, not only tell what was done, but to offer some in sight on reasons behind actions. The evaluator is also free to enter his/her feelings into the document.

Having said all the above, then, what is an appropriate model to adopt in this study? Many reviewers of the models assert adherence to a single model is disadvantageous than helping effective evaluation. Selection of more than one model or using once own approach is what usually recommended. For instance, Patton (1997:177) believes creative thinking implies not accommodation of one particular virtue in doing things the way they always have been done. In addition, Mccormic and James (1990:181) and Kent et al (1996:135) assert, recent research in both the social sciences and education use a number of styles derived from the two fundamentally different perspectives. Pluralistic conceptions of evaluation are needed where multiple methods, measures, criteria, perspectives, audiences and interests are recognized. Evaluation has moved from a monolithic to a plurality conception, reflecting the pluralism that had emerged in the larger society.

However, though I believe in the importance of adopting a concise approach from many perspectives, for the sake to study details of the teaching learning processes, I thought the illuminative model important to include many theories in one, except emphasizes qualitative data. The model enables the evaluator to investigate all aspects in implementation, unintended and intended. It makes free, the evaluator from prescriptive criteria/ judgment based on already developed approaches. It is my choice; an illuminative model is, therefore, to guide my investigations following.

# PART THREE

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### 3.1 Design of the Study

A descriptive case study design was adopted for this research. Gall, et al (1996: 549) writes, researchers generally use case studies for one of three purposes: to produce detailed descriptions of phenomenon, to develop possible explanation of it, or to evaluate the phenomenon. It has been contended also (Yin, 2003: 6), case study designs are more appropriate if 'How" and 'Why' questions are the major concerns of a study.

It has been indicated, in the introductory part, the major concern of the study is to attain detailed understanding of teacher performances, and most of the research questions posed were the 'how' and 'why' questions that the method obviously fits the study.

In case studies the major challenge to the researcher is the question of validity (credibility). In this study, as response to this problem, multiple methods of data collection were used. Creswell (1998: 202) calls this triangulation. That is, researchers make use of multiple sources; methods, investigators, and theories to provide corroborating evidence. The study used three different instruments of data collection to effect triangulation. These were: observations, interviews and documents.

For instance, in attempting the first question, how teachers formulate and use instructional objectives? Why? All the three instruments are used, i.e. teachers' daily and annual lesson plan as documents, classroom observations using field notes, and also interviews. The lesson plans were assessed to see how teachers are appropriately formulating instructional objectives. That is, whether objectives are clear and understandable, and formulated in terms of the three domains of learning. Class observations were made to understand whether they use the self formulated instructional objectives as guides in their teachings, whether announcing the lesson

objectives right the beginning of instruction and checking attainment of objectives at closures are conducted. Semi structured interviews were to see how teaches perceive the importance of formulating and using instructional objectives and/or conscious of formulating good instructional objectives. The data obtained from all these sources enter explanation during analysis either supporting or contradicting each other.

As authenticity rather than reliability is often the issue in qualitative researches, the data obtained from various sources, analysis and interpretation are not separately presented. The narrative structures are both inductive and deductive to engage the reader throughout the text (Creswell, 1998: 20).

## 3.2 The data collection Instruments

### 3.2.1 Observation

Many writes perceive observational data as a vital set of data in implementation studies. Gesten and Carnine (1982: 68) write, despite the widespread use of interview techniques to assess levels of implementation of an educational practice, most valid way to measure implementation is direct observation. Classroom observation is a key instrument of data collection in describing what approaches are being used. Merriam (1988: 102) also contends, observational data gives a first hand account of the situation under study and when combined with interviewing and document analysis, allows a holistic interpretation of the phenomenon being studied.

As to Hopkins (1993: 92), there are four types or observations, namely: open observation, focused observation, structured observation and systematic observation. For this study, open observation was used to collect class interaction data. In open observation, the observer either can notes down key points about the lesson or uses a personal form of short hand for making a verbatim recording of classroom transactions.

It was writing down of key points employed in this study. The notes to key points were mainly related to;

- The extent teachers use instructional objectives as guide to their teachings.
- The extent teachers are covering portions.
- Whether teachers use a variety or teaching approaches in class.

- Teachers' use of instructional materials
- How teacher' assess students

Each of the teachers was observed three different lesson periods with different topics, different classes and grade levels, one observation session per week. Observations were also made outside classroom to get more evidences on teachers' use of media materials, when the inquirer was not in class with them. Most data from observations are described in the narratives than reduced into tables of quantification during analysis.

### 3.2.2 Interviews

Interviews in qualitative research paradigm are one of the major sources of data. In evaluation studies, interviews are very useful instruments to understand reasons how and why things happen the way they are happening. The why of classroom interactions, particularly, are better addressed through participant interviews.

In this study, the process of interviewing was through taking intensive field notes to minimize the feelings of insecurity. During interviews three groups of informants were involved; teachers, students and instructional leaders.

#### 3.2.2.1 Teachers

In the school, there are four Geography teachers teaching grades 9 through 12. In the interview process all of them were involved. The repeatedly conducted interviews with teachers were semi structured related to specific lesson they taught and usually made just after class teaching.

Most interview questions were related to finding answers for the why of classroom interaction. Moreover, questions of teachers' experience, field of specialization, teaching load, and participation in activities other than classroom teachings were also made. All the information related to the teacher informant backgrounds were collected from themselves at the first interview with the teachers. Table I shows this.

**Table I: Bio data of the teacher informants**

| Teacher code | Qualification and field of specialization | Years of teaching | Teaching load | Posts in school |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teacher 1 (TI) | Diploma in Agriculture | 19 | 16 | - |
| Teacher 2 (TII) | BA in Geography | 10 | 14 | - |
| Teacher 3 (TIII) | BA Geography | 4 | 14 | Department head |
| Teacher 4 (TIV) | BA Psychology | 2 | 16 | Guidance and counselor |

Fortunately in table I, all of the teachers are at different qualification and experience. It helps to understand the existence of difference between experienced/ in experienced, and between least qualified and better qualified. It also helps to search evidence related to the supports the experienced or the qualified are providing for the other colleagues.

#### 3.2.2.2 Students

In evaluative case studies, an interview with student is an inevitable task of the researcher. Without making deep interviews with the students it is difficult to obtain the natural (with out intervention) teaching/learning activities in schools. For this study deep interviews were made with purposefully selected students of the school. Eight students, two for each grade's 9 through 12 are used in the study. To select the students, since the main intention of using student interviews was only to understand how teachers perform in classrooms, students ranking first in class are involved. They are thought to provide vital data without biases, and with interest. The semi-structured interviews with students have included:

- the general approaches teachers' use when teaching.
- how and when teachers' ask questions
- Teachers' extent of using media
- whether teachers' provide extra teaching sessions – make–ups, tutorials,

differential teachings, etc

- How teachers' assess students

#### 3.2.2.3 Instructional Leaders

Interviews with instructional leaders- department heads and directors were made to see whether they provide support or guidance for teachers, how they evaluate or supervise teachers, whether they have enough documentation on things they do and whether appropriate collegiality among different parties in the school exists.

### 3.2.3 Documents

Documents in this study are used both as major instrument of data collection and also as supplementary evidences with interview responses and class observation notes.

Among documents used in this study are:

1. Teachers annual and daily lesson plans as vital data to understand:
   - How teachers formulate instructional objectives.
   - Whether they have included a variety of methods, materials and evaluation mechanisms.
   - Whether they are teaching per their plans
2. Files in the pedagogical center and school library to see how much the teachers are efficiently using available materials in the school.
3. Department and office documents to understand whether collegiality exists in the school. To check if discussions related to improving classroom teachings are made among teachers, etc.
4. Curriculum materials; syllabuses, textbooks and teacher guides to see the extent the teachers use these materials.

## 3.3 The Research Setting

The first, for most important thing in research is having an interest and a conducive research environment that helps collect an appropriate data with kindly cooperation. With this, Seyoum (in Amera, 2000: 48) contends, 'without interest, it is very hard to imagine one could engage in productive research work'.

In this study, therefore, since I had better past exposure, able to make easy access to the teachers, and I believe that some studies are also fair if conducted for schools far of the capital, I have selected illuababor province as my initial research area. Then, for case study site, I had to make comparisons among schools in the area. At last, Gore Secondary School was selected as an appropriate research setting due to the following justifiable reasons.

a. The great majority of students in the school fail to join the preparatory classes showing more problems in implementation. For instance, among students which were 715 in grade ten by the year 2003/4, there are only 24 (3.3%) students this year (2004/5) attending 10+1 preparatory classes. Those who are attending the technical training are also few, about six students.
b. The backgrounds of Geography teachers in the school are varied that it enables making easy comparisons among them (see table 1).

The research setting, Gore Secondary School, is found in Gore town. The town is located some 570 kms southwest of the capital, in Illubabor. The school 50$^{th}$ year anniversary journal indicates, Gore is among oldest towns in the country. In the journal, modern establishments like Bank of Abyssinia in 1915, health station in 1933, electrifications during the late Italian period, Modern schooling by American missionaries in 1901, were evidences for the town that makes its history interesting.

However, through years, as indicated in the journal, the importance of the town begun declining due to the discovery of oil in the middle east and the corresponding establishment of Asab as major port. As a result of oil discoveries, the journal explains, major traders in the town which were Arabs started to leave the town, reducing the importance of the town as trading center. The opening of Asab as major trade out let has also attracted export products of south -west (like coffee, hides and skins, Ivory, wild life skins, etc), which were exported via Gambella.

