

**Practices and Problems of Community Participation in
Secondary Schools Management in Central Zone of Tigray
Region**

**By
Habteslassie Alemayehu Tesfay**

**Addis Ababa University
College of Education and Behavioral Studies School of Graduate
Department of Educational Planning and Management**

June, 2014

**Practices and Problems of Community Participation in Secondary
Schools Management in Central Zone of Tigray Region**

BY

Habteslassie Alemayehu Tesfay

Practices and Problems of Community Participation in Secondary
Schools Management in Central Zone of Tigray Region

BY

Habteslassie Alemayehu Tesfay

A Thesis Submitted to the Department of Educational Planning and
Management in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree
of Master of Arts in Educational Leadership

Addis Ababa University

School Of Graduate Studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by Habteslassie Alemayehu Tesfaye, entitled: An Assessment of Practices and Problems of Community Participation in Governmental Secondary Schools Management in Central Zone of Tigray Region and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts (in Educational Leadership) complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the examining committee:

External examiner _____ signature _____ date _____

Internal examiner _____ signature _____ date _____

Advisor _____ signature _____ date _____

Chair of Department or Graduate Program Coordinator

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the current practices and major problems of community participation in seven selected secondary schools in central zone of Tigray Region. Specifically, the present study was intended: to assess the level of PTA and KETB in school management; the degree at which these community representatives involve increasing enrollment and reducing dropout rate; finding factors that affect PTA and KETB participation and to investigate the roles played by school principals in enhancing CP through their representatives. A total of 179 Of PTA, KETB, teachers and woreda education office experts have participated. Of this 88 (26.2%) of teachers were chosen in a stratified random sampling with proportional allocation method; and 56(PTA), 35(KETB) and woreda education office experts were selected purposively. Both closed-and-open ended questions were administered to PTA, KETB and teachers. Interview was conducted with the woreda education experts. The other tool used in this study was document analysis. While analyzing the data collected using these aforementioned tools; frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation were employed. According to the results of the analysis CP in school management is below the median value (i.e, less than 3). The finding of this study indicates that the status of community participation in the management of secondary school was inadequate. And the contribution of KETB and PTA members to increase enrollment and to reduce dropout rate of students was not sufficient furthermore, the study revealed that lack of training, lack of time and poor economic status, lack of understanding of roles and responsibilities, long distance and inconvenient meeting time, lack of commitment and willingness, lack of appreciation of overall objectives of education and lack of accountability on the part of PTA and KETB members; and principals 'unable to communicate with KETB and PTA members, lack of understanding their capacity ,non participatory leadership approach, due to lack of training were affecting community participation. thus, to alleviate the major problems encountered with community participation recommendations have been for warded .These included PTA and KETB members at all levels in the process of school management ,provide clear and specific guide line and sensitize them, provide training to school principals, conduct meeting, motivate and encourage PTA and KETB members organizing experience sharing programs; provide rewards for those who have better performance and replace by new members those who are passive participants in the school management .

Acknowledgements

First and for most I want to express my sincere and deepest thanks to my advisor, Zenebe Baraki (PhD) for his unreserved guidance, constructive comments and professional advice to carry out my work effectively.

I also owe an enormous debt of gratitude to my family: my father Meregeta Alemayehu Tesfay, my mother W/ro Flash G/Mariam, for their support and moral encouragement. My sincere and profound gratitude goes to my wife W/ro Genete G/hiwot for her endless moral and financial support to complete my study and education as a whole.

My special and deeply- hearted thanks extended to my colleagues, Mebrahtu Tsegay, Asmelash Kiefe and W/ro Tseriti Tsehaye for immense help and support.

Finally, sincere thanks go to those school principals, vice principals, teachers, members of school administration and parent committees, as well as officials of REB and INEO who have rendered great contribution to this study.

H/selassie Alemayehu

Table of Contents

Content	Page
Abstract.....	I
Acknowledgments	II
Table of contents.....	III
List of tables.....	V
Acronyms.....	VI
CHAPTER ONE	
1. The Problem and its Approach	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	2
1.3. Objectives of the study	4
1.3.1. General Objective	4
1.3.2. Specific Objectives	5
1.4. Significance of the Study	5
1.5. Delimitation of the Study	6
1.6. Limitation of the Study.....	6
1.7. Definition of Terms	6
1.8. Organization of the study	7
CHAPTER TWO	
2. Review of Related Literature.....	8
2.1. Concepts and Definitions of Community and Community Participation	8
2.1.1. Concepts and Definitions of Community	8
2.1.2. Concepts and Definition of Community Participation	10
2.1.3. Principles of Community Participation	11
2.2. Types and Levels of Community Participation	11
2.2.1. Types of Community Participation	11
2.2.2. Level of Community Participation	12
2.3. Community Participation in School Management	16
2.3.1. Community Participation in Planning	18
2.3.2. Community Participation in Decision Making	19
2.3.3. Participation in Resource Management	19

2.3.4. Participation in Monitoring and Evaluation	20
2.4. Community Education Committees (CECs)	21
2.4.1. Parent Teacher Association (PTA)	22
2.4.2. The School Board	24
2.5. Factors to Community Participation in School System	25
2.5.1. Parents and Community Related Factors	26
2.5.2. Teachers Related Factors	26
2.5.3. School Principals Related Factors	27
2.6. Strategies Foster to Community Participation	28
2.6.1. The Role of School Principal in Enhancing CP in	29
CHAPTER THREE	
3. The Research Design and Methodology	34
3.1. The Research Method	34
3.2. Sources of Data	34
3.3 sample and sampling techniques.....	35
3.4. Instruments and procedures of data collection	36
3.4.1. Instruments of data collection.....	36
3.4.2. Procedures of data collection	38
3.5. Method of data analysis	39
CHAPTER FOUR	
4. Data Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation.....	40
4.1 Degree of community participation in school management	41
4.1.1. Levels of Community Participation in Planning.....	43
4.1.2 Level of CP in decision- making	45
4.1.3. Level of CP in Finance and Resource Management.....	47
4.1.4 Level of CP in implementation of school plan	49
4.1.5 Level of CP in monitoring and evaluation.....	51
CHAPTER FIVE	
Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations	66
5.1. Summary	66
5.2. Conclusions	69
5.3 Recommendations.....	69
REFERENCES	71
Appendix.....	74

List of Tables

Table 1: List of sample schools	36
Table 2: General back ground of respondents	42
Table 3: Community participation in planning	43
Table 4: Community participation in decision making	45
Table 5: Community participation in finance and resource management	47
Table 6: Community participation in implementation school plan	49
Table 7: Community participation in monitoring and evaluation	51
Table8: The extent of KETB and PTA participation in Increasing enrolment and reducing dropout rate of students	53
Table 9: Factors affecting community participation negatively on the part of KETB and PTA members	56
Table 10: Factors affecting community participation negatively: on the part of school principals.....	60
Table 11: The role played by school principals to participate the community in school management	64

ACRONOMYS

CP---	-----	Community Participation
CECs	-----	Community Education Committees
EduCo	-----	Education Committee
ESDP	-----	Education Sector Development Program
ETP	-----	Education Training Policy
KETB	-----	Keble Education and Training Board
MOE	-----	Ministry of Education
PTA	-----	Parent Teacher Association
PACS	-----	Proclamation for Administration and Control of School
PMAS	-----	Proclamation for Management and Administration of School
REB	-----	Regional Educational Bureau
UNESCO	-----	United Nation Education Scientific and Cultural Organization
VEC	-----	Village Education Committee
WEO	-----	Woreda Education Office
BESO	-----	Basic Education System Overhaul

CHAPTER ONE

1. The Problem and its Approach

This chapter consists of background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study, definition of key terms, and organization of the study.

1.1. Background of the Study

Community participation has received increased attention across the world in recent years. To this end a number of countries have enacted policies that foster community involvement. Community participation (CP) is considered as an end itself (as a democratic right) and as a means to achieve sustainable development and poverty alleviation (Stiglitz, 1997). Recent interest in CP in formal education has emanated from decentralization policy. Decentralization involves devolution and transfer of planning, financial, implementation and political responsibilities from the central government to the local government. One of the aim of process decentralization is to take service closer to the people. CP in education, is an important means of improving educational relevancy, quality and access to increase resources, improve accountability of schools to the community they serve. This could develop schools, responsiveness to the local needs. As a result, it intends to improve equitable access, retention, quality and performance of schooling. Strengthening this idea, Education Sector Development Implementation Manual (MOE, 1998: 43) states:

Community participation is one of the strategies that should be used to achieve the goals. The participation of the community may take place in different forms. These ranges from assisting in the increase of school enrollment by encouraging their members to send their children to school to contribute for provision, maintenance and management of schools..... normally it is necessary to give areal role to the parents and community in the day- to day management of school.

The above statement shows that attainment of educational goal is impossible without the active participation of the community in school management. The better the participation of the community in school management, the better it will contribute to increase enrollment reduce dropout improve, equality of education etc. The success of these efforts, therefore, depends on the strength of managerial and institutional capacity through out the education system. Effective school requires effective school management. Effective school management, in turn require well- developed intermediary organizations that provide leadership and resources schools need to translate polices into action (World Bank, 1997: 194) A key indicator of an effectively managed school is the management of the school being seen as shared responsibility of the community with the life of the school. Schools therefore need to create management systems that empower the community with the life of the school to achieve the school's goal.

These systems should include: planning, decision making, financial, implementation, monitoring the work of the staff, and evaluating the work of school (MOE, 2004:3)

So, efficient management of schools cannot be realized by the effort to the school principals alone. That is why the MOE clearly established the guide line for the woreda education and training board, kebele training and management board, and parent teacher student association with clarity specified duties and responsibilities to be actively involved in school management as representatives of the community. These show that the proper functioning of the school and realize its goal, the participation of the community in school management is crucial.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the school is to educate, train, create good citizen and equip the rising generation with skills. Knowledge and desirable social behavior that will be of benefit to the individual himself and the society at large. The success of schooling, therefore, depends to a large measure, up on the value that communities attach to education when education is highly valued and actively sought, the mission and goals of the school are shared and supported by the community. Therefore, schools shall take the lead to participate the community in its role and function. (MOE 2002:46). Educational programs that take place at school level are more likely to be more relevant, more supported, more successful and more sustainable to the extents that they participate their communities to the extents that they participate their communities in their

planning, implementation, and evaluation. (Shaeffer,1994: 12). Similarly UNESCO) 1985:94) States:

Genuine community participation in educational management requires that there be a possibility for community to intervene at each and every step in the process study, design decision making, implementation monitoring evaluation as well as in the main areas of concern(resource management, personnel policy managing the educational process etc).

Participation is therefore, meaningful when it deals with decision making at all points in the educational process from its initial orientation to its programming and execution. The participation of parent to and community in school management, therefore, enhance the chances that a positive interest in the school, a sense of friendliness and good will to wards staff, provide adequate finance support and develop a sense of responsibility for the improvement of the school (Bagin and Donald, 2001).

In addition to this, the participation of community in management of the school will create smooth relationships that promote the community to make their own contribution to the school. This could take in a form of constructing new buildings, supervise construction works in simple matters, make direct labour construction, maintenance and upkeep school facilities, enhance enrollment of boys and girls and to reduce drop outs. Generally it will make its own contribution for the improvement of the quality of education (MOE, 1998: 44-45).

For the effective performance of the school and achievement of education goals, appropriate participation of the community in the management is therefore, crucial (Towns Send 1994:11).

The participative the management is, the easier for the school to adopt changes that comes within and outside the school. In relation to this, (Bangin and Donald, 2001- 11-12) States:

The school in a dynamic, changing social order can not adopt it self to change or make the necessary improvements in its programme without participating the community in its affairs..... There must be a structured. Systematic and active participation of the community in the educational planning, Policy making, problems solving and evaluation of the school.

In order to realize these, school principals need to establish, maintain and regularly consult and participates the community or its representatives in management of the school (Townsend, 1994: 148).

Taking the significance and contribution of community participation in school management, MOE has developed a guide line with specific roles and responsibilities for the community. At school level, the two school governing bodies are Kebele Education Training Board and Parent Teacher Association (MOE, 1994: 21-29). These school governing bodies are,

established in each school however, their progress and performance in carrying out their roles and responsibilities remains inadequate.(MOE, 2002: 17) there are in number of reasons for the inadequate performance that requires extensive study.

The study, therefore attempts to answer the following basic question:

1. Do members of KETB and PTA discharge their responsibilities by participating in planning, decision making, financial and resource management, implementation, monitoring and evaluation?
2. What is KETB and PTA member contribution to teaching- learning process in terms of increasing enrollment and reducing dropouts rate of students?
3. What are the factors that hinder/ enhance PTA and KETB members to participate in secondary school management?
4. Do principals discharge their duties and responsibilities to participating and enhancing the community representatives in school management.

1.3. Objectives of the study

1.3.1. General Objective

The general objective of this study is to assess the current practices and problems of CP in secondary school management. The study is also aimed at identifying causes that account for the problem to occur and suggesting possible solutions that could mitigate the major setbacks pertaining to community involvement in secondary schools in the central zone of Tigray Region. More specially, this study has the following specific objectives.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

1. To assess the current level of PTA and KETB participation in some selected secondary schools in the central zone of Tigray Region.
2. To ascertain the involvement of PTA and KETB in increasing enrollment and reducing the rate of dropouts.
3. To find out the main factors that promotes or hinder the participation of PTA and KETB in the target secondary schools management activities.
4. To investigate the roles played by the school principals in participating and enhancing the community representatives in the school management.

1.4. Significance of the Study

If the school allows the community to participate in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the school program, positive contribution of the community return will be high so as to achieve school goal. It is on this base that MOE, (1994: 21-22), clearly defined the role and responsibilities of KETB and PTA to be involved in school management as representative of the community. Having this in mind, the study will have the following significance

- ❖ The study will bring the prevailing problems of CP in school management on the surface that help principals, KETB and PTA members, woreda education officials and other concerned take the necessary measures to work for improvement
- ❖ This work could serve as source of information for further studies.
- ❖ Policy makers may see the policies and practices so that they may reconsider the directives in the way that it can address factors that have deter CP.
- ❖ Principals and the community may know what goes wrong in CP in schools' system so that they could design ways to improve factors that contribute to the low involvement of the community in school management.
- ❖ The finding of the study may be potentially significant to help education officers at all level to assess their performance in relation to the topic under discussion and to fill gaps in CP in secondary school management.

1.5. Delimitation of the Study

There were 12 woredas and 22 secondary schools (grade 9-10) in central zone of Tigray region. The study was delimited to a manageable size to involve seven woredas and seven secondary schools of the zone. These sample schools were chosen from the 12 woredas randomly. A part from this, the study included secondary school in rural and urban area.

1.6. Limitation of the Study

It is clear that research work could not be totally free from limitations. Due to this fact, the researcher faced lack of cooperation of some woredas education officials, reluctance of some principals and teachers to fill in and return the questionnaire as a result it was difficult to collect all the questionnaire by the time table set at the beginning. In addition to this, most sample schools were in accessible for transportation. So it was difficult to reach them and collect the data.

1.7. Definition of Terms

Although terms are generally taken to be self-explanatory defining some concepts is important since the terms could be used in different context. Thus, the following terms are defined for the purpose of clarity and focus.

Assessment

Assessment in this context is the process of evaluating the performances of the community in the school system to ensure participating. Specifically it is the process of investigating the extent to which the community involved in school management through their representatives (i.e. through PTA and KETB).

Community

A group of persons living in an area served by a particular school or by a network of schools (Lewy, 1977:225). In this study, it means all the people to including those who have children in school and those who do not have.

Community Participation

Is a process of engaging and involving communities in the school management system through democratically elected community education committees mainly PTA and KETB. Hence, participation is revealed in the delivery of services, often as a partner with other actors, as implementers of delegated powers, and involving in real decision making at every stage including problem identification, planning, implementation and evaluation that affects the community (e.g. in education).

Management

It is the process of identifying the problem, planning the work to be done, implementing, monitoring and evaluating the planned action through the active involvement of parties (individuals) to address the common interests.

Parent teacher association: A structural organization in the school that is responsible for the effective management of the school composed of the students, teachers and parents from the school community.

Governmental school: a school fully runs by the government as per proclamation No. 260/1984. In this case schools run by Woreda, zone education or regional education bureau.

School principal: administrative head and a professional leader for school system, policy and manages the school's total program. For this study it refers to both principals and vice principals (Dejnozka, 1984)

Secondary school: a school comprised of either first cycle of secondary education (grade 9 and 10) or second cycle of secondary education (grade 11 and 12) or both, article 3,2,3 (TGE, 1994:14). For this study it refers to first cycle of secondary education (grade 9 and 10).

1.8. Organization of the study

This study organized into five chapters. The first chapter provides the problem and its approach. The second chapter deals with the review of related literature. The third chapter contains research design and methodology. The fourth chapter deals with the presentation and analysis for the data. The fifth chapter includes the summary, conclusion and recommendation of the study.

CHAPTER TWO

2. Review of Related Literature

In order to form a broader picture of community in the management of secondary schools, this chapter first examines concepts, principles, types and levels of participation. It also deals community participation in school management, school board/ committee, parent teacher association, strategies that foster CP and finally deals the role of principals that enhancing CP in school management.

2.1. Concepts and Definitions of Community and Community Participation

2.1.1. Concepts and Definitions of Community

The term community has been defined differently depending on the context it is used. Most commonly, it is defined in terms of people, place, and interest. Lewy (1977) defines community as a group of people who are living in an area served by a particular school or by a network of schools. UNISCO (2003) conceived community as a stratified group of people residing in a delimited area bounded together with similar norms, cultures, interests and often share resources, as well as challenges. Thus, a community is an aggregate of population who are living fairly close together in some geographical area having a set of common characteristics. The community comprises all categories of people. Children, adolescents, adults, elders, leaders, resource persons, groups etc. Various researches works in community underscores to look into the population, number, the age and the sex composition among others these are the foundation of studies conducted in relation to community in a specified geographical area.

Geographical area is the base of the community on the land. Community members are living together in a more or less compact territory as in urban areas or in a defined area a part from others as in rural areas. This could affect the provision of services in face to face relationship and cohesion of the community. Other geographical settings including mainly the topography may have influence on community is life such as education accessibility. Topography could make easy or hard to reach the community. Accessibility in turn affects the mores and customs of the community. It is evident that people who are living in isolate area (e.g. in rural) may have

some unique ways of behavior or customs in comparison to members of a community who are living in towns. Thus, in defining a community the physical setting needs to be considered.

Furthermore, a community may be conceived in terms of the common characteristics its members share in their walks of life. These may include culture, language, religion, race, mode of life, tradition, goals and so forth. The community members could possess a set of basic institutions like health, education, religious, agricultural etc that bring them together in a sense of unity or a feeling of belongingness so that members able to act in corporate way.

According to Shaeffer (1992) some communities are homogeneous while others are heterogeneous. Some are cooperative whereas others are conflictive. Some communities are governed and managed by leaders chosen democratically and some are governed by leaders imposed from above and represent central authorities. Zenter (1964) identifies three aspects of communities. First, community is a structure organized either formally or informally. In this aspect, every member in a community plays roles for common goals interactively. Secondly, member of the community have some degree of collective identification within limited occupied space. The third aspect of community is a community in which members have some degree of local autonomy and responsibility to discharge for common development.

From the above definitions, three basic elements could be sorted out from the term community. Its members (people), the geographical setting and social structure organized based on common interest blending these elements, a community could be defined broadly, an aggregate of population who inhabit in a delimited territory with a certain pattern of social ties for which they work together to solve their common problems and to satisfy their needs. Community conceived very narrowly, it refers to a group of people in a village or neighborhood, having common interest in their daily walks of life. Hence the definition assigned to community may be narrow or wide depending on the purpose of context.

What Bray (1996) perceives community with in the field of education is consistent with what has been discussed so far? Accordingly, in the context of education Bray identifies three aspects of community. The geographic community is a community whose members settle in a restricted area like in a village or district. The second aspect of a community is described in terms of

membership to the community including such characteristics as ethnic, language, culture etc. The last one is stated based on shared common concerns of the community including parents, associations and institutions. For instance, parents as a community member could have shared concerns for the welfare and learning of their children.

MOE (1998) describes community as a group of people living together in a particular area and sharing similar economic, political, cultural and social experiences. For the practical purpose of this study community is considered as people within the service area or within the vicinity of the school having common social interest and experiences/practices.

2.1.2. Concepts and Definition of Community Participation

Participation in relation to community is defined as the creation of opportunities to enable all members of a community to engage in various developmental activities Medgley (1986), as cited by United Nations (1981). Other scholars like Naryaran, and katrinka, E. (1997) describes community participation as the meaningful and active involvement of the community from planning to the implementation of a program. The term participation is an experience felt differently by different people in different situations. Even in similar situations the form and degree of participation is not the same for all. Diverse activities and practices can be labeled as community participation though each involvement pervades a variety of degree of participation and provoke different outcomes.