The fate of the town was also reflected on the school. The school, which administered 8th grade national examination by the year 1945, and the London matriculation in 1961, is still a secondary school. A report in the school journal reveals even a single classroom

building was not built for the school from the year 1967.

The school journal writes, many noble intellectuals played/playing prominent role in the country's politics, and other activities, like Professor Jamal Abdulkadir, Colenel Goshu Wodle, Dr. Senay Like, and Colenel Tedla Desta were products of the school.

## 1.4 Data Analysis Strategy

Borgan and Biken in Amera (2004: 42) write, qualitative studies basically are involved in words arguments than numerical explanation. Case study focuses mainly on describing, recording, analyzing and interpreting the conditions that exist.

In this study also, the data drawn form observation, interviews and documents were studied carefully, presented, analyzed and interpreted being grouped in to five themes related to research questions. During analysis, in order to engage reading, structural steps are not followed like the other paradigm. The analysis was in such a way that the reader jumps from one assemblage to another and consequently moves from judgment to understanding (Creswell, 1988: 199).

# PART FOUR

## FINDINGS

This section of the study describes the major findings obtained in terms of themes related to the basic purposes and questions.

It has been stated in the introductory part, the main purpose of the study is to understand instructional performances of teachers. Specifically, interested in classroom processes of "how "and "why" teacher performances. The study attempted to find answers for questions:

- How teachers formulate and use instructional objectives? Why?
- To what extent teachers are able to cover portions in time? Why?
- How much teachers use a variety of instructional methods in classrooms? Why?
- How much efficiently teachers use instructional materials available in the school?
- How much appropriate is teachers' assessment mechanisms?

Stated also, qualitative case study is the interest of the research. As common to qualitative research paradigm instruments used in the study are open observation, interviews and documents. In searching answers for most of the questions, open observations are used as major instrument of data, conducted only by the researcher, using field notes. Interviews and documents are used both as major and supplementary sources for triangulation.

Most data are described in words rather than reduced to qualities –numbers/ percentages. During analysis both inductive and deductive procedures are included. Inductive in a sense those preliminary perspectives are developed from data through observations. Deductive involving the finding of more evidences using interviews and documents as supplementary sources, to move the reader from judgment to better understanding. Quoting teacher views is through writing codes, t1, t2--- t4; while, student reflections are using the first letters of their name.

## 4.1 The Formulation and the Use of Instructional Objectives

Whether the curriculum is designed poorly or orderly, its success or failure is dependent up on the quality of planning and implementation by teachers. Particularly, the formulation and appropriate use of instructional objectives as intended by developers of the curriculum, and the philosophy of the discipline is a pre-requisite duty of the teacher. Supporting this, Rosenshine and Frust (1973:14-15) state, Clear and understandable instructional objectives are the basis for selecting contents, forming learning activities, deciding on what instructional materials and evaluation mechanisms to use. Coherence among instructional processes at large is possible only with an appropriately set and translated in to practice of instructional objectives.

In this section, to understand the extent geography teachers in the school are conscious in formulating appropriate instructional objectives, their annual and daily lesson plan objectives were related to reflections of some writers' /theories/. In addition, observation in class rooms were also made to arrive at whether the teachers are using the self set instructional objectives in daily lessons as guide to their teachings.

**Table II: General and specific objectives in teacher instructional plans**

| General objectives | Specific objectives |
|---|---|
| • Have the knowledge of the distribution, contribution to GDP, employment opportunities of those activities<br>• Develop basic skills and knowledge on the meaning and development of geography<br>• Have a knowledge of African soils<br>• Understand the peoples and population of Africa<br>• Develop African past and present conditions | • Describe about population<br>• Describe about economic activities<br>• Describe about agriculture<br>• Understand economic activities of the polar zone<br>• Have a knowledge of map projection |

***Source: Teachers' annual lesson plans (2004/5, grades 10-12) and daily lesson plans (march-April)***

Scholars in education believe instructional objectives are appropriately formulated if they indicate clearly the kind of behavior to be developed in the students' and the area of content in which the behavior is to be applied. Objectives should use verbs describing observable actions which have observable products such as, to identity, to choose, to solve, to analyze, to explain etc. Objectives should clearly guide the teacher as to which methods, materials, and evaluation mechanisms to apply during instruction. An all rounded development of students' is attained if objectives are formulated and put in to practice in terms of all the three domains of learning; affective, psychomotor and cognitive domains (Pratt, 1993:141; Rosenshine and Frust, 1973:14-15; Biggs and Collins, 1982:141).

However, what one understands from teacher-formulated objectives in table II is obviously limited to reflect clear and understandable behaviors and contents. The objectives are ambiguous, behaviors not related to contents and contents not specified in such a way that one understands the intentions of the concepts to teach. Differences are not also observable between general and specific objectives.

For instance, the first among general objectives in table II is vague that it does not indicate which economic activities are to be treated. In the second objective also, in spite development of skill is not related to the meaning of geography, the objective is formulated as if there exists skill developments. In the third objective, it is also meaningless to state, "Have knowledge of Africa soils". "African soils" is very wide concept that a specific area of geographical interest is not mentioned.

A count through general objectives in teachers' annual lesson plans (2004/5, grades 10-12) also shows, balancing among the three domains of learning were not maintained. In three different annual lessons assessed each for grades 10-12, from a total of 42 general objectives, only five were attempted for skills /psychomotor domain, and one objective for the affective /attitude domain.

The specific objectives in table II and many others in teachers' daily lessons are also not different from the general, having very wider concepts/ contents. Action verbs do not describe observable behaviors (like read, interpret, demonstrate, show, etc). For

instance, among specific objectives in table II, an objective stated as, "describe about population" does not indicate specific content within the very wide scope population. Action verb in an objective stated as, "understand economic activity of polar zone" also does not reflect observable behavior. Understanding is very general term that will not be attained within 40 minutes duration of a period, also not measurable.

Assessed teacher daily lesson plan objectives also show similar problems of ambiguity in contents and behaviors, imbalance among the three domains of learning, the mixing of general with specific, repeatedly writing similar behaviors in a number of successive objectives (see also table V.)

Further, in teachers' daily lesson objectives, there are incidents where a single specific objective is set for a number of class sessions with different contents – sometimes unrelated. A case is T2's lessons, where a single objective, "... students will be able to identify secondary economic activity", is stated for about four different contents/concepts-manufacturing, transport, political Geography of Africa, test (lesson planning dates, 12/7/05 – 16/7/05, grade 11). Such a situation is not only for a single lesson but also through out the daily lesson of this teacher. In two months daily lesson plans of all teachers, not at all objectives are stated for the purpose of acquisition of practical skills and development of attitudes.

Regarding the extent of referring self-set objectives when presenting lessons in class, **field note I** for all class observations indicates none of the teachers were using instructional objectives in their daily lessons as guides to their teachings. Anderson (1987: 70) writes, teachers should make the students to know what contents and objectives are to be dealt during a study before the study actually began. However, none of the teachers were sought announcing the purpose of the lesson before instruction. All teachers were observed beginning lessons either remembering the previous or asking questions related to the daily lesson topic. The need for announcing lesson objectives is not known among the teachers. The teacher is also expected to check whether his lesson objective is met or not at the end of the lesson through feedback. Yet, none of the teachers were seen doing this. In all the sessions observed, teachers were found winding up lessons with out closures- either summarizing or questioning. The bell

usually rings up when they are explaining or writing notes on the chalkboard.
Educationalists contention like, objectives define the directions in which it is desirable for growth, provide basis for selection of content and learning experiences, and basis for evaluation (Ragon, 1966: 113); clear goal setting contributes to better student out comes (Crremers in Stephenson, 2001: 145) etc, have no place among Geography teachers in the school. They write objectives in their lesson plans only for they are required to do so.

Two major explanations could be developed from what I have observed and what teachers contended during interviews. The first is, teachers knew theoretical expectations of good instructional objectives but the way they perceive its importance is eroded due to lack of enthusiasm and dedication. Those who have taken courses in Education (excluding T1) were found neglecting the place instructional objectives have in learning, though they claim that they know the theories of setting appropriate instructional objectives. The second is, the weak management and guidance from responsible parties; directors, supervisors, department heads. I have seen teacher annual lesson plans signed and sealed with only single (one) objective under each chapter, and teacher's daily lessons with out specifying instructional materials and evaluation mechanisms still signed with no comments. Checking the quality of prepared lesson plan is unknown among instructional leaders.

## 4.2 Covering Portions in Time

In countries where curriculum is centralized and examinations determining students' future career are prepared and administered at national level, it is obvious that teachers are expected to cover portions in time. Due to various reasons, however, teachers may stand indifferent, resistant to perform what is required of them.

In this part, teachers' consistency with the prescribed contents in the national curriculum is considered as one of the indices to understand how far the implementation function of teachers is going effective. To this end, teachers in the school were observed when teaching in classroom, and their lesson plans are assessed to check whether they are covering or will be able to cover portions within available time.

Teachers' lesson plans (Feb. – March, 2005) indicate, for grades 11 and 12, portions are as per their schedule. However, in grades 9 and 10, teachers were found too late to cover the left topics, even through make-up sessions.

For instance, in grade 9, the syllabus expects teachers to cover at least two chapters of the textbook within allotted periods in the first semester. However, teachers only have gone through the first chapter. In the second month of second semester (Megabit) teachers daily lesson shows they are still in unit two, which ought to be in the first semester. **Field not II** indicates also, teachers teaching in grade 9 (T1, T2 and T4) are not at equal paces in covering portions. While T2 and T4 were observed teaching the topic "tropical zone" on an observation date 9/4/05 and 1/4/05 respectively, T1 had already taught it before 7/3/05 observation date (more than a month ahead). It shows the prevalence of communication gap among the teachers even teaching the same grade level - the weak culture of working together.