Owing to this, different scholars categorized the level of community participation (CP) in different ways for instance, Yodit Goumnitz, Goike and Robins (2003: 26-27) classify the contributions of the community in terms of time/interest; labor, physical resources, and money. Accordingly, a member of a community could contribute from being as an observer (as such he/she may attend the project or provide moral support up to contributing skills and leading CP activities). Moreover an individual may attend school events and/or participate in the election of community representatives (e.g. PTA) at lower level of participation and working as community representative at the higher end of the continuum. Members within the vicinity of the school may join to the school efforts by providing labor support in classroom construction or serving in PTA, for example the support could be in material donation for school building or beautifying

the school. In addition to time devotion to discuss about school affairs individuals in the community could contribute to schools performance in terms of labor, physical resources and monetary donation. Monetary donation could be demanding at early stages of school improvement efforts. But it can be a less active form of contribution because a time involvement is relatively little. Therefore, it is difficult to assign any one form priority over another though each form of participation can represent a varying degree of quality and impact. Furthermore, high levels of participation in time/interest have potential to cultivate a proactive leadership in community. Low levels of participation may merely reflect parents attendance at school events a much more passive form of participation. Hence, enhancing CP both in terms of quantity and quality could lead and bring about higher impacts on school's performances. This active form of community involvement is required for the improvement of education.

2.1.3. Principles of Community Participation

Community Participation is likely unreachable in the short term by many societies of the world. Their willingness and ability to participate evolve over time, faster or slow depending on a number of complex, factors and conditions. In order to facilitate it planners, managers as well as the political leaders of a government must undertake a number of measures. Among which restructuring of educational system that calls for significant change in the pattern of school governance is the main one (Shaeffer, 1994:18).

2.2. Types and Levels of Community Participation

2.2.1. Types of Community Participation

CP depending on the area of involvement takes different types. UNESCO (1985, 7-10) categorize CP on the bases of how it is initiated by itself to participate spontaneous or voluntary participate in running educational activities, induced participation (where the administrator takes the initiative by itself to promote participation and compulsory participation (Coerced, manipulated to mobilize to the community to get manpower or financial contribution from the community).

Another type of classification of CP on the extent to which the degree of influence on decision-making takes three forms, purely formal participation (nominal participation) where the flow of

information is one way from principal to community. It is simply to attend meeting or receive information. Participation confined to consultation is the secondary type where the community is not only informed but is also able to react and express its opinion but not making decisions. The third type is participation involving power sharing where the community controls the decision making process (UNESCO 1995:57-58).

In reality, however, area of participation does not adhere to and fro. So that, any one case may include some features of several kinds of participation. To make the participation meaningful, the greater the community has the share in decision making the better it would be rather than simply to inform them.

Particular type of community participation may be more favorable than others depending on the circumstance (Gouinda, 1995: 44). “No perfect model” for participation exists. The form participation takes is highly influenced by the overall circumstance and the unique social context in which action is being taken (World Bank 2004:1).

2.2.2. Level of Community Participation

There are various levels of participation ranging from simple consultation to joint decision-making to self-management by the community from itself. Therefore CP in education lies on a continuum ranging from nominal participation depending on style of management levels of empowerment and the socio-cultural context (Gajananayak,1993:5). Therefore, access and provision of quality education is realized through the appropriate level of CP (UNESCO, 2006) policymakers, educators and other stakeholders involved in education are seeking ways to utilize the limited resources effectively and effectively to identify and solve problems in the education sector so that quality education can be provided for children.

The involvement of the community in children education did not suddenly appear at once as something new. In this connection, Williams (1994) contends that till the mid of the 20th century responsibility for educating children were rested on the shoulders of the community. Although there still are places where communities contribute highly in schools, CP in education hasn't yet been fully recognized nor extended systematically to a wider practice. It is in the late last

decades of the 20th century that an increased amount of research on community participation mushroomed.

Community participation in education in this study is defined to mean the level or extent of community involvement in the management (of planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluating) process, activities; or running of schools. That is the level to which parents and other identifiable community groups contribute towards creating an environment conducive for efficient and effective teaching and learning. In other words, it refers to the involvement by the community in education program with the framework of national development program.

While community involvement in education has always been appearing in many countries, recent studies conducted in its impact on education has recognized that CP should be understood along a continuum or ladder of participation. With this regard, Uemura (1994) points out three ladders of participation. These are;

- Advocating enrollment and education benefits;
- Boosting morale of school staff; and
- Raising money for schools.

These ladders of participation have been practicing in Ethiopian schools participating in BESO II project. Despite their shallowness, the lists indicated above can demonstrate some of the positive forms of participation that the communities can apply to foster school improvement programs.

Shaeffer (1994) indicates seven ladders of participation that could serve as a useful device for varying degree of CP. He also argues that the involvement of the community could be analyzed in terms of the extent of participation and the areas of education in which greater participation can occur. Shaeffer's ladder of participation are:

1. Complete non-participation and exclusion from school affairs, except (often) on the provision of resources
2. Involvement (at home) with motivating children and helping them with home works.
3. Involvement as 'audience' on passive supporters of school-run- meetings or assemblies.

It should be noted that in these three ladders of participation, the community members are excluded from the school decision making process. Whereas the rest four rungs of the ladder assume leadership roles and influence the choice made by school administrators. At these levels there would be a higher degree of participation in quantity and quality of CP in schools and communities transform from a relatively passive to more practice role. These higher levels of the ladder as indicated by Shaeffer are:

4. Participation as ‘consultants’ on school issues;
5. As ‘partners’ in teaching and training;
6. As ‘implementers’ of delegated powers, and
7. As ‘citizens’ of a community in control of the school.

Shaeffer further provides some specific activities that involve a high degree of community participation in a wider development context, specifically, it implies CP in the following stages of educational development activities:

- Collecting and analyzing information;
- Defining priorities and setting goals;
- Assessing available resources;
- Deciding on and planning programs;
- Designing strategies to implement these programs and dividing responsibilities among participants;
- Managing programs;
- Monitoring progress of the programs; and
- Evaluating results and impacts.

Despite the over simplification of the frames in depend on the true nature of the relationship that exists between the community members and schools, the ladder could be used as a tool for understanding the level of CP in education or schooling (Yodit etal, 2005).

Understanding the importance of CP in education, UNESCO (2006) asserts that CP could be understands along a continuum of decision-making power. Thus, citing Sherry Arnstein and Koger Hart, UNESCO put forth eight levels of CP which can be applied at any given time and

which helps to analyze the current level of community involvement. Manipulation, Decoration, Tokenism, Communities are assigned but informed, Participate in project implementation, Initiate and direct decisions, and communities initiate, plan, direct, and implement decisions.

At manipulation level communities do not have awareness on issues with which they encountered. They are not given feedback on action taken or the problem is analyzed with the community. In decoration communities are used as needed so participation is incidental. Whereas at the level of tokenism, community merely appear to have been given a voice though in reality they have little or no choice about issues that affect the school system. In situation, where communities assigned but informed, they are given complete, accurate information about their actions as well as they know why their participation is needed. In the next level communities are treated seriously in expressing their views. At the level of CP in project implementation, there is a higher degree of responsibility given to the community in the design (such as selecting site) and in the production (building). However, in here the initiation for decision is external. It is at the eighth level of CP that the highest level of involvement demonstrated. At this stage from the initiation to the implementation process the community has a decisive role.

Therefore understanding the level of CP and having the clear picture of the involvement is important to study the current practice of CP in school system. So far CP is the extent at which the community involves in the school system. Particularly, in relation to this study, meaningful CP is conceived as the degree at which people within the vicinity of secondary schools take active part in the major management function through their representatives. In other words CP in education (school) management refers to the involvement of community representatives (i.e. PTA and KETB) in planning, implementing, supporting, monitoring, evaluating and in making decisions on issues pertinent to the school in accordance with the national educational policy. So far we have seen the involvement the community in education, generally. At this juncture it is important to see the participation of the community in school management. This would be presented here under.

2.3. Community Participation in School Management

Different scholars in the field of education define school management as a social process. For instance, Kenexevich, (1975:12) has defined school management as a social process concerned with identifying, maintaining, stimulating, and unifying formally organized human and material resources with an integrated system designed to accomplish predetermined objectives. Furthermore, Orlosky and others explain that school management as follows, at the simplest level, school administration can be explained as a process that includes planning, deciding, implementing and assessing results and preplanning (Orlosky et al 1984:4).

Thus, from the above definitions we can conclude that school management is leadership that initiates individuals and groups of people to higher purpose and greater efforts which help them to see their own responsibilities and commitments in a cooperative manner.

Regarding this issue Chamberlin (1966:346-7) states that:

School management is a co-operating activity or service of activities through which the aims of the school and the means of their achievement are developed and placed in to operation. This involves working closely with people.

This shows that, school management is not a one part activity. In achieving organizational goals: it rather requires the participation of all parties in that organization.

Participation is the association with others with special rights and obligations. It is the involvement of subordinates in some ways in the decision making processes either they are consulted individually or in a group by their leader.

Moreover, participation encourages people to direct their creative energies towards organizational goal achievement and gives them some voice in decision making that affects them. In this connection Zaudneh, (1987:10) says that, participation has a potential force for raising productivity, good thinking, higher moral, through participation in various roles individuals develop knowledge, skill and values that are expected of them.

The government of Ethiopia (1994) states that school management is decentralized and the management of schools will be participatory and democratic. Thus, the participation of the community is encouraged one of the rationale for community involvement in school management through decentralization approach is to empower the community members in decision making and to develop sense of belongingness on the parts of the community on affairs pertaining to the school system. Achieving quality education and provision of appropriate education to the citizen are realized through active CP.

Participation in school management may include resource mobilization as well. The goals of the education sector development program can not be achieved within the limited resources of the government (MOE, 2002). Moreover, active participation of the community in school management is helpful identifying the root causes of the major problems that the education system faced in addressing access and quality education. Shaeffer (1994) maintains that issues like curriculum development, managing resources, sponsoring co-curricular, providing consultancy services etc could be addressed by involving the community meaningfully managing schools. In contrast to the earlier policies the current education and training policy has decided to decentralize the education sector with two major objectives: devolution and decentralization (Yodet et al, 2005). Devolution (giving away of responsibility and authority to the local people to enable the community to be involved in managing schools) the devolution of operational planning, budget allocation and control. This will lessen the burden of responsibility from the government while building capacity at lower levels. Local people are in a better position to guide the integration of the school with the community participation at lower level will spread among the community awareness of their own capacity to solve problem they face as well as motivate local people towards self-mobilization. In the second place, a decentralized education management system will encourage CP in decision-making and enhance accountability at lower level. Lower level management is also significance to make efficient use of local capacity and resources while increasing relevance by encouraging flexibility.

CP is considered as an end in it self as a democratic right and a means to the achievement of suitable development and poverty alleviation Stiglitz,(1997). As a means of to an end, CP in education is seen as a way to increase resources, improve accountability of schools to the community they serve, ensure a more cost effective use of resources and, importantly, be

responsive to local needs. As a result, CP enables improve equitable, access, retention, quality and performance of schools (UNESCO, 2003).