Similarly, inability in covering portions was also observed among teachers teaching in grade 10. Though are expected according to the syllabus to cover 8 chapters, they were still in chapter 4 (end of Megabit – left with one or two months maximum). What is very desperate to students at this grade level is that they are national examination takers and they didn't also learn the last chapter (chapter four) when they were in grade 9.

In conversations with the teachers, they gave two main reasons for their inability to cope with the available time. The first is the presence of complete discordance between contents and allotted periods to the course, and the second, student in ability to help them in preparing their own notes from the textbook. One teacher said,

> *... I have tried to cover portions for students through make-ups, but still unable to cope because the gap between textbook portions and periods available are so wide. In addition, when I order students to prepare their own notes from the textbook, most students' do not do it, and some of them copy all what is found in the text. I am forced to provide them a note, which wastes the time (T4, 14/09/05).*

Contradicting, students were found accusing teachers for their lack of concern to finish portions. One student said:

> *... Covering the portions in time? I don't think it could be. Teachers are not seen eager. They do not give us make -ups... It is not a case only in Geography. We have also similar problems in other subjects (PD, grade 9 student, 14/03/05).*

Another student also said,

> *... We are too late in the text, only 40 pages [168 pages left for second semester]. Our teachers have habits of chewing chat and taking some drinks... They come to classes with out preparation.... Many times miss classes. The habits make them tired that class time is not sufficiently used. They do not even use the whole 40 minutes allotted for a period (BC, grade 9 student, 15/03/05).*

Interview responses reflect two opposing views. While teachers resent they have been providing make-up sessions in order that portions are covered in time, differently, students are complaining teachers are not eager to cover contents in textbooks. Students leveled the teachers at the status of indifference; not providing make-ups, come to classes with out any notable preparation, even do not properly use the allotted 40 minutes time in a period. **Field observation note II** for further justifications shows, similar situations with what students have complained than only what teachers leveled. During my presence in the school, except one teacher (T1) whom I didn't see being absent from the school even for a day, the rest were found repeatedly leaving the school for different reasons – seeking transfers, competition to join colleges, for post graduate application and marriage. At this junction, it is to be clear that I do not have the thinking that teachers should stay in the school all the time; however, the situation is up to one wonders whether or not the school compound had people working in it regularly. What makes the situation worse is, no teacher was compensating for the missed periods which were minimum of a week session for each teacher.

Normally, make-ups for missed periods are just after the teacher returns from where he goes. No one guarantees replacements after a while or around end of the semester. My observations substantiate students' complaints that, teachers are late in covering

portions not only because of vastness of portions but also because of repeated absence from classes and not providing compensation sessions. More deserving is a response of one student

> *…. In this year, worse than last, missing classes are common among teachers. He [the teacher] repeatedly does not come to school. He does not compensate missed periods. From eight chapters of the text, we are still in chapter three. Serious is we didn't begin the second semester learning [two weeks in the second semester]. Our teacher didn't still come form where he goes…. It is in this situation we sit for the national exam. (AM, grade 10 student, 15/03/05).*

What can be inferred mainly is the prevalence of poor management in the school. Instructional leaders are not as such found challenging the teachers to be consistent with syllabus requirements. Another problem aggravating teachers' inability of covering portions is their way of presenting contents. Teachers were found wasting a minimum of 50% of the class time only providing shortened notes from the student textbook, which is meaningless repetition. Since students have enough textbooks, they had to leave it for students instead of stepping down and do what is expected from the students.

Regarding portions in grades 11 and 12, teachers' daily lesson plans indicate, they are ahead of the time provided in the syllabi's. Particularly, grade 12 portions are on the way to be covered, the teacher is in the end of the chapters. However, students at these grade levels have also complaints like, the teachers are not interested to teach the map reading section of the textbook; though they are few in number, were not enabled to do more exercises in class; and teachers miss classes provided that they have enough time to cover portions. One student in grade 12 (AL, 17/03/05) said,

> *…. Last year, we have learnt Geography up to chapter six, but we didn't deal with the last chapter (map reading), though we had time to cover.*

This implies, teachers are skipping some difficult portions. In **field note II** also, teachers were observed mistreating some topics. For instance, in one of class observations, T3 was sought not correctly defining globe as true map of the world, and T1 miscomputing the difference in altitude between highest and lowest points in Ethiopia. This probably result from the fact, number of questions usually appearing in national examinations

from the map reading part are few (not more than ten questions) that teachers pay little attention, skip the portion, and make mistakes when teaching-come to classes not enough prepared. The importance of Geographical skills (map reading) in Geographical learning are unknown or underestimated among curriculum developers and examination board at national level, which in turn resulted purposeful negligence of topics related to map reading/ map works on the part of teachers.

## 4.3 Teaching Approaches

Many writers in Education contend, variety not only an appropriate method makes learning interesting and sustain students' attention over a long period of time with the teacher. With out variety in approaches, a subject can easily be memory exercise, a listing of things that occur together in an area (Canglosi, 1991: 261, Fullan and Pomfret in Dawit, 1999: 52).

With this, decade's gone scholars in education have been suggesting methods and strategies of approaching lessons since schooling. While some are general – to every discipline, others are to a certain field of study-specific.

In geography, beginning from its conception as an area of knowledge in schools, many writers have provided their own account on the techniques and strategies of learning Geography. Citing contributions of some, Naish (1992) contends, to effect understanding than mere memorization of facts, approaches to teaching Geography should include a full use of case study and direct observation in the field. The importance of encouraging student active participation in field observation shall not be underestimated among teachers. He advises, teachers to develop students' curiosity towards Geographical investigations through:

- Retaining student interest
- The study of local area – real place.
- The use of active methods such as fieldwork or practical work.
- The discussion of Geographical background to current events, and
- Developing the reading and interpretation of various types of maps.

Likewise, Battersby (1995) and Fisher (1998), have also added specific active teaching approaches: developing a sense of place, using new technologies, improving graphicacy techniques. Battersby (1995: 21) puts, one of the fundamental aims of any Geography instruction is to create a "sense of place" in pupils. Fisher (1998) also contends, Geographical understanding is enjoyable only if a sense of place develops in the mind of pupils. Fisher justifies, a sense of place creates an accurate framework of location knowledge, provides a mental image of the nature of the place, and fosters positive attitude towards distinct aspects of other places and ways of life.

Fisher and Battersby state, enquiry learning as the best approach to develop an appropriate sense of place in pupils' mind. That is, entertaining a number of successive questions related to the place under discussion. For instance, when learning about Alaska, the teacher first motivates students' to raise questions of what they need to know of Alaska. Then, they may ask questions like, what is Alaska? Where Alaska is located? What kind of life exists there? How do people live there? Etc. The teacher, in this case is there to raise student curiosity as mentor instead of telling/explaining matters himself. Referring to available learning resources (textbook, maps, models, pictures, charts, data etc), all the procedures of searching for answers are performed by students, either individually or in groups. At the end, of course, the teacher is expected to consolidate (summarize) the lesson. In active learning environment students are solely responsible for their learning, they contend.

Fisher and Batterby write also, the use of technology while learning Geography is among crucial requirements. As one of the school subjects, perhaps the most, affected by dynamism, Geographic learning must form appropriate access to new technologies. Particularly, the use of Information Technology (IT) and Geographical Information Systems and Remote Sensing (GIS/RS) are considered the foremost attention areas to be accessed, transformed and manipulated interactively – regarded as model of the real world.

Though not advocating an absolute class control of IT on student learning, Fisher (1996) writes the significance of IT in Geography as:

- Enables understand an alternative image of people, places and environments.
- Increase time for greater depth of analysis by generating graphs, charts, maps, rapidly.
- Increase learners' autonomy in class.

Equally important strategy proposed is developing graphic skills of pupils. The writers' stress, improving graphic ability of students is one of the missions of Geography in schools. They advise, teachers to check the difference in graphic ability of pupils at the beginning and end of the academic year through student own portfolios. Student involvement in graphing, charting, sketching, modeling, etc gives reality to the subject from being arid and theoretical, they posit.

Further, Freeman and Raup (1959: 18) also advise teachers; always to make intense reading on recent publications, update themselves with timely information. They state, if Geography teachers set out to develop the urge to be Geographers in their students, at least fair to equip them with methods namely, knowledge of sources where Geographical information is to be found, and knowledge of the methods used to extract it, which can only possible through forming an appropriate access to current information oneself. A conclusive remark is what O'Neill and Kiston (1996: 125) stress, i.e. the teaching of Geography is not always to teach about; rather it provides the opportunity to have experience. Implying that, methods are more important than contents or body of knowledge.

Unfortunate, in light of the cited approaches to teaching Geography, what school syllabi's (9-12) propose, and what teachers are actually performing in school under study is quite different. School syllabi's have not enough or not at all suggested contemporary approaches of Geography teaching – enquiry, case study, a sense of place, use of new technologies, graphicacy, field work/observations, etc. See table III.