CP in school management is likely ensured through their representative. Community education committees, such as, parent teacher association (PTA) and kebele education and training board (KETB) are two of the major ones which are established to ensure real involvement in school management.

It should be; however, noted that the representation of the community in school affairs by PTA, KETB, or the other community representatives does not guarantee active participation. To make meaningful CP in school management, community through their representatives have to go the extent to involve actively in planning, budgeting, monitoring and evaluating, mobilizing (the entire community) as well as in decision- making activities on issues relevant to school effectiveness. To address this needs countries set up community education committees and established guidelines and directives.

To this end, parents and community, PTA members should know what the school is trying to achieve, otherwise, there is a risk that they pull the plan in opposite directions (Fullan, 1991).

2.3.1. Community Participation in Planning

Planning is “a rational process of preparing a set of decision for future actions directed at achieving goals and objectives by optimal means” (Sarhory, 1974:96) planning is, therefore essential to see the future, see possible problems ahead and make provision on time (Forojalla 1993: 39). Education planning on the other hand is the process of education planning on the other hand Forojalla, 1993: 39) Education planning on the other hand, is the process of educational development with the aim of making education more effective and efficient in terms of responding to the needs and goals of students (Musazzi, 1982: 119).

At school level the principal is responsible to plan all activities to be implemented throughout the year. However, the principal should involve management committees, and PTA by convene

meetings and holding discussion and arriving at the decision for implementation (Mohanty, 1990:30).

Strengthening the above idea Kaufman (1995: 23) states:

.... Where parents and community member do not feel they are part of planning the results usually be ignored.... remain on Shelves. So parents, school board members have to be part of thinking and planning... This Will help to be responsible and to create a better future for to morrows child---

2.3.2. Community Participation in Decision Making

One of the areas that the schools need to participate the community is decision making. It is a selection of a course of action among alternatives; which can be taken by individual principal or by participating other concerned (Wehrich and Koonth, 1993: 198)

The community wants to become involved and wants to know the rational before school decisions are made parents and community member become offended if the school arbitrarily makes decisions that directly affect them (Bagin and Donald, 2001, 145).

Therefore, the school principal has to participate the community in areas that concern them. CP in decision making serves as a political model as well as a strategy for tapping additional local resources for education (Kennedy, 1979:19). Strengthening this idea Shaeffer (1994: 143) states:

When community involve in school decisions, as a result of such participation, contributed more to the school. Bothe financially and in kind services and parents feel comfortable visiting the school when level they wished.

2.3.3. Participation in Resource Management

The school is a social institution created to serve the community. To run the school effectively, financial, material and human resources are very important. Education is an expensive endeavor

that requires a largest share of a countries resources. Resources are, however, always scarce. On the other hand, population changes and the demand for education go up and cost of education rises from time to time. Due to this, educational system in many countries is caught in a financial shortage; their further expansion was hampered by inadequate funding (Peanonin UNESCO,1988,89-90).This calls the Participation of community in financing the education system that is beyond the capacity of the government (Coombs, 1985:138). According to UNESCO (1985:24). The Participation of the community in financing schools takes there forms monetary contribution), contribution in kind and in the form of free labour. To run the schools effectively, the use of these resources should be managed effectively, both by the school as well as the community. This is because the availability of finance and resources by itself does not bring any attainment of quality of education without efficient use through appropriate financial management.

2.3.4. Participation in Monitoring and Evaluation

Successful school improvement is linked to systematically planned and executed monitoring and evaluation process and financial outcomes (Stoll and Fink, 1996:53). Monitoring in this case is the continuous or periodic process to review and gather information by management about an activity or program on a continuing and systematic basis to ensure that actions are implemented according to plan (Aspin Wall and et. al 1992:48).

The purpose of monitoring, therefore is to achieve effective and efficient performance by providing feedback to management. This enables to improve operational plans and take timely measures in case of short falls and constraints. Therefore, it has to be conducted by responsible body (Stole and Fink, 1996: 54).

On the others hand, evaluation is a process for determining systematically and objectively, the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impacts of a activities in the light of their objectives (Aspin wall and et. al, 1992:50). The representatives of the community who are accountable to the people who elect them to participate in monitoring and evaluation are the school committee/ board and PTA (Rebore, 1985:24).

2.4. Community Education Committees (CECs)

Local communities can play a broader range of roles. For instance UNESCO (2006) lists down some of the higher levels of CP in education. These functions include administrative (e.g. school maintenance), managerial tasks (such as disciplining teachers and students), financial functions (e.g. budgeting, mobilizing funds and resources) personnel functions (as in monitoring teacher's attendance); pedagogical and the likes. This type of managerial functions by the community is realized through democratically elected members from the entire local community. According to Shaeffer (1994), to serve as a means to build and foster parental and community involvement in school management community education committees such as PTA and school boards are set up.

In this connection, Ethiopia designed CP as one of its strategies to address the provision and access of quality education to the citizens. Thus, PTA and KETB are established to ensure CP in school management through representative members (MOE, 1998). All important segments of the community need to be represented in the community education committees by electing them democratically (UNESCO, 2006). Furthermore the roles and responsibilities of the committees have to be clearly defined. Democratically elected representatives could bring strong and meaningful cohesion between the school and the community. CP enhances acquisition of skills in the governance of schools for the community and develops a sense of belongingness. So CP is a means of educational decentralization and efficiency in schools.

Among others UNESCO (2003:3) CECs have to discharge the following responsibilities. To discuss on agendas (topics); such CECs should conduct meeting and keep minutes. Issues of concern may include mainly mobilizing the community to assist the school in cash, in kind of or in labor. CECs are required to provide culturally appropriate approaches for instance flexible school calendar, educational program, curricula that reflect the community context and involve community members. To promote good relationship between the education program and the community, these committees have the responsibility of communicating with the community, education program and/or national and local authorities.

In assessing the impact of CECs at systematic level, UNESCO (2006) lists: the number of meetings held, variety of issues addressed, level of authority mandated and gender disparity, capacity for fund raising tasks and objectives accomplished, etc are the best indicators of CECs effectiveness. It is also pointed out that investigating the reporting mechanism of these committees and examining their performance is important to understand the practices of CP in school management.

As a means of ensuring CP in education (as stated above) in Ethiopia KETB and PTA are set up at primary and secondary schools (MOE, 1998). Of course, before the current education and training policy there had been the so-called parents committee and school committee organized in a centralized and non-participative.

In the present education system, MOE (1994) the structure of secondary education will be four years duration, consisting of two years (grade 9-10) general education and two years preparatory education (grade 11-12). The general education, which is the concern of this study is aimed at enabling students to identify their interest for further education for specific training and for the world of work. There will be governmental financing to the completion of general secondary education and for related training. Educational management will be decentralized with an overall coordination and democratic leadership by PTA, school boards consisting members from the community, professional principals and students (MOE, 1994).

2.4.1. Parent Teacher Association (PTA)

PTA is a common and influential organization set up by the school and community cooperation in many countries. PTA is organized from parents who have children in the school and the school teachers who seek to promote students welfare and develop schools (Ukeje, 1992). The principal objectives of this association is to create conducive learning environment for children by bringing close relationship between the school and parents. It is assumed that such relationship between teachers and parents could have paramount importance in training children and in developing working school climate to secure the highest advantage for every child.

Similarly, as indicated in the contemporary education and training policy (MOE, 1994), the intention behind establishing PTA is to strengthen the relationship between the school and parents for the benefit of the learners. Membership in PTA comprises almost a one – one ratio of parent-teacher who are elected by parents and teachers association. The chairperson is to be selected by the parent and teacher assembly while the secretary is assigned among the members by themselves. The PTA begins its work by making its own ground rules in accordance with the rules and principles of the national educational policy.

The major responsibilities and duties of this association include maintaining discipline and ensuring whether the school is functioning appropriately. PTA conducts meetings with the community and discusses about issues pertinent to the school system. In such general meetings this association is expected to create awareness to parents about the school activities, what teachers are doing in teaching and the problem they may come across in the instructional process. In the way the school could also identify the needs, interests and attitudes of the parents and the community in general. PTA needs to have its plan and evaluate its performances periodically.

Therefore, the role of PTA in creating favorable learning/teaching school environment and in maximizing the efficiency of the school in carrying out its tasks is crucial. Having understood the significance role that could be played by PTA, Bagin and Donald, (2001) state that PTA is back bone for sound school community relation. Successful PTA could create mutual understanding between the school and parents and secure meaningful effort in education the children. Parents can accept teachers as helpful individuals. Likewise teachers could perceive parents as cooperative Shaeffer (1994) asserts such helpful cooperative and thoughtful relationship as very essential for students' academic and personal development.

PTA has avenues of contact which are potent and for reaching. Through this avenues, it is possible to reach not only parents but also the whole community. This is because the parents who are members of PTA have business and social contacts with the entire public. Moreover, students' ethical development could be better fostered when parents and the school are working together.

Recognizing the importance of parent and school relationship in developing students discipline, the policy give the responsibility of building students; moral (ethics) to PTA (MOE, 1994). It's PTA's duty to ascertain whether students (also teachers and school principals) behave and accomplish their tasks appropriately. Whenever, PTA detects problems on the parts of students', teachers or school principals the association has the responsibility of advising them and to come on the right track. However, if the subject don't show improvement, PTA has to recommend a resolution and present to the school principal or the school board as well as monitor and evaluate its implementation. In addition this association has to participate, comment and suggest its recommendation in the school planning, budgeting, decision-making, monitoring and evaluation of the school activities (Shaeffer, 1994, MOE, 1994).

2.4.2. The School Board

The school board is the highest school governing body which comprised individuals from the community including the local administrator as the chairperson and the school principal as secretary of the board (MOE, 2002). Other members of the kebele education and training board (KETB) are three school PTA representatives, civic non-governmental and governmental organization representatives as well as famous individuals with in the vicinity of the school. It is accountable and has responsibility to approve school plan budget monitor and evaluate the school performance. Moreover, the board has the duties of getting drop-outs back in to schools (MOE, 1994).

The principal purpose of the local board is to enhance CP so that efficient education could be provided to the citizens. In this regard, KETB is responsible to expand formal and non formal education by mobilizing the entire community with in the school vicinity. It is evident that CP in schooling is most often channeled through formal bodies like KETB in accordance with the government directive and policy. In this regard, scholars like Boahene and Aknorful (1999) describe that the major function of the school board is to work in line with areas of the school policy, school improvement, school management and school finance by securing the active involvement of the community: MOE (1994) underscores the responsibilities KETB in planning, provision, maintenance, finance, staffing, instruction, supervision, decision-making monitoring and evaluation of the school performances as per the education policy and the

school plan. Therefore as the major school management body, the school KETB is accountable and has the responsibility to take active part in planning and approving school plan, budget, monitor and evaluate the school performance.

Furthermore, the board is required to devise ways to generate school revenue and mobilize the entire community for additional resources for schooling. As it is indicated in the directives, KETB is responsible to support co-curricular activities so that students could consolidate their classroom learning by relating to the outside practical life. In addition to assisting teachers and other school personnel's, the board has to supervise and ascertain whether the school community performs their tasks properly with the appropriate utilization of the school resources. In this regard MOE (1994) documents that KETB has the duty and responsibility of advising those school personnel's and students who show disciplinary problems but if they cannot demonstrate improvement from their mistakes, the board is responsible to take the necessary measure. The KETB is expected to make its own ground rule early in the beginning of the academic year by which all the members to abide by as well as to present a biannual report on its performance to the entire community through the chairperson.

2.5. Factors to Community Participation in School System

Involving the community in various school programs is not an easy task. There are several potential setbacks that hamper CP in school system. Historically, CP in education is implicated up on by a number of negative factors. Though the factors that influence CP may vary with different settings, some of the major factors that affect CP shall be discussed here under.

In attempts to understand factors that prevent communities from being involved from formal education Shaeffer (1992) found that the degree of CP is particularly low socially and economically marginalized regions.

This is because such regions tend to have the following elements:

- a. Lack of appreciation of the overall objectives of education.
- b. A mismatch between what parents expect of education and what the school is seen as providing.

- c. The belief that education is essentially the task of the state.
- d. The length of time required to realize the benefits of better schooling,
- e. Ignorance of the structure, functions and constraints of the school challenges may vary from one stakeholder to another. The barriers could either related to the community or from the school itself or related to both.

2.5.1. Parents and Community Related Factors

One of the major factors that deter parents/communities from taking part in schools is economic constraints. Some parents and families are unwilling to collaborate with schools because they cannot afford to lose their economic labor by sending their children to school. Even though they see the benefits to send their children to schools, opportunity costs are often times too high to pay. Furthermore, Shaeffer (1992) contends that poor communities/parents in general cannot bear the additional expenses of participatory process, especially in supporting financially, devoting time and energy for the school.

Rietbergen (1996) also confirms that lack of information, training, undefined roles and responsibilities and financial constraints are factors that impedes Cp in school management.

In general financial constraints, lack of time, energy and clarity, conflicts of interests, complexity of modern education, distance from the school, lack of sense of efficacy etc are the major barriers that could be related to community related problems in CP in school management (UNESCO, 2002; Shaeffear, 1994; and Ahmed 1991).

2.5.2. Teachers Related Factors

All problems in CP is not only related to the community but school personnel's, such as teachers and school principals also have had their own adverse effect on CP in school management. For instance, not all teachers welcome parents and communities involvement in school affaires. Gaynor (1998) analyzes the complex relationships that exists between teachers and parents in her study on school management with particular emphasis to decentralization in education. She argues that many parents in many countries would like to be more involved in selecting and monitoring teachers performances. Analyzing impacts of education and

community (EduCo) project in which parents were given much responsibility in school management and monitoring teachers, Gaynor expressed that teachers were not at ease. Teachers felt threatened by parental involvement, believing that it could diminish public regard for professional status. On top of this, a World Bank study of social assessment on EduCo, Community managed-schools, in Salvador (Pena, 1995) indicated that even though parents valued education and had positive attitude towards teachers, they were suspicious about the government. The finding of this study also stated that teachers tended to feel they are losing authority within schools as powers are assumed to the community and parents. Consequently, resistance among teachers were observed in devolution power to the public/community/.

2.5.3. School Principals Related Factors

The school principal leadership style is crucially important in gaining the community support for running the school. Alison (1997) argues that the more democratic the principal is the better the CP will be. The principal's attitude, confidence, clarifying the rules and regulation to the community and to their representatives as well as his/her administrative supports are very demanding if CP is needed and exploited for the betterment of schools' programs.

The internal management of schools is often taken care of by teams or councils with various members of school principals, deputies and school board however this does not guarantee a more participatory decision-making. In this connection, Kanddasny and Lio (2004) claim that the principal's effectiveness as a democratic leadership depends much more on his/her attitude towards participating the community (and its representatives) in decision-making. UNESCO (2006) contends that CP can be understood along a continuum of decision-making power, where communities initiate and share all aspects of the decision making process.

The school principal may fear involving in assuming power to the community in decision making and other managerial functions for not to be dominated by them. So he/she prefers to exclude the representatives in major decisions. In other words, the principal feels uncertainty in enhancing participation. Bagin and Donald (2001) such exclusion of the community in decision making limits the degree of CP and the implementation of the decision.

Disregarding the ability of the community as the potential problem-solver is one of the barriers that hamper CP. Community less involvement is resulted as principals' assume PTA and KETB members possess little or no significant role in decision making (Arnott and Charies, 2000).

Time factor could be one hindrance for involving the community representatives. Principals noted that time required by the PTA or school board entailed some opportunity cost (for example, for supervising other business). In addition, as Copper and Ulrich (1996) describe, the way in which time is managed during PTA or the school board could restrict participation.

Furthermore, lack of administrative support in motivating the community (representatives) building their capacity through training, apathy etc are some of the setbacks that hamper effective CP in school management. On top of this the principals difficulty in convincing people of the value of involving and providing only aid roles to the community are the other barriers or problems related to the school principal in involving the community.

On the other side educators have pointed out strategies that could improve the problem of CP in the management of schools. This shall be presented briefly below.

2.6. Strategies Foster to Community Participation

Although CP can be a tool to tackle some educational problems, it is not panacea that can solve all the problems that the education sector encountered any strategies to achieve a high degree of CP demand careful examination of communities because each community is unique, and complicated in its nature. This part of the report tries to illustrate some issues that need to be solved to improve CP. To begin with, UNESCO (2006:4) suggested the following strategies in order to enhance CP.

UNESCO (2006) also advises to assess the most important and urgent gaps in the provision and management of education in; planning, provision of facilities, maintenance, finance, staffing instruction, supervision and evaluation conditions to be fulfilled for communities effectiveness, a legitimate agreement among all important groups as to the roles, responsibilities and relationships of the different groups should be considered. There ought to be clarity regarding to

the roles, responsibilities and relationships. Furthermore, to carry out the responsibilities the members should have appropriate knowledge. It is not realistic to expect community members to have the technical capability to manage and own education activities without adequate and appropriate training and mentoring. Training programs ought to examine the capacity of the community and sort out training needs and ways to address these needs. The training on the education programs should involve other community members so as to promote the quality and sustainability of their assistance to the school (UNESCO, 2006). Provision and quality education is not only the concern of representatives or professionals. Thus the entire community should have take part and have necessary information regarding the education program though much is needed from school principals. The school principal should support the community representatives by directing and by building their capacity for meaningful and active Cp in school management.

2.6.1. The Role of School Principal in Enhancing CP in

School management

The role of school principal in fostering CP is crucial. Principals have to sensitize, motivate and welcome the community education committees and the whole public to the school. Much of schools success depends on the quality and effectiveness of the schools' leadership. The role played by the school principals either hinder or facilitate community's participation in school management. This approach (style) of the principal make or could have direct bearing on school improvement programs. The level of CP is predominantly influenced by the principals leadership style. The more participatory the principal is the more effective in procuring the community's support, so that the school will be successful in accomplishing its objectives. Owing to this, among others, the school head need to have and update his/her conceptual, human relation and technical skills as a manager (UNESCO, 1986). The principal should have adequate skills in human relationship and as instructional leader. He/she has to get the work done through people. Creating strong bond between the school and the community is possible through open, transparent and knowledgeable school manager. In favor of the need for appropriate conceptual knowledge MOE (2002), contends

1. Conduct a feasibility study to introducing or strengthening CP in schooling
2. Establish or strengthen community education committees monitor their functioning and adjust or extend their role
3. Decide long term roles and responsibilities of the committees in the education system and the relationship that they will have with other parts of the system.
4. Use the education committees as possible and appropriate to assist in return and reintegration.

Shaeffer (1994) in his part also suggested that in order to provide the necessary support, understanding the nature of the community and assessing the capacities of the community is good strategy to enhance CP. It is thus, important to examine the extent to which the community is involving in various activities particularly in education. Careful assessment communities is necessary to successfully carry out activities that promote CP in surveying the communities Shaeffer (1994) listed down some specific questions that may that could help to understand the existing organization. These include; the kind of school/parent/community structure(s) or organization(s) found including the members, the criteria for membership election. Their responsibilities, the right of these organizations as well as investigating the nature of the organization and/or regulations that government and/or the organization is demanding. Beyond this how the existing community organizations in relation to school/education discharge its responsibility and their level of participation and what they actually achieved by the committees need to be asked and answered to understand the CP through their representatives. This in turn, could help to foster activities performed by the community.

Contends that in order for school principals to discharge their responsibilities as one of a prominent figure in school management they have to update and upgrade their skill in-and-on the job training. Such knowledge could help the head teachers to play their pivotal roles in maintaining healthy relationship between the school and the communities by creating trust between and among parents, teachers, the entire community and themselves. Understanding and motivating communicating and exploiting the communities, resources and potentials as well as solving the problems pertinent to the school activities are likely possible through such competency building.

However, it is possible to establish the principles for which may assist the process of community involvement to become successful. Jimma University (2008:107) suggests the following five principles for schools to establish effective involvement of the community.

- A. Principles of uniqueness: Each community has a unique combination of resources, facilities, personnel needs, attitudes and limitations, and the first principle of CP is that the people in the best position to know what these factors are and how they are related to the people in the community.
- B. Principle of Ownership: As people come to know that the program and plans of the school belong to them as members of community they will come to recognize the legitimacy of their involvement. So this notion of ownership been maintained always.
- C. Principles of skill training: people who are involved in the decision making processes need to be given the skills for sound participation in group tasks. This skill training is most effective when it is done in the context of actual, activity so that the involvement could become widespread and effective.
- D. Principles of Representation: A far greater chance of success in the education program of schools are obtained through participation when people from all subgroups in the community are appropriately represented than lets representation.
- E. Principles of leadership; Effective participation is the function of effective leadership. It is this principle that allows the others to exist and determines in what form they will exist.

In a nutshell, these major areas of salient CP principles can only accomplished successfully through effective leadership style.

SUMMARY

To sum up the above review of related literature, CP in education affairs is one of the most over used but least understood concepts in developing countries. Many authorities agree that the definition, the term differ from country to country and within the field of emphasis.