**Table III: Proportion of suggested methods of teaching in Geography syllabi's**

| | | Grade 9 | | Grade 10 | | Grade 11 | | Grade 12 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Frequency | %age | Frequency | %age | Frequency | %age | Frequency | %age |
| 1 | Explanation | 31 | 32.7 | 42 | 34.4 | 10 | 28.6 | 13 | 26 |
| 2 | Discussion | 31 | 32.7 | 40 | 32.8 | 17 | 48.6 | 20 | 40 |
| 3 | Demonstration | 13 | 13.6 | 12 | 9.8 | 6 | 17.2 | 11 | 22 |
| 4 | Field work/visit | 8 | 8.4 | 8 | 6.6 | - | - | 1 | 2 |
| 5 | Group report | - | - | 1 | 0.8 | - | - | - | - |
| 6 | Guest speaker | 6 | 6.3 | 16 | 13.1 | 1 | 2.8 | 4 | 8 |
| 7 | Dialogue | - | - | 1 | 0.8 | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | Debate | - | - | 1 | 0.8 | 1 | 2.8 | - | - |
| 9 | Map reading/ interpretation | 6 | 6.3 | 1 | 0.8 | - | - | - | - |
| 10 | Drawing sketches | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 2 |

***Source: Secondary school syllabus grades 9-12***

Table III above illustrates explanation and discussion as guiding methods of teaching – 65.4%, 67.2%, 77.2%, and 66% respectively for grades 9 through 12 – advocating a major classroom control by the teachers. Though it has been stressed, methods are more important than memorizations of contents in geographic learning, syllabi's are guiding teachers to be infused with teachings of facts .For those who refer to methods suggested in the syllabi's, explanation and discussion appear as major teaching approaches for each and every topic /content; particularly for grades nine and ten. Explanation and discussion are risk-free methods that teachers usually are attracted to use them than the others-demonstration, fieldwork/visits, gust speakers, drawing sketches, etc. In the syllabi's assigning of methods also seems randomly. While equally eight fieldwork/ visits are suggested in grades 9 and 10 syllabi's, nothing and only one are for grades 11 and 12. Drawing sketch maps pervasive in learning Geography so as to develop graphic skills is only suggested once in Grade 12 syllabus.

Necessarily required after field visits/observation, group report, is proposed only once in Grade 10. There are also methods unnecessarily recommended many times though they are not related to the contents like: eleven times demonstration in grade 12, guest speakers 16 times in grade 10, dialogue only once in grade 10.

Further looking details in to the syllabi's, particularly for grades 9 and 10, procedures are not explained at all. Only methods – discussion, explanation, etc are stated with out any detail descriptions – how to conduct, on what issues to stress, etc.

Worse in actual implementation, **field note III** indicates, teachers in the school have ignored methods in Geographic literature and in the syllabi's. Class observation, student interviews, documents, and also response of teachers reveal the predominant method of teaching as classroom lectures/explanations. Teachers were seen absolutely controlling most of the class time (fair if said the whole period) talking themselves, sparingly questioning, writing notes-leaving little/ no time for the students. The students spent much of "their time" copying from chalkboard, listening only to the teacher than doing geography- sketching, reading maps, data processing, presenting field reports, etc. The only opportunities to talk for students were when asking for not clear explanations or answering teacher questions.

Teachers were found standing near the blackboard some times asking recall questions, explaining all the matters of daily lesson with writings of shortened notes on the chalk board. No teacher was observed moving in class, motivating student activity, helping individual students even in preparatory classes (grades 11 and 12) where class size is small. In some of the classes teachers were observed writing notes shorted from student textbook for the whole period, which is meaningless except wasting student time. Two commonly practiced methods were:

- Writing note in one of two successive periods and explanation at another
- Class lectures interspersed with notes.

Deserving methods in Geography (indicated before) are either overlooked or unknown among the teachers- even not included in their annual and daily lesson plans. Students said that, their teachers in the school, at all made no attempt even for a day in the whole first semester to teach in other methods than classroom explanation/ lecture. An inviting

response of a student in grade 12(AL, 22/03/05) read as:

> *... During my presence in this school (4 years), I haven't seen a teacher employing methods like field work/observation, drawing sketches, reading maps, inviting guests, etc. apart from classroom lectures himself ... I think vastness of the texts is a problem, though not for grades 11 and 12.... Better if some of the portions come to grades 11 and 12.*

Similar reflections were also forwarded form students in other grade levels

> *... When teaching about rocks and soil, it was easy and more understandable had the teacher take us to the field or brought specimens to class and demonstrates... If I am now asked to identify among different rocks and soil types physically, I can't, for only know them theoretical (PD, Grade 9 student, 23/03/05).*
> *... The whole first semester lessons were in classroom. No teacher has taken his students for observations outside... our teacher "runs" only to cover portions, does not care whether we are understanding or not. Most of the time he gives us notes while explaining. To copy what the teacher is writing on the chalkboard, I don't attentively listen to his explanation... I dislike such teaching (EW, grade 10 student, 22/03/05).*

From student responses, it is understandable that, without training, at all, students were able to cite what the teacher is expected to perform in class, when presenting geographical concepts. Probably their teachers in primary school used to teach them using different methods. Partially implies, teachers know what is expected of them. Except T1, others have taken all courses in education that the importance of using a variety of methods is not hidden to them, unless they purposefully neglect.

Particularly, T2 and T3 are qualified in Geography teaching, taken subject area methodology courses, I expected better from them, though unfortunately not. In conversation with the teachers, none of them responded, they do not have the ability to execute the different methods of Geographic learning. Rather they cited many reasons that are external like:

- Large class size, arrangement of desks in classrooms invites the use of lectures/ explanation.
- Shortage of time, Unable to cover vast portions in textbooks even with present ways of teaching.
- Students' unwillingness or lack of interest to perform duties assigned to

them. When we try to provide lesson through group discussion or any other method, students simply sit close-minded and the whole 40 minutes are lost.

- Students consider active methods of learning as a means taken by the teacher to take rest, waste class time.
- Students are unable to perform duties in instructional language – like class discussion, group report, questioning and answer etc.

One teacher said,

> *…. I usually teach like this. I give them short note first, then explain in the next period… vastness of portions, large class size, poor participation of students in class enforce us to depend on class lecturer/explanation. We do not think of going to fields or use another method. Always we try to cover portions. Even through class lectures, I am still left with five units. Imagine, students are those taking national examination (T2, after class teaching – grade 10, 22/03/05).*

Other teachers had also to say:

> *… There are many problems creating frustration upon us when we try to use other methods. The main of them is students are usually not participatory, may be from their background… Few students understand responding to teacher questions is one of their responsibility. Students have also a great problem in language…. one day when I asked them to tell me the types of volcanoes and how they occur. I didn't get any response from the students. Immediately, when I present the same question translating into Afan oromo, Many hands were raised… ($T_4$, after class teaching, grade 9, 25/03/05).*

> *…. We are required to accomplish two opposite things together-transforming all the written information in textbooks, will not be covered within available time, and participating students in various activities in and out of classrooms. Those who have developed the syllabi's should have seen such extremes ($T_1$, after class teaching, grade 9,25/03/05).*

Axiomatic, teacher responses like, class size, student interest and background, and the nature of the curriculum are serious to affect the implementation function of teachers. However, more interesting is how much teachers are taking initiatives to tackle the

constraints so that provide better lessons. **Field note III** indicates, in the school, let alone minimizing problems, in classes where the mentioned constraints do not exist, teachers were not seen presenting lesson differently. Observations in grades 11 and 12 sessions show unchanged ways of teaching. Though the numbers of students in these classes were 17 and 14 respectively for grades 11 and 12, teachers still devoted explaining and note giving. Students at preparatory stages are obviously able to help their learning – produce reports for projects or any other activity, interested with bright futures, and matured to entertain teacher orders. Contents in students' texts are also not vast, even can be covered early for that of grade 12.

What is more convincing from the two groups of interviewees is the teachers are resisting defects on their part. They are only complaining backgrounds of students, the curriculum, and the class size, context in which they are teaching. Obvious, it is one of human tendency to report what guarantees oneself safety, expected also that teachers respond relatively high commitment.

It could be inferred that, the actual problems are not only what teachers have cited. Rather includes also teachers' lack of commitment to their job and the general weak collegiality among parties in the school.

### 4.3.1 Teachers' Lack of Commitment

Writers believe, teacher commitment and acceptance to the curriculum are among crucial requirements for successful implementation (Cronbach, 1974: 117; Zajda, 2000: 51).

However, class observation **field note III** for all periods indicates, no sign of teachers' commitment to teaching-teachers were not seen motivating, helping individual or weak students. Except telling the students what are in their textbooks, teachers were not seen relating lesson with the environment for the development of student curiously. None of the teachers ever take students for field visits/observations. Even no difference in teachings was observed among qualified and unqualified, apart some problems in understanding of Geographical concepts.

Lack of commitment among teachers was not only in performing class instruction, but also in preparing lessons. Table IV illustrates this.

**Table IV: Activities/ methods in five successive daily lessons of teachers**

| The teacher | Lesson 1 | Lesson 2 | Lesson 3 | Lesson 4 | Lesson 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $T_1$ | -Brainstorming<br>-Discussion on the contents<br>-Summarization | -Brainstorming<br>-Discussion | -Brainstorming<br>-Class presentation<br>-Class evaluation | -Brainstorming through asking questions | -Brainstorming<br>-Motivating students<br>-Controlling the class situation<br>-Discussing with students |
| $T_2$ | -Brainstorming<br>-Students are grouped and discuss in class | Same | Same | Same | Same |
| $T_3$ | -Students discuss in group<br>-Their group leaders report<br>-They take notes<br>-Ask and answer question | Same with 1 | -Group discussion<br>-Reporting<br>-Asking and answering questions<br>-Taking summery notes | Same with 3 | Same with 3 |

***Source: Teachers' daily lesson plans (March – April)***

Clear from table IV, daily lesson plans of the teachers are those naively constructed with repetitions of activities/ methods. Superficial (not actually seen practically implemented) daily lessons of two teachers ($T_1$ and $T_2$) in the table and many others indicate brainstorming as major method for more than ten successive daily lesson plans. It was good had they were seen using this method. I think they misconceived brain storming as questioning- probably not aware of in this respect.