Schools are institutions that can prepare children's to contribute to the betterment of the society in which they operate by equipping them with skill important in society. There are different of

participation ranging from simple consultation to joint decision making to self management by the community itself. Being so, CP in education lies on a continuous ranging from nominal to high level of participation depending on the management, socio-cultural context. Shaeffer (1994) put the levels of participation on a 'ladder' which goes from complete non participatory and exclusion from school affairs, except in the provision of resources'; though involvement (at home) motivating children and helping them with home work; involvement as an 'audience' and passive supporters at school run meetings; to participate as 'consultants' on school issues; as 'partners' on teaching or training; as 'implementers' of delegating power; and ultimately as 'citizens' on community in control of the school. The level of participation of the community as partners in teaching or training and as implementers of delegated powers reflect a more fundamental and significant since the community has the chance to make decision based on its priority.

The CP in school management has an important building block in creating a sense of ownership of schools. Schools should lay a fertile ground to take the lead to participate the community in the management of the schools. CP in school management has become necessary because of lack of government administrative and management capacity; community based management is often less skill intensive and more cost effective than centralized approaches. Therefore, community would participate in planning, decision making, school resource management, implementation and monitoring and evaluation with the help of representatives (PTA and KETB). PTA and KETB were established in all schools to participate in the management of school activities on behalf of the community. PTA is a joint body of parents and teachers of a school. It is basically an association of teachers and parents who have their children's in a particular school. And its purpose is to create strong links and relations between the school and the community, to bring parents and teachers come closer, to make parents know the school; what teachers are doing for students and the problems they face, to assist in raising funds to address some of the basic needs of the school. The main function of the school board is to work in line with area of the school policy, school development, school management and school finance.

Involving the community in various school programs is not an easy task. There are several potential setbacks that hamper CP in school system. Historically, CP in education is implicated

up on by a number of negative factors. Though the factors that influence CP may vary with different settings, some of the major factors that affect CP shall be discussed here under.

In attempts to understand factors that affect communities from being involved from formal education Shaeffer (1992) found that the degree of CP is particularly low socially and economically marginalized regions.

This is because such regions tend to have the following elements:

- a. Lack of appreciation of the overall objectives of education.
- b. A mismatch between what parents expect of education and what the school is seen as providing.
- c. The belief that education is essentially the task of the state.
- d. The length of time required to realize the benefits of better schooling,
- e. Ignorance of the structure, functions and constraints of the school challenges may vary from one stakeholder to another. The barriers could either related to the community or from the school itself or related to both.

The level of CP is greatly influenced by the inherent interest, capability and leadership style of the principal. The principals have to discharge their responsibility by creating participatory approach .They have to be aware that the community has not only the right to participate in the management of their schools, but also they themselves, have the responsibility to do it.

CHAPTER THREE

3. The Research Design and Methodology

3.1. The Research Method

To assess the practices and problems of community participation in secondary schools management in central zone of Tigray Region, a descriptive survey method was employed. Descriptive survey research design helps to gather a large variety of data related to a problem under study and it is also effective for providing a snapshot of the current behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs in a population. In relation to this, Seyoum and Ayalew (1989) stated that the descriptive survey method of research is more appropriate to gather several kinds of data such a broad size rather than case study (which is in-depth study) and comparative study.

Moreover, the method also helps to provide adequate information that enables the researcher to suggest some valuable alternatives. Supporting this, Keeves (1990) has pointed out that descriptive method of research is a fact finding study with adequate and accurate interpretation of the findings. Therefore, to have a clear picture on the existing problems and to accomplish the objectives stated earlier a descriptive survey become appropriate.

3.2 Sources of Data

Both primary and secondary sources of data were employed in the study. The primary sources of data were obtained from woreda education supervisors, school principals, PTA, KETB and teachers.

The selection of those people as a source of data was based on the expectation that they have better information and experiences in relation to the study, secondary sources of data were gathered from documents of schools, publications, journals, books, and reports written on community participation, related literature and previous research findings were also reviewed to meet the objectives of the study.

3.3 sample and sampling techniques

According to the central zone administration bureau (2013), there were 12 woredas and 22 government secondary schools (grade 9-10). The study involved members of PTA, KETB, and teachers of central zone in the Region. These different school community were used as the population of the study.

Since the major focus of this study is assessing the practices of CP in secondary school management through the community representatives (PTA and KETB members), as well as the school principals and Woreda education are included in the study.

Within the twenty two secondary schools there were 1009 teachers whereas 336 teachers were found in the sample of seven secondary schools, of these 88 (26.3%) teachers from each school were selected using simple random sampling method. Therefore, 56 PTA and 35 KETB members, were selected using comprehensive sampling.

The researcher was used purposive sampling and simple random sampling techniques to select the respondents of the study. To select Woreda education experts and supervisors KETB and PTA purposive sampling technique was employed. This can allow to obtain information from those who were worried in the education system. As well, purposive sampling was also used to select school principal. In addition simple random sampling technique was employed to select teachers from the sample schools. The distribution of the respondents was shown as follows.

Table 1: lists of sample secondary schools in the central zone of Tigray

No	Name of secondary schools (grade 9-10)	PTA	KETB	Teachers		Total participants
				Total	Samples	
1	Nigiste Saba	8	5	68	18	31
2	Suhul Michael	8	5	41	11	24
3	Kalib	8	5	54	14	27
4	Rama	8	5	38	10	23
5	Lidia	8	5	34	9	22
6	Alula	8	5	46	12	25
7	Enticho	8	5	55	14	27
Total		56	35	336	88	179

3.4 Instruments and procedures of data collection

3.4.1. Instruments of data collection

In this study, questionnaires, interviews and document analysis were employed to gather data from respondents.

A. Questionnaire

The research contained both close and open ended items for the PTA, KETB and teachers. Koull (1996) suggested that questionnaire is widely used in educational research to obtain information about certain conditions and practices and to inquire into opinions and attitudes of individuals and groups. Two types of questionnaire was administrated to collect data from PTA, KETB and teachers at school level. Closed ended items were prepare in order to obtain realistic data. The number of open-ended items were few, because this instrument help to under take in –depth studies and open ended questions were justified due to the fact that it calls for a free response in the respondents own words (Best and Khan.2003)

The questionnaire was administered to the seven secondary schools of PTA, KETB and teachers to procure information on the role played to establishing and enhancing the community representatives participation in the school management. The items of the questionnaire were constructed by the researcher and modified from various sources based on the directives issued by the government and other related publications in relation to community in school management, particularly the contents of the items were restated to the efforts made by the principals in involving PTA and KETB members in planning, decision making, resource management as well as in monitoring and evaluation of school activities. The scoring of each scale varied from 4 to 5 with Likert or verbal frequency scale. The items were presented in respondents mother tongue (Tigrigna) to avoid language barriers. The translation was made by the researcher independently. For editing two teachers, first degree graduates and the other with second degree majoring in English. The questionnaire has two parts: First section contained the general data of the respondents. The other part was about the roles of principals and other related issues.

B. Interview

Semi-structured interview questions were employed as an instrument to collect relevant information. The reason for using semi-structured interview is that it can permit the exploration of issues, which might be too complex to investigate through questionnaires and also justifies as it allows better flexibility for the interviewer and interviewee to explain more explicitly what he/she knows on the issue (Best and Kahn, 2003). The interview was conducted with WEO and supervisors to collect data in order to obtain complete information for the study.

The interview format having eight questions were presented to Woreda education experts for triangulation purpose. The items were developed by the researcher on the bases of the responsibilities that are expected from the principals to discharge in enhancing CP. The interview was conducted by the researcher .Then using the leading questions the researcher asked the WEO experts and took notes.

C. Documentary Data

Besides, other related documents were surveyed. Then the data was collected and organized in line with the basic research questions and discussed and interpreted by relating them to reviewed literature. This is done to enrich data obtained through questionnaire and interviews and to solicit additional information that can not be obtained through other methods. Document analysis, files and documents were assessed to see how they have been doing (taking part) in the school management activities.

In this regard, effective indicators of community educational committees such as frequency number of meetings held, variety of issues addressed tasks and objectives accomplished, etc by PTA and KETB members in the schools management activities.

3.4.2. Procedures of data collection

The school principal arranged meeting for the KETB, PTA and teachers, and the researcher explained to the respondents about the purpose of the questionnaire. The questionnaire were distributed to KETB, PTA members and teachers with the help of each secondary school principals. After all the respondents were informed the purpose of the study and their responses would be used for the fulfillment of second degree in educational leadership and academic purpose and they were also assured that their responses would be kept confidential. So as to triangulate the data about CP and the role played by the principal, interview was conducted with WEO experts in seven Woredas where the target secondary schools are found at the interview being carried out, the researcher was taking notes of the responses. Besides this, after making clear about the objective of the research the researcher got permission from the principals to survey pertinent documents (minutes, files and reports) of the secondary school the documents were collected with the assistance of the school record officer. All this data were collected from February 2014 to March 2014 from each secondary schools at break time.

3.5. Method of data analysis

The data gathered through questionnaire, interview, and document analysis was structured, organized and formed to make easy for analysis.

In order to acquired detailed information, the data obtained through questionnaire was organized in tables and the data obtained from interview, open ended question, and document analysis was analyzed in narration under each category in table with relevance to the issue. Both quantitative and qualitative methods of data analysis was employed.

To analyze the data obtained from different sources, various statistical techniques were employed. Percentage and frequency distribution were employed to analyze various characteristics of sample population like sex, age, work experience, education level and the like. To find out the average value against each item for groups of respondents descriptive statistics (i.e percentage , mean and standard deviation) was computed by using statistical package. The findings of the research are going to be reported based on this analysis and interpretation of the data and finally on the basis of the data analysis conclusion was made and recommendation were forward.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. Data Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation

This part of the study deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of the findings of the data obtained from the sample population through questionnaires, interviews and document analysis. Both quantitative and qualitative data analysis techniques were used. The data obtained from questionnaire were analyzed using frequency, mean, standard deviation. Therefore about 179 questionnaires were distributed to the respondents and all were properly filled and returned. Out of the 179 questionnaires distributed, those for PTA were 56(31.3%) the 35(19.5%) were KETB and 88 (49.2%) were teacher respondents.

Interview were held with seven WEO experts and education high school supervisors. Moreover documents were also analyzed. The questions were common to the groups and the data gathered were organized using tables followed by discussion. For the sake of convenience, clarification and comparison related question were treated together. The presentation and analysis of the data begins with background characteristics of the respondents.

The information gathered by employing interview and document were analyzed textually (qualitatively). From interview and document analysis were used to substantiate the data gathered through questionnaire.

The first purpose of this study was to assess the current level of community participation in the secondary schools in the management schools related to areas of planning, decision-making, finance and resource management, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation.