$T_4$ had no both daily and annual lessons. It shows weak management on the side of directors .I didn't go further asking the principals for I thought no excuses, and justifiable reasons are there for a teacher appearing before a class with out any notable preparation. Surprise I have seen is, in daily lessons of $T_2$ and $T_3$ activities written are similar for more than twenty successive lessons. These teachers have insistently indicated group works and group report as their methods, but what actually observed in class, students' reported, and also what the teachers themselves admit is, only classroom lectures/ explanation. The teachers were seen even not knowing the need to implement what they have planned. Though not practically seen in class, daily plans are better constructed by T1 – he is the one with least qualification.

Concerning the place lesson plan has in instruction, Collaham and Clark (1988: 114-115) write, lesson plan is a visible sign of preparation on the part of the teacher. The teacher has the road map to guide him through the lesson. Observed teachers' daily

lesson, how ever, do not indicate an appropriate sign of preparation for classes by the teachers. It was only for principals urge them to do so. For such teachers, mere provision of the necessary training in methodology and equipping them with all the teaching resources is not sufficient. A continuous quality control, monitoring and support in the process are most deserving.

### 4.3.2 The Weak Collegiality

Fisher (1998: 1) contends, curriculum implementation urges a collaborative and teamwork, requires not only a clear understanding and acceptance of individual duties and responsibility but proper execution of interaction among different parties in the process-role relationship.

The role relationship among parties in school can be demonstrated through teacher-director, teacher-teacher, student-teacher, student-directors, and student-student relationships.

In the school, these relationships generally were sought to be weak or in existent. School directors are found making actual academic communication with teachers only once in a semester for the purpose of semester appraisal. Department file indicates, teachers formal meetings are occasionally when dividing classes among themselves. Student-teacher relationships are restricted only in classroom, the teachers' standing in front of the chalkboard, telling to do this and that, students passively listen to what he/she says. No discussions are reported from the students' and read from department documents regarding the weak, female students, the how to learn/ teach, etc. student - director relationships are only when disciplinary problems, not academics. Student-student talks regarding their problems is also weak, they are not empowered.

A conversation made with the director (academic/vice) explains, three successive stages of class observations to exist in the school: a collaborative observation conducted by wereda supervisors, school directors and department heads; an observation for the purpose of appraisal made by the school director and department

heads of respective departments, and a peer-observation session made by teachers within department to exchange experiences among themselves. In all the three stages, the director said, weaknesses and strengths are discussed with the teacher. Teachers within themselves also discuss about their problems and prospects, and report to the office, the director reported.

However, all that teachers said about the number of class observation conducted and the existence of peer observation is different. Teachers said, they have been observed only once in the semester by the department head and school director. Continuous follow-up to assess the degree to which what is in the syllabus have been realized or not is inexistent. Though the director insisted to claim, sharing of experiences as regards teaching learning processes to be strong in the school, responses of teachers and department file did not justify this fact. An interview made with T1 (teacher with no qualification in Geography) is evident:

> *... Not yet guidance or support is provided for me either from the director or colleagues in the department... After class observations, they only tell me to cover portions in time, which is impossible as you see (8/04/05)*

Clear from the above quote that, peer-peer support among teachers is not attempted. When supervisors or directors observe classes, comments are not enough provided to the observed teachers. What instructional leaders stress is only whether portions are covered or not.

In department file also, the only document available is which shows class sharing among teachers at the beginning of the semester. Nothing is there as an evidence for the existence of teacher-teacher communication on matters of how to teach, how to assess, how to help academically poor or female students, etc. even individual teacher files explaining teacher performances were not seen.

Teacher-student relationships are also impaired. Normally the teacher is expected to provide individual supports for slow learners, particularly females. Teachers are required to reflect high expectation so that they communicate with their students freely. According to informal conversations with students, however, teachers were blamed for being

passive to student problems in learning. One student said,

> *... Teachers consider us disinterested, come to school for nothing... They do not believe we attentively listen when they are teaching... Under estimate we may score good grades in national examination (AM, grade 10 student, 11/04/05)*

A student from grade 9 (BC, 11/04/05) has also this to say:

> *... Many times through our monitors, we tell teachers, "you are too fast that we are unable to cope with your teachings", "when taking notes from chalk board, the bell rings before we finish copying; please give us enough time" etc. But no one pays attention to our needs.*

Another 11th grade student (GK, 14/04/05) reported:

> *... Except occasional make-ups; tutorials and differential teachings are not usually attempted among teachers. This year, as to my knowledge, no one teacher provided us extra learning opportunity than the normal class time.*

Students explained teachers' underestimating their ability. Positive enforcement from the teachers is not provided. Both the school directors and teachers are inattentive to students needs. Helping students through make-ups, tutorials or differential teachings are inexistent.

**Field note Iv** does not show also, a single teacher providing supportive teachings in all my presence in the school for two months. Actually, what teachers' responded to their inability in providing tutorials and differentiation teaching is justifiable. Though the teachers are not as such loaded (see table I), the number of classes they teach are many.

T1 said that,

> *... I am teaching eight classes of minimum 75 students in each. To provide even a single tutorial session, I am expected to call them eight times. This is rather a burden than helping students (15/04/05).*

T2 also contended,

> *... Vastness of portions restricts our attention only to providing make-ups. Many students also do not come when we call them for make-ups.... They have no interest for learning (15/04/05).*

Obvious, a teacher who is responsible for many classes/ numbers of students no doubt finds providing tutorials or differential teachings a frustrating task. In situations where original portions are not covered, it is difficult for the teacher to do other supportive activities. It is also demoralizing if most students do not attend make-ups and tutorials with interest.

However, teachers have also their contribution to the problem – the lack of interest. Acceptable are the problems in grades 9 and 10 contexts, but it becomes meaningless when comes to students in grade 11 and 12. Teachers are not also providing extra supports or guidance for the higher classes, apart teaching their usual class sessions.

In student-student relationships, similar situations are sought to prevail. Students reported that, except some times they are advised to help each other, formal supports are not there between those high achievers and low achievers.

Regarding student-directors relationships, students also complained directors disregarding student problems. They said directors are biased towards teachers - respond only to teacher views. Students observed that, some teachers repeatedly miss classes, skip portions, come to class without preparation, do not efficiently use the whole 40 minutes time in a period etc. However, when they inform this to the office, they leveled, no response is obtained.
According to one student informant,

> *... Many times he [the teacher] does not come to school. Repeatedly miss classes. We have reported this to the school principal, but no improvement we have observed yet (BC, grade 9 student, 15/04/05).*

The various forms of weak relationships initially with no doubt come from principals' inability to manage and assure that teachers and students are demonstrating their

duties. Directors had to facilitate conditions for effective teaching/learning than merely leave the responsibility of implementation to the teacher. Fullan (1992: 491) in this respect stresses, the need to have knowledgeable and committed directors in school. Unfortunate that, most directors seem to be available to fill only administrative gap. Nowadays, it is becoming culture in our country that the unqualified are sitting on places where qualification and competency is needed.

In some schools, principals are those appointed by out side's, or elected by the teachers that difficult for them to properly perform what is expected from instructional leader .A case is directors in the school who are Biology and English graduates that are new to administrative qualities.

The actual deterioration of power of directors as a result teachers are apprised for the sake of being appraised – no promotion, incentives, termination etc, and the general culture of fears not to discourage or threaten another are also major problems for the existence of weak relationships among parties in the school. Though I didn't come across literatures reflecting similar problem, the absence of effective role relationships among parties in schools, even beyond this level could be recorded as among drawbacks in Ethiopian education – calling attention.

In general the status quo is in accord with what (Pratt, 1980) contends, no matter how teachers are made knowledgeable about the subject matter, provided with effective instructional techniques, they usually change challenging tasks of the curriculum to risk free classroom activities. The findings, particularly in situations of classroom teachings are similar to Abdulaziz's (1997) attempt to evaluate Geography instruction in secondary schools of Sidama zone, and Aklilu's (1992) findings in his study of student achievements in map reading skills in Addis Ababa. Abdulaziz writes, in most of the classes he observed during his study, teachers were found dominating the class authoritatively through lectures, devoted to presenting the subject matter than seeking student active participation. More teachers talk, passive students' involvement was his major findings. Aklilu's findings also reveal, learning was limited to classrooms and taught using lectures as major method of instruction-only few teachers were mentioned applying demonstration. Safe to state that teachers approach to teaching has not been

changed over decades. No doubt, in the new curriculum also, many teacher characteristics has remained the same though the context and circumstances of secondary teacher education have been claimed to have changed quite dramatically in the recent history of the country (Bridges and Marew, 2000: 22).

## 4.4 Teachers' use of Instructional Materials

It has been asserted in the educational and training policy (1994: 24) that, the appropriate selection and use of instructional materials is crucial for successful implementation. Implies that, only providing the necessary materials to schools have no guarantee unless teachers properly use it in class.

In this section, as one of the indices to determine whether appropriate implementation is effected or not, teachers' use of available materials was considered a major area of investigation. For evidences, instead of teacher questionnaire and interviews, I have used observations, documents and student interviews. It was because of two main reasons: I had the suspicion that teachers may purposefully ignore the reality and inform what is not actually in practice, and in my preliminary observations, as being a teacher of Geography for years; I have arrived at the conclusion that enough materials are available in the school.

In consultation through literature, the meaning of instructional materials is sought to differ from Authors to Authors. While some consider instructional materials to include those that are not directly related to instruction (like, buildings, desks, chalkboard, etc), others restricted its meaning to the materials directly helping instruction (printed materials, audio-visuals, concrete objects, instruments, etc). Needless to go details, for the purpose of this study-instructional process in Geography, the second stance was considered and instructional materials to mean.

**Curriculum materials** – textbooks, syllabuses, teacher guides, reference materials, manuals, etc.

**Media materials** – graphs, charts, maps, photographs, models, instruments, specimen, computers etc.

My initial approach was to ask the teachers how much they use the available instructional materials in their teachings. Responses of the teachers indicates (except T4 who responded truth fully, he is using mainly the student textbook), they are using effectively both the curriculum and media materials in the school for the purpose of lesson planning and actual classroom instruction.

However, **field note IV** during actual observations, documents and student interviews were unable to support this. As opposed to teacher claims, evidences in some instances rather show almost none use of curriculum materials, except student textbooks. At this junction, it is not to argue that teachers should directly copy what are in the syllabus and teacher guides into their respective lessons, or use media materials in all their lessons. Rather, I believe there should be some sort of relation between what the teacher is doing and what the curriculum expects in order that one defines teachers are implementing the curriculum. I believe also, if there are modifications, should be for better or if the specifications not fit the school situations. Classroom teaching/learning processes should not be lowered to meaningless memorization of facts in textbooks in the name of class size, scarce materials, student interest, etc.

Justifiable that, a comparison made between annual and daily lessons on the one hand and syllabi's and teacher guides on the other shows a complete discordance in objectives, methods, media materials, time allotted and evaluation mechanisms specified. The only similarity is in the contents/concepts to be attained.

Since difficult to present all the evidences here, only table V below was constructed to illustrate the difference between teachers' lesson objectives and syllabus objectives.

**Table V: A comparison between objectives in the syllabi's and teacher lesson plans**

| The teacher | Grade level | Syllabus objectives | Teacher objectives |
|---|---|---|---|
| $T_1$ | 9 | -Describe zonal distribution of climate and vegetation with altitude | -Explain the influence of climate on altitude<br>-Explain the distribution of temperature<br>-Explain the distribution of rainfall and types of rainfall |
| | 9 | - Find the exact location of Ethiopia<br>- Describe the relative location of Ethiopia | -Explain about the location of Ethiopia<br>-Explain about the types of location |
| $T_2$ | 9 | -Locate the tropical zone<br>-Describe major physical and human characteristics of the tropical zone<br>-Identify the sub-regions of the tropical zone | -Describe about tropical zone |
| | 11 | -Explain the status of industrial development in Africa<br>-Describe types of manufacturing industries in Africa<br>-Locate major industrial areas in Africa on a map<br>-Discuss the problems and prospects of industrial development in Africa | -Describe about manufacturing |
| $T_3$ | 10 | -Identify major economic systems and their characteristics<br>-Discuss the advantage and disadvantages of major economic systems. | -Explain the types of economic systems<br>-Describe the categories of economic activity |
| | 12 | Identify major types of distribution maps.<br>Read information from distribution maps.<br>Represent data on maps by using the various diagrammatic methods.<br>Explain the meaning of map projection.<br>Discuss the purposes of selecting map projection.<br>Compare and contrast the different types of map projection. | Describe and analyze quantitative maps.<br>Describe types of quantitative maps.<br>Have the knowledge of map projection.<br>Identify the types of map projection. |

***Source: Syllabus documents and teachers' daily lessons (February – March, 2005)***

Though teachers reported that they are referring to the syllabus when preparing lessons, table v shows no evidence of relation in terms of action verbs used and specific contents to be dealt. It implies nothing than a usual tendency of teachers to obscure their defects. Normally, more experienced teachers are said to appear implementing the syllabus

skillfully than those of less experienced. Experience is sought to place teachers in a better position to prepare and appropriately use plans, efficiently employ a variety of teaching techniques, instructional materials, evaluation mechanisms, etc. However, this was not so in the school. A case is T2 in the table V. In his daily lesson plans in a week (4 periods), written was only one specific objective. His objective itself is also vague to express clear contents to be learned (discussed in 4.1).

Further, I have also referred student exercise book; it Indicates, teachers were using the textbook as only curriculum material for teaching. All the notes provided for students were those only shortened from student textbook at all grade levels, in spite many reference materials are found in the library. I have seen about 8 currently published books (1990's) very useful reference materials in the library, but none of the teachers' borrowed them for use to support their instruction in the year. Lending list of the library was empty for all geography teachers in the school.

Moreover, students also resented teacher weaknesses in bringing extra information beyond what are in their textbooks. One student said,

> *... All that we learn are only from the textbook. Leave alone using extra resources, they skip some topics so as to cover portions... They do not even motivate us to read in the library (BC, grade 9 student, 10/03/05)*

As to why teachers refer to student texts ignoring syllabi's and the teacher guides, teachers were unable to set convincing reasons. Two of them said, it became unusual for us to refer to different materials for reasons not known. One of the teachers responded, "It is our weakness, nothing than that" the other one, kept silent – may be, I do not know. For it may irritate the teachers, I didn't go more.

To my part, I have considered it as part of the general lack of commitment among teachers and the absence of technical management and support on the side of directors and supervisors. Directors and school supervisors were found mainly devoted to administrative activities than guiding and supporting teachers. According to T4, when supervisors come to the school, they only observe administrative activities, and few teachers (not more than 3) in classroom. What they evaluate is only teacher lesson

plans, department file, and activities of some clubs. They also come once in a year that their contribution is not as such influential.

Regarding media materials (Instructional Aids), as different from many research findings – materials are scarcely available, the teachers' instead of lacking what to use in class, were seen inefficiently/not at all using available media in the school. "Teachers rarely/not at all use media materials", is a common voice among students. Some students also reported that their teachers do not bring maps even during map reading classes. In my observations in classrooms, and sitting outside, I didn't also see a teacher with a media in his hand. It seems as if they were ordered not to use. Teachers during class observations taught all the lessons without media (instructional Aid), may be because they were not used to before. I think afraid of using as a result investigator is in class (around). Student responses in conversations include:

> *... I didn't see my teacher with media this year. To illustrate, he usually uses graphs, pictures, maps in the textbook holding it up. Some times he also draws sketches on the chalkboard to explain for us (EW, grade 10 student,15/03/05)*

> *... Actually when he teaches, provides us many examples related to the lesson. However, concepts are not at all concretized using media. He tells us every thing orally (PD, grade 9 student, 15/03/05)*

Obvious, one of the methods through which a teacher makes his teachings concrete, long lasting and understandable is through the use of media. Particularly, when comes to Geography, it is meaningless teaching it with out media for a single period not for months and semesters. It was good opportunity, I observed in the school, many rock specimen (collected by previous teachers), charts, maps, models, instruments-may not be available in other schools like pantograph (important to easily enlarge or reduce maps, sketches, etc), thermometers (maximum and minimum), altimeter (to measure altitude), slide projector, compasses, tracing table, etc. However, the teachers' properly used none of these except maps and models (globe), which were reported by some students.

I have attempted also to see the extent of teachers' use of media from a lending list in the school pedagogical center. What the pedagogical center document shows is only one chart borrowed by T1 in the whole first semester. It strengthens the response of students who reported, teachers not at all use media materials. Particularly instruments (altimeter, thermometer, slide projector, compasses, and pantograph) were seen in the school store unused by the teachers at all. Teachers even do not know the availability of these materials in the school. I have taken one of the teachers (T3) to the school store to show him the materials available. He then, surprised for still not knowing them, and was trying to blame the school directors. We observed that some of the materials were also without manuals, difficult to know how to use them. I thought the incident implying the need to introduce courses on how to use instructional materials in teacher education curricula.

The findings are in line with some research out puts like that of Solomon (2000: 61) where 70% of the class sessions have not utilized any instructional material though 65% of the teachers rated the presence of enough instructional materials in pedagogical center. Solomon's finding also shows, teachers were found using only the student textbook as resource material (Ibid: 52).

## 4.5 Student Assessment

One of the requirements for quality implementation is to foster good principles and practices of assessment. The educational and training policy, in this respect, States:

> *...Continuous assessment in academic and practical subjects, including aptitude tests will be conducted to ascertain the formation of all round profile of students at all levels. MOE (1994: 18)*

The policy statement implies, two ways of evaluation of student achievement: continuous assessment and aptitude tests. Similarly, many literatures on assessments advise teachers to get rid of the over reliance on written tests/examinations. Keef and Jenkins (1997: 16) note that, the traditional school testing should be abandoned for it motivates rote memory, leaving too many other qualities untested. Njabili (1999: 115) writes also, to eliminate/ minimize the element of risk associated with written

tests/examinations (students failure, identification of student potential), teachers have to effect a systematic collection of marks or grades over a period of time, consolidate the marks or grades into a final score-continuous assessment (CA).

Regarding the instrument to be used in CA, scholars have also provided a detail account on what it should be. For instance, Nijabili (1999: 121) resents, though it is the responsibility of the teacher to develop his/her own CA methods, teachers can conduct two types of markings:

1 **Impression markings**: classroom exercises of on going work, practical exercises of on going work, practical tests especially prepared.
2 **Schematic markings**: class tests especially prepared, end or term examinations, project work of special studies.