Regarding these items, a 5- point Likert scale, from very low (1) to very high (5) was employed for the purpose of this study, means from 2.50 -3.49 range was taken as moderate level, while from 3.50 and above was considered as high level participation in the statement. A mean of less than 2.50 was considered to indicate low level participation in the statement.

4.1 Degree of community participation in school management

Before, discussing the data related to the major questions, a summary of characteristics of the respondents is presents below.

Description of the characteristics of the target population gives some basic information about age, sex, marital status, occupation and educational level of the respondents. The following tables contains about the general characteristics of respondents involved in the study.

Table 2. Generaground of the respondents

Variables	Levels	KETB		PTA		Teachers		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age	20-29	2	5.7	18	32.1	35	39.8	55	30.7
	30-39	7	20.1	17	30.4	25	28.4	49	27.4
	40-49	20	57.1	12	21.4	22	25	54	30.2
	>=50	6	17.1	9	16.1	6	6.8	21	11.7
	Total	35	100	56	100	88	100	179	100
Sex	Male	32	91.4	50	89.3	55	62.5	137	76.5
	Female	3	8.6	6	10.7	33	37.5	42	23.5
	Total	35	100	56	100	88	100	179	100
Marital status	Mired	30	85.7	42	75	55	62.5	127	70.9
	Single	5	14.3	14	25	33	37.5	52	29.1
	Total	35	100	56	100	88	100	179	100
Occupation	Merchant	18	51.4	10	17.9	-	-	28	15.6
	Farmer	8	22.9	6	10.7	-	-	14	7.8
	Teacher	7	20	23	41.1	88	100	118	65.9
	Principal	-	-	7	12.5	-	-	7	3.9
	Other	2	5.7	10	17.9	-	-	12	6.7
	Total	35	100	56	100	88	100	179	100
Education level	Read &Wr	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Grade1-4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Grade5-8	3	8.6	2	3.6	-	-	5	2.8
	Grade9-10	5	14.3	3	5.4	-	-	8	4.5
	Grade11-12	4	11.4	6	10.7	-	-	10	5.6
	Certificate	8	22.9	16	28.6	-	-	24	13.4
	Diploma	9	25.7	7	12.5	9	10.2	25	14
	Degree	6	17.1	22	39.3	79	89.8	107	59.8
	Above degree	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	35	100	56	100	88	100	179	100	

Where K= KETB P=PTA T=Teachers and N=Number of respondents

Table 2 indicates the age, sex, marital status, occupation and educational background of the respondents. The highest age proportion of the respondents were between 20 and 45 years old (76.5%) of all these respondents are males. And those who are married (70.9%) exceed in amount. Most of the respondents (65.9%) occupation were teachers. Next to teachers (15.6%)

of the participants were merchants. Farmers comprised (7.8%) of the respondents. but the rest (6.7%) were from other occupations. Where as, the number of teachers those who have first degree consisted of (59.8%) from the total respondents. Then about (10.1%) of the education level of the respondents were between grade 9 and 12.

The first purpose of this study was the level of community participation in planning, decision-making, finance and resource management, implementation, monitoring and evaluation and the results are presented from Table 3 to 7.

4.1.1 Levels of Community Participation in Planning

Table 3: Community Participation in Planning

No	Item	Perception of Respondents							
			V.High (5)	High (4)	Medium (3)	Low (2)	V.low (1)	Mean	S.D
			f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)		
1	Formulating strategy plan and action plan of the school	K	-	2(5.7)	8(22.9)	23(65.7)	2(5.7)	2.28	0.65
		P	3(5.4)	4(7.1)	15(26.8)	26(46.4)	8(14.3)	2.42	0.99
		Ts	3(3.4)	10(11.4)	22(25)	42(47.7)	11(12.5)	2.45	0.92
2	Securing school resources	K	-	2(5.7)	6(17.1)	20(57.1)	7(20)	2.08	0.76
		P	-	3(5.4)	14(25)	31(55.4)	8(14.3)	2.21	0.74
		Ts	-	7(8)	16(18.2)	49(55.7)	16(18.2)	2.15	0.81
3	Planning the school programs	K	-	1(2.8)	7(20)	22(62.8)	5(14.3)	2.11	0.67
		P	-	5(8.9)	17(30.4)	25(44.6)	9(16.1)	2.32	0.84
		Ts	3(3.4)	6(6.8)	23(26.1)	39(44.3)	17(19.3)	2.30	0.96

Where K = KETB P= PTA T=Teachers and f= frequency

As depicted in Table-3 of the first item, the respondents were asked to rate the extent to which the community participation in formulating strategic planning and action plan of the school. Accordingly, 23 (65.7%) of KETB and 26(46.4%) of PTA members reveals the involvement of

the community participation in planning in the school strategic plan and action plan was low. While 42(47.7%) of teachers also approved that the participation of the KETB and PTA members in planning the school strategic plan was low. The mean score values of KETB, PTA and teachers for this item (2.28, 2.42 and 2.45) respectively are below the medium average (3.00) Furthermore, from the interview held with WEO experts, it was found out that KETB and PTA members didn't participate in the planning. Due to this, plans were developed by principals and teachers and discussed on staff meeting, make all sort of adjustment and finally sent to woreda education office. The document of staff meeting also supports this but not minutes of KETB and PTA.

This shows that, KETB and PTA members were not actively participating in the planning of school activities. From this it is possible to understand that the responsibility given to them at least to approve the school plan developed by principal is not practical (MOE, 1994: 22, 28). Due to this weakness, it is clear that the school may face problem during plan implementation, reduce sense of ownership belongingness with the community that end the plan with high risk of remaining in black and white (Fullan, 1991: 241).

In the second item they were asked to rate the extent to which they plan the available school resource to be used for the teaching learning process. 27(77.1%)of KETB, 39(69.9%)of PTA members 65 (73.9%) of teachers indicated that their participation in planning securing school resource was low and very low. As of the information gathered from 7 WEO experts, the participation of the community representatives in planning securing school resources in secondary schools was insignificant and simply existed in the organizational structure of the school.

This shows that, securing of schools resources or school property is left to school staff, while the representative of the community (PTA and KETB) they are not carrying out the responsibility given to them in this regard (MOE, 1994: 22).

Regarding item 3, 27(77.1%) of KETB, 34(60.7%) of PTA members and 56(63.6%)of teacher responded that the participation of the community representatives in designing and planning school programs was low and very low. The mean score rated by KETB and PTA members, and

teachers respectively 2.11, 2.32 and 2.30 are below the medium value (3.00). This indicated that, the KETB and PTA members' participation in planning, school programs was found at low level. Further more, the information gather from interview with WEO experts and document analysis strongly support the data obtained through quantitative. From this, one can possible to conclude that planning school program activities was prepared by school and less result achievement principals without involving or participating of KETB and PTAs members, therefore, this leads to inactive participation of the school.

4.1.2 Level of CP in decision- making

Table4: Responses on Community participation in decision- making

No	Item	Perception of Respondents							
			V.high (5)	High (4)	Medium (3)	Low (2)	V.low (1)	Mean	S.D
			f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)		
1	The extent of decision making on budgeting	K	1(2.9)	4(11.4)	10(28.6)	16(45.7)	4(11.4)	2.48	0.94
		P	3(5.4)	5(8.9)	20(35.7)	25(44.6)	3(5.4)	2.64	0.91
		Ts	-	7(8)	29(33)	39(44.3)	13(14.8)	2.34	0.82
2	The extent of decision making on teachers' complaints	K	-	3(8.6)	11(31.4)	17(48.6)	4(11.4)	2.37	0.79
		P	-	7(12.5)	15(26.8)	24(42.9)	10(17.9)	2.33	0.91
		Ts	-	3(3.4)	17(19.3)	37(42)	31(35.2)	1.90	0.82
3	The extent of deciding students' and teachers disciplinary problems	K	2(5.7)	4(11.4)	6(17.1)	18(51.4)	5(14.3)	2.42	1.04
		P	3(5.4)	4(7.1)	15(26.8)	27(48.2)	7(12.5)	2.44	0.98
		Ts	-	7(8)	16(18.2)	48(54.5)	17(19.3)	2.14	0.81

Where K = KETB P= PTA T=Teachers and f= frequency

With respect to item 1, the participation of the community in decision making in school activities ranging with mean value from 1.90 to 2.48, which are significantly less than the ideal

mean value (3.00). For instance, 16(45.7%), 25(44.6%) and 39(44.3%) of KETB, PTA and teachers taken in order reported that the community representative participation in decision-making on budgeting was low.

From the interview with the principals and document analysis of minutes of KETB and PTA. It was found that decision making on school budgeting and determine how it spent was made by the school principals and teachers members of PTA. From this it is possible to understand that KETB and PTA are not carrying out their responsibilities given to them either to adapt, reject the budget that spent in schools.

Regarding item 2 decisions about teachers' complaints, 17(48.6%) of KETB, 24(42.9%)of PTA and 37(42%)of teachers reported that the participation of KETB and PTA members in resolving teachers' complaints through decision was found to be low. Besides 4(11.4%), 10(17.9%) and 31(35.2%) of KETB, PTA and teachers respectively reported their participation in decision-making was very low. Moreover, the mean values of KETB, PTA and teachers responses respectively are 2.37, 2.33 and 1.90 which are below the average value (3.00).

Further more, from the interview with school principals and document observation (analysis), it was found out that in most school matters decisions were made by the principals together with teachers who were member of PTA.

From this, it is possible to conclude that that KETB and PTA member participation in decision making on teacher complains was poor and low. Due to this is difficult to call there was genuine participation.

Therefore, the PTA and KETB participating on decision making such as teachers absenteeism, poor performance, improving the educational delivery, monitoring and supervising teachers, ensuring that teachers arrive at school on time and perform effectively in class room was not adequate

Lastly, with respect item 3, 23(65.7%) of KETB, 34(60.7%) of PTA members and 65(73.9%) of teachers reported that deciding on students' and teachers' disciplinary problems was low and

very low. While 6(17.1%) of KETB and 15(26.8) of PTA members' participation in decision-making on students' and teachers' disciplinary problems was found at medium level. To counter check this, the researcher conducted interview with WEO experts about the participation of KETB and PTA members decision making on school matters. Nearly all respondents reported that the participation of the community was insignificant and simply nominal. Most of the decisions were made by school principals themselves together with teachers who were members of PTA. Furthermore, the informants also confirmed that the community's participation on the over all school management, school policy, financial management, disciplinary hearings, school budget and administration, monitoring on teacher attendance was poor. Furthermore, the current status of community participation as the respondents confirmed, agrees with Shaeffer's (1994) idea that, there is participation only when the local community representative are taking part in decision making. From this, it is possible to conclude that the extent to which KETB and PTA members' participation in decision making in school affairs is low and poor.