Gowin(in Derebsa,1999: 207 – 209), apart from tests/examinations, advises teachers to use techniques like, observation, anecdotal records, socio-grams, interviews and discussion, and self-assessment. More importantly, welfare (in Kent et al., 1996) lists five instruments to appropriately evaluate students in geography teaching/learning processes. They are:

- Objective testing: oral questions, exercises, Quiz/tests, etc.
- Project: report writing, developing media materials, etc.
- Structured assessment/ blue print grid: to measure achievements in value, attitudes, dispositions, etc.
- Examinations.
- Geographical skills: port folio (sketching), data interpretation, data collection, etc.

However, the way geography teachers in the school assess their students is related to none of the above approaches to CA. There is lack of clear understanding the main features of CA on the part of the teachers. Not only among teachers, it is also unfamiliar to the directors. The result oriented teachers appraisal format is expecting teachers to provide 3 tests, and other two instruments from projects, assignments, group works; the notion of CA is unknown among the school community, at large.

In teachers annual and daily lessons plans, the commonly/repeatedly set

evaluation/assessment mechanisms include, oral questions, exercises, quizzes/tests, report writing, group work, follow up and helping. Though group work, assignments and test/quizzes are the only instruments accounted in students' final grades. Teachers also are sought to randomly/ haphazardly writing assessment methods in their plan. **Field note V** indicates, in more than 20 successive daily lessons of T2, for instance, follow up is posed as the only assessment instrument. There are also teachers who knowingly or unknowingly skip to write assessment techniques in their plans. In the annual lesson plan of T3, for grades 10 and 12, assessment procedures are not indicated at all.

Students' reported, somewhat uniform assessment techniques used among the teachers. 60% student scores are similar for all students (final examination) while slight variations are observed in the left 40% scores as.

- 2 tests (20%), one written assignment in groups (10%), exercise book neatness (10%)
- 3 tests (30%), group work-review questions in textbook (10%)
- 4 written tests (40%)

Clear, the teachers are much concerned with written tests/examinations that are short handed to evaluate skills and attitudes. No one considered instruments of measuring Geographical skills like student written reports of field observation, interpretation/ reading of maps, pictures or graphs, the drawing of sketches, producing models, etc. They are also ignorant to the methods of measuring attitudes, behavior and values. Teachers are seen to perceive assessment not as an integral part of teaching/ learning processes. They present structured tests every $4^{th}$ week of a month, which is rather summative to each unit in the textbook than formative intended for improvement. No one was found keeping continuous records of students' progressive achievements in classroom exercises, portfolios etc, rather than student test scores. Students were made to do group or individual assignments usually once, in the middle or end of the semester.

Conversations made with the teachers' reveals, teachers are ordered to do uniform assessments- three tests and one or two other instruments. They do not have the right to assess students only with their own mechanisms. The teachers also believe that, they

are implementing continuous assessment though what they actually doing is repetitive written classroom tests not different form questions in final examination.

I have asked the teachers also whether they confirm with such assessment procedures. They responded, "Actually not". T2 (25/04/05) specifically said,

> *... Few students usually do assignments, home- works and group works. Most of the students are those copying from others... Large class size makes test administration difficult that many students get similar scores... Three students are sitting on the same desk that no one controls them.*

Similar negative reflections were also forwarded from students. More to what teachers resented, students complained the numbers of tests they take within a semester are many that it seems they are learning only for tests/examinations. One student said,

> *... Tests are making us restless. Every week beginning from second month of a semester, we take at least two tests.... There is difference among teachers in assigning marks, even among those teaching the same grade level–some are strict some are merciful (PD, grade 9 student, 26/04/05).*

The general misconceptions on the part of the teachers on the nature of continuous assessment are seriously affecting student interest and motivation towards learning. Particularly, students in grade 9 and 10 are learning ten subjects that at least they have to take 30 tests within a semester period - really burden. They are forced to study only for class tests. The situation is putting students under continuous tension; never makes them quite free from worry.

Though Bridges and Marew (2000: 14) only have criticized assessment orientation in previous education system (the Derg) as," measuring knowledge mastery, even in vocational and technical subjects", the same is sought to prevail in the school under study. All Geography teachers in the school assess their students only through written tests, assignment and examination. The policy requirements and what the teachers are doing is quite opposite. It calls serious attention if similar incidents are in other schools in the country.

# PART FIVE

## CONCLUSIONS

It is explained in the literature part that the process of curriculum development requires continuous refinement, which can only be attained through appropriate evaluation. Evaluation of either the intended or the implemented curricula enables designers and those charged to put it in practice identify their weakness and strengths there by make necessary adjustments.

This study, as one of the contributors to the curriculum arena of the country, aimed at understanding teacher performances in implementing Geography curriculum with specific reference to gore secondary school. The study posed five questions as per instructional specifications set in the curriculum, objectives, contents, methods instructional materials, and evaluation mechanisms.

In an attempt to explore answers, it used three different instruments of data. These were; observation, interview and documents. For each of the questions, more than one source of data was employed so that triangulation is maintained.

The findings show:

- Instructional objectives were not appropriately formulated. Most objectives set by the teachers are not clear and understandable to pre-inform what methods, materials and evaluation mechanisms to effect. Objectives were not formulated in such a way that balancing is maintained among the three domains of learning; affective, psychomotor and cognitive domains. During instruction announcing the daily instructional objectives for students' right at the beginning of instruction were not attempted. Assuring whether the formulated objectives are met or not at closures of each instruction through questioning or feedback, was also not observed.

  Two main reasons were discussed as causes for teachers' inability of formulating good instructional objectives and use it appropriately in class. The first was, teachers knew the theoretical expectations but the way they perceive its importance was

eroded due to lack of enthusiasm and dedication. The second was, the weak management and guidance from responsible parities; supervisors, directors and department heads. Instructional leaders leave all the duties of instruction to the teachers, instead of controlling.

- teaching in grades nine and ten were not as per syllabus expectations. Teachers were sought too late in covering portions. In an interview made with teachers, they cited problems like, the complete discordance between allotted periods and vastness of portions and students inability to cope with their fast paces of teachings – unable to help their learning. Though teachers claim, they were trying to cover portions through make-ups; students were found accusing teachers for their lack of commitment to cover portions. Students said, portions were not covered in time not only because of vastness but also providing make-ups, even for missed periods are not common among teachers. My observations substantiate student views than only what teachers contended. During my presence in the school, teachers were seen missing classes for various reasons but no one was observed providing make-ups.
- Monotonous teaching experiences than variety was what observed. In all class observation sessions, teachers were authoritatively controlling classes through lectures/explanations. Deserving methods in geography like, case study, inquiry, demonstration, reading and interpreting maps, sketching, specimen collections, field work/visits were not seen applied by the teachers.

Teachers resented problems like large class size, student inability to freely communicate using instructional language, and also student negative conceptions towards active methods of learning. One teacher said,

> *... When I try to provide lesson through inquiry, for instance, students consider it as a means by the teacher for taking rest, waste class time (T4, just after class observation, grade 9, 20/03/05).*

Conducted student interviews and my observations in class, however, reflect teachers were also contributing their part through purposeful negligence – lack of commitment. Though cited reasons by the teachers are justifiable for grades 9 and 10, does not convince when it comes to the situations of grades 11 and 12.

Students in these classes are few that it was easy for teachers to use a variety of approaches, but, teachers were seen teaching the same way as those where students are weak to freely communicate, and class sizes are large. Teachers' inability of using a variety of methods, in addition to lack of commitment, was sought to result from absence of collegiality and actual deterioration of powers of directors since teachers are appraised for the sake of being appraised (no promotion, incentives, termination, etc). In the school; teachers, directors and students were not seen forming discussions as to the ways of improving classroom instruction. Department files show, no evidence regarding discussion on matters of how to teach. Occasional meetings among teachers were only on the sharing of classes among themselves and how to prepare examinations. Academic communication between teachers and directors were only when evaluation for semester appraisal.

- Inefficient uses of instructional materials also were among weaknesses observed. Teachers were seen using student textbook as only resource for teaching. Evidences were not observed for teachers' use of curriculum materials like the syllabus and teacher guides. Observation notes reveal teachers were not using media (instructional aids), though unthinkable to teach Geography without materials like, charts, models, maps, etc. For more evidences, students were interviewed and school pedagogical center files were searched. With the exception of one student who said, his teacher sometimes brings very old maps and shows them, the other seven interviewed students reported that teachers not at all use media materials.

  In the pedagogical center, lending list shows only one chart borrowed by one of the teachers. In the school store also, many materials like, pantograph, planimeter, different types of maps, slide projector, thermometers and compasses were observed. However, none of them were used for class instruction. It implies, not scarcity but inefficient use of available materials by the teachers.

- Assessments in the school are totally confined to paper-pencil tests/examinations. During class observations assessments were only through asking oral questions. Except some student class works in the higher-grade levels, in grades 9 and 10

teachers were devoted to class lectures/explanation. Teachers reported it was because of shortage of time to cover portions that they do not give opportunities for students to involve in different classroom exercises.

Assessment instruments contributing to student final grades, as opposed to the policy requirements – continuous assessment and aptitude tests, includes only written tests/examination for more than 80% of the students total scores. The rest 0-20% were accounted by one or two written assignments not different from paper-pencil tests, and student exercise book neatness, which is meaningless. Geographical assessment mechanisms like, portfolios, fieldwork reports, producing instructional materials, collecting specimens were not attempted in all grade levels. The notion of continuous assessment was not clearly understood among Geography teachers in the school.

In a conversation as regards conformability of assessment mechanisms of the teachers, what students reported was, not comfortable. Students said, though those weak may be happy that they easily copy from others and pass the tests, it is a burden for those like to do their own. They are also forced to take at least two tests every week beginning form the second month of the semester that, not always free from suffering for class tests. They usually study for tests not understanding.

In sum, what one understands from the findings of the study is that, teachers are not properly implementing Geography curriculum in the school. The objectives of the curriculum were not met. The way the teachers' are teaching is also contributing a lot to low student achievements in national examinations. I believe, therefore, the following areas need attention.

1. All the implementation activities should not be left to teachers. School directors have to provide the expected guidance and management. Particularly, supervising what teachers are doing in the school is weak that teachers reached the stage of neglecting their major duties.

2. Subject specific support groups need to be established down at the zonal/woreda level. It has been observed that school supervisors coming

from educational offices were unable to provide the necessary subject specific supports, since are not trained. What makes supports more necessary for Geography teachers in the school are many important but unused instruments in the school like, pantograph, slide projector, altimeter, compass etc.

3. In all grade levels learning the map reading section of the textbook was un attempted that it is better if it comes to the beginning of textbook chapters. More important in Geography is the map reading section than those telling names of places, mountains, countries, activities etc. The map reading part enables easy access to illustrations in textbooks, and motivates students towards learning.

4. For whatever reasons justifiable or not, teachers are unable to cover portions that either minimizing contents in textbooks or increasing the number of periods in a week have to be made

Summing up, since the study is confined to the evaluation of teacher performances in one school; interested researchers in the field can take this issue and investigate in another setting for general understanding.

# REFERENCES


Abdulaziz Husien (1997). Analysis of Geography Instruction on the Basis of Flander's Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC) in Senior Secondary schools of Sidama Zone. Addis Ababa. AAU (Thesis).

Aklilu Dalelo (1992). Performance of Senior Secondary Students in Basic Mapwork Skills. Addis Ababa. AAU (Thesis).

Amare Asgedom (1996) "Learning from the Media: Five Models". Educational Journal. Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 93-106.

Amera Seifu (2004). Educational Research practices of Bahir Dar University Teachers: The Case of Education Faculty. A.A. AAU (Thesis).

Anderson, G. (1990). Fundamentals of Education Research. Hampshire. The Falmer Press.

Anderson, L. (1987). "Comparative and International Education Society: the Classroom Environments Study" Comparative Education Review Vol. 31, No. 1.

Batterby, J. (1995). Teaching and Learning Through the National curriculum: Teaching Geography at Key Stage 3. Cambridge. Kris Kington Pub.

Biggs, J. and Collis, K. (1982). Evaluating the Quality of Learning. New York. Academic Press, Inc.

Bohla, H. (1979). Evaluating Functional Literacy. Tehran: Hulton Educational Publications, Ltd.

Bridges, D. and Marew Zewde (2000). Secondary Teacher Education in Ethiopia. Addis Ababa. The British Council.

Calder, J. (1994). Program Evaluation and Quality. A Comprehensive Guide to Setting upon Education System. London. Kogan page ltd.

Canglosi, J. (1991). Evaluating Classroom Instruction. New York. Longman Publishing Group.

Collahan, J. and Clark, L. (1988). Teaching in the Middle and Secondary Schools: Planning for Competence. New York. McMillan Publishing Company.

Creswell, J. (1998). Qualitative Inquiry and research Design. Choosing Among Five Tradition. Thousand Oaks. Sage Publications.

Cronbach,L(1974). 'Course Improvement through Evaluation'. Commentaries on Purpose, Processes, Product. Lexington. Heath and Company.

Dawit Mekonnen (1999). An Evaluation of the Implementation of Seventh Grade English Syllabus in Eastern Gojjam. A.A. AAU (Thesis).

Derebssa Dufera (1999). Principles of Curriculum Design and Development. Addis Ababa. AAU (Distance Education Material).

Dublin and Olghon (1988). Course Design: Developing Materials and Programs for Language Learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Early, M. and Rehage, R. (1990). Issues in Curriculum: Selected Essays. Illions. NSSE.

Fisher, T. (1998). Developing as a Teacher of Geography. Cambridge. Cris Kingston Publishing.

Freemann, W. and Raup, H. (1959). Essentials of Geography: 2nd Edition. New York. McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Fullan, M. (1992). Successful School Improvement: The Implementation Perspective. Great Britain: St. Edmunds Burry Press.

_____ (1991) The New Meaning of Educational Change. London. Cassel.

Fullan, M. and Pomfret, A. (1977) "Research on Curriculum and Instruction" Review of Educational Research. Vol. 47, No. 2.

_____ (2000). Set Readers for Curriculum Implementation and Evaluation. A.A. AAU (Unpublished).

Gall, M. D. et al (1996). Educational Research: An Introduction. Sixth Edition. USA: Longman.

Gersten, R. and Carnine, D.(1982)."Measuring implementation of a structured educational model in an urban school district: An observational approach ". Educational evaluation and policy analysis.

Getahcew Endalemaw (1994). An Evaluation of the Implementation of the Lower Primary school Social Studies Syllabus. The Case of North Shewa Administrative Zone. A.A. AAU (Thesis).

Giroux, H. A. et al (1981). Curriculum and Instruction: Alternatives in Education. Berkely. Mcutchen Pub. Co.

Gopsill, G. (1966). The Teaching of Geography: 3rd Edition. New York St. Martin's Press.

Harlen,W(1978). Evaluation and the Teacher's Role. Houndigs. Macmillan education.

Hopkins, D. (1993). Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research. Buckingham. Open University Press.

Hord, S. (1995). "From Policy Classroom Practice: Beyond the Mandates" International Perspectives on Educational Reform and Policy Implementation. London. The Falerm press.

ICDR (1999). Geography Syllabus Grades 9-12. Addis Ababa. EMPDA (Unpublished).

Johnson, H. (1994). "Analyzing Teachers Behaving in Implementing Curriculum" Teachers Develop Teachers Research Reports on Classroom Research and Teacher Development. London. Heiman.

Keef, J. and Jenkins, J. (1997). Instruction and the Learning Environment. Larchmont. Eye on Education, Inc.

Kent, A. et al (1996). Geography in Education. View Points on Teaching and Learning. Cambridge. Cambridge University press.

Kindalem Kebede (1998). An Evaluation of Teachers' Classroom Performance in Implementing the New Social Studies Syllabus in the Second Cycle of Primary Education. The Case of South Gondar. A.A. AAU (Thesis).

Lewy, A. (1991). National and School Based Curriculum Development Pairs. UNESCO: IIEF.

_____ (1977). Handbook of Curriculum Evaluation. Paris. UNESCO.

Madaus, G. et al. (1983). Evaluation Models: View Points on Educational and Human Service Evaluations. Boston. Klwer-Nijhoft Pub.

McCormic, R. and James, M. (1990). Curriculum Evaluation in Schools: 2nd Edition. London and New York. Routledge.

Merriam S. (1998). Case Study Research in Education: A Qualitative Approach. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publisher.

Naish, M. (1992). Geography and Education. National and International Perspectives. London. University of London.

Nijabili, A. (1999). A Practical Guide for Classroom Measurement and Testing. Dar-es-Salam. Mature Publishers.

O'Neill and Kiston (1996). Effective Curriculum Management. London. Routledge.

Ornestein, A. and Hunkins, F. (1988). Curriculum Foundation, Principles and Issues: 3rd Edition. Allyn and Bacon.

Patton, M. (1997). Utilization Focused Evaluation: 3rd Edition Thousand Oaks. Sage Publications, Inc.

Popham, W. (1993). Educational Evaluation. Third Edition. Boston. Allyn and Bacon.

Pratt, D. (1980). Curriculum Design and Development. New York. HBJP.

Ragan, W. (1966). Modern Elementary Curriculum. New York Holt.

Rosenshin, B. and Frust, N. (1971). "Research on Teacher Performance Criteria" Research in Teacher Education. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, pp. 37-72.

Sadler, D. (1981). "Intutive Data Processing as Potential Source of Bias in Naturalistic Evaluation" Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. Vol. 3, No. 4, pp 25-31.

Saylor, J. et al. (1980). Curriculum Planning for Better Teaching and Learning. New York. Holt, Rinehert and Winston.

Shiundu, J. (1992). Curriculum: theory and Practice in Kenya. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.

Shiundu, J. and Omulando, S. (1992). Curriculum Theory and Practice in Kenya. Nairobi. Oxford University Press.

Solomon Araya (2000). An Evaluation of Grade 8 Mathematics Syllabus in SNNP. With Specific Reference to Sidama Zone. A.A. A.AU (thesis).

Stenhouse, L. (1975). An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development. London. Heimann.

Stephenson, J. (2001). Teaching and Learning on Line: Pedagogies for New Technologies.

TGE (1994). Education and Training Policy of Ethiopia. A.A. MOE.

Townsend, T. (1994). Effective Schooling for the Community. London. Rutledge.

Williams, W. (1978). "Implementation Analysis and Assessment" Evaluation Studies: Review, Annual. Vol. 3. London. Sage Publications.

Yin, R. (2003). Case Study Research: Design and methods: Third Edition. Thousand Oaks. Sage Publications

Zajda, J. (2001). "Teachers' Work Commitment and the Effectiveness of Disadvantaged Schools" Curriculum and Teaching. Vol. 6, No 2, Melbourne, Jamews Nicholas