4.1.3. Level of CP in Finance and Resource Management

Table 5: Responses on Community participation in finance and resource management

No	Item	Members	Perception of Respondents						
			V.High (5)	High (4)	Medium (3)	Low (2)	V.Low (1)	Mean	S.D
			f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)		
1	Mobilizing the community to contribute resources	K	3(8.6)	18(51.4)	11(31.4)	3(8.6)	-	3.60	0.76
		P	5(8.9)	27(48.2)	17(30.4)	7(12.5)	-	3.53	0.83
		Ts	4(4.5)	48(54.5)	21(23.7)	12(13.6)	3(3.4)	3.43	0.90
2	Budget preparation and approval	K	2(5.7)	19(54.3)	7(20)	6(17.1)	1(2.8)	3.42	0.93
		P	5(8.9)	29(51.8)	14(25)	6(10.7)	2(3.6)	3.51	0.92
		Ts	5(5.7)	48(54.5)	23(26)	7(8)	5(5.7)	3.46	0.93
3	Checking and monitoring school resource	K	1(2.8)	5(14.3)	8(22.8)	19(54.3)	2(5.7)	2.54	0.90
		P	3(5.4)	6(10.7)	12(21.4)	32(57.1)	3(5.4)	2.53	0.87
		Ts	-	10(11.3)	29(33)	40(45.5)	9(10.2)	2.45	0.82

Where K = KETB P= PTA T=Teachers and f= frequency

Regarding table 5 item1, the mean value 3.60 of KETB, and 3.53 PTA was high. Moreover, teachers with the mean value 3.43 reported that the members' of the community participation was moderate. The PTA and KETB members mobilize the community in financing education contribution in the form of money, in kind and in the form of labor.

From this, it is possible to say that KETB and PTA members' commitment to mobilize the community so as to get money, kind and labour support was as moderate. Rather they are also expected to go beyond that and assume key role examining, budgeting and determine how resources spent (Shaeffer,1994: 70).

The response of the interview conducted with WEO expert also supported that the commitment of the KETB and PTA members in mobilizing the community to make contribution money, in kind and labour was average.

Regarding item2, about 19(54.3%) of KETB, and 29(51.8%) of PTA members and 48(54.5%) of teachers revealed that the participation of the community in school budget preparation and approval was at high level. Where as the mean values of each group of respondents (3.42, 3.51 and 3.46) taken in order, are above the average (3.00). This also shows the participation of the community in line with approving and preparing the school budget was found at moderate level.

From the interview and document analysis of minutes of KETB and PTA members ensured that participating in budget preparation was moderate. Therefore they are also expected to go beyond that and play key roles in examining, determining and controlling school budget (resources).

Moreover ,regarding with monitoring school resource, about 54.3% of KETB,57.1% of PTA members and 45.5% of teachers reported that their participation in monitoring school budget was with the mean score of 2.54,2.53,and 2.45 respectively which are less than the ideal mean 3.00.this indicated that the participation of KETB and PTA members in monitoring the school resource was low .Furthermore, from the interview with WEO, it was found that KETB and PTA role in monitoring and evaluation school resources were only limited to certain activities. Therefore it is possible to understand that KETB and PTA did not have significant role in

monitoring and evaluation of school performance. This means KETB and PTA did not have the information on the extent to which the plan is implemented, what remain and what problems were face and what measures to be taken. As a result they could not provide real feedback to concerned bodies and make proper decisions regarding future planning and development.

From this, it is possible to understand that the KETB and PTA are not fully carrying out their responsibilities to them to adopt, reject or modify the budget prepared by school principals and appraise how it spent it. Therefore available of resources by it self does not have any impact on the attainment of quality of education without efficient and appropriate use of financial management.

4.1.4 Level of CP in implementation of school plan

Table 6: Responses on Community participation in implementation of school plan

No	Item	Perception of Respondents							
		Members	v.high (5)	High (4)	Medium (3)	Low (2)	v.low (1)	Mean	S.D
			f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)		
1	Follow up of the teaching learning process of the school	K	-	1(2.8)	6(17.1)	27(77.1)	1(2.8)	2.2	0.52
		P	2(3.6)	3(5.4)	10(17.9)	37(66.1)	4(7.1)	2.32	0.82
		Ts	-	5(6.7)	10(11.4)	66(75)	7(8)	2.14	0.63
2	Follow up of the school resources	K	2(5.7)	1(2.8)	8(22.8)	21(60)	3(8.6)	2.37	0.90
		P	2(3.6)	5(8.9)	9(16.1)	32(57.1)	8(14.3)	2.30	0.94
		Ts	-	5(5.7)	11(12.7)	58(65.9)	14(15.9)	2.07	0.71
3	Monitoring the implementation of disciplinary decisions	K	-	1(2.8)	8(22.8)	19(54.3)	7(20)	2.08	0.73
		P	-	5(8.9)	6(10.7)	42(75)	3(6.1)	2.23	0.68
		Ts	-	5(5.7)	8(9.1)	61(69.3)	14(15.9)	2.04	0.69

Where K = KETB P= PTA T=Teachers and f= frequency

As indicated in Table 6, the mean values of the responses of each item range from 2.04 to 2.37 and each of them is less than the mean value (3.00). This implies that the participation of the community in implementation school activities was low.

As can be seen from table 6 item-1, 27(77.1%) of KETB, 37(66.1%) of PTA and 66(75%) of teachers with mean values 2.2, 2.32 and 2.14 respectively, reported that the participation of KETB and PTA members in following up the teaching learning process was low.

This indicated that there was a low level of participation in implementation of the school plan. From this it is possible to understand that school plans are left to principals and teachers for implementation. This could be either due to a low level of participation during planning and decision making. The lower involvement during planning and decision making, the lower it will be during implementation (Kaufman, 1995: 23). Hence, in order to make KETB and PTA members take part in implementation, principals need to let them involve in planning, decision making and conduct meetings in appropriate place and time. In addition to this, it requires to provide adequate training to make them aware of their responsibilities.

Moreover 24 (68.6%), 40(71.4%) and 72(81.8%) of KETB, PTA and teachers respectively with mean values 2.37, 2.30, and 2.07 taken in order indicated that the participation of KETB and PTA members in follow up the school resources, handling them properly, and using for the teaching learning purpose was low and very low.

This reveals that follow up and controlling school resources is left to school principals and other staff members while the PTA and KETB are not carrying out their responsibilities given to them in this regard (MOE 1994: 22).

Further more, 26(74.3%) of KETB, 45 (80.4%) of PTA and 75(85.2%) of teachers with mean value 2.08, 2.23 and 2.04 respectively indicated that the participation of KETB and PTA implementation of disciplinary decisions was low and very low.

This showed that KETB and PTA members were not actively involving in monitoring disciplinary problems of the schools.

In addition to this, from the interview and the minutest of PTA, it was found out that most disciplinary cases were seen by staff members. From this it is possible to understand that PTA was not carrying out its responsibility as required. This creates not only dalliance to take timely measures but also over burdened teachers, and poor support from parents for decisions passed (MOE, 1994: 35).

4.1.5 Level of CP in monitoring and evaluation

Table–7 Responses on Community participation in monitoring and evaluation

Item	Perception of Respondents							
	Mem bers	V.High (5)	High (4)	Medium (3)	Low(2)	V.Low (1)	Mean	S.D
		f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)		
Preparing evaluating criteria to evaluate the school plan	K	-	3(8.6)	9(25.7)	19(54.3)	4(11.4)	2.31	0.78
	P	2(3.6)	5(8.9)	7(12.5)	33(58.9)	9(16.1)	2.25	0.94
	Ts	2(2.3)	7(8)	20(22.7)	52(59.1)	7(8)	2.37	0.82
Identifying strength and weakness and challenges encountered	K	1(2.8)	2(5.7)	8(22.8)	17(48.6)	7(20)	2.23	0.93
	P	-	5(8.9)	7(12.5)	36(64.2)	8(14.3)	2.16	0.77
	Ts	2(2.3)	5(5.7)	7(8)	67(76.1)	7(8)	2.18	0.74
Monitoring the school resources and evaluating the implementation of the school plan	K	-	3(8.6)	8(22.8)	20(50.1)	4(11.4)	2.28	0.78
	P	-	5(8.9)	5(8.9)	34(60.7)	12(21.4)	2.05	0.81
	Ts	-	7(8)	25(28.4)	47(53.4)	9(10.2)	2.34	0.77
Evaluating their own activities	K	-	3(8.6)	10(28.6)	18(51.4)	4(11.4)	2.34	0.79
	P	-	5(8.9)	14(25)	29(51.7)	8(14.3)	2.28	0.81
	Ts	2(2.3)	7(8)	20(22.7)	58(65.9)	1(1.13)	2.44	0.75

Where K = KETB P= PTA T=Teachers and f= frequency

Table 7, summarizes that the mean values of the participation of the community in monitoring and evaluation of each item range from 2.16 to 2.44 and each of them is less than the ideal mean value .

As indicated in table 7, item 1, about 23(65.7%) of KETB, 42 (75%) of PTA and 59(67.1%) of teachers with calculated mean values 2.31, 2.25 and 2.37 respectively revealed that the participation KETB and PTA members in developing evaluating criteria to evaluate the implementation of the school plan was low. That is, the community representatives do not participate in monitoring the programs auditing and evaluating the results and impacts in light of criteria.

Moreover 24(68.6%) of KETB, 44(78.6%) of PTA members and 74(84%) of teachers with actual mean values 2.23, 2.16 and 2.18 respectively proved that the KETB and PTA members did not participate in identifying strengths, weaknesses and challenges the school encountered.

With respect to item 3,(68%) KETB, 46 (82.1%) PTA, and 56 and (63 .6%) of teachers with mean value 2.28, 2.05, 2.34 respectively, revealed that below the average medium value. This indicated that the PTA and KETB members did not monitoring and evaluating of the implementation of school plan.

Furthermore, from the interview with WEO supervisor and experts and document analysis it was found that KETB and PTA members role in monitoring and evaluating of school planning were only limited to fill in the performance evaluation of teachers and certain activities. From this the PTA and KETB did not carrying out their responsibilities.

With regard to item 4,evaluating their own activities, 22(62.8%) of KETB, 37(66.1%) of PTA members and 59(67%) of teachers, with actual mean values 2.34, 2.28 and 2.44 respectively, revealed that they did not evaluate their own activities and was found at low level. Further more, the data gathered from the interview held with WEO experts and open ended questionnaire explains that the KETB and PTA members' in evaluation of their school activities was inadequate.

From the above data, it is possible to understand that KETB and PTA member did not have significance in evaluating of school performance. Besides, KETB and PTA members did not have the information on the extent to which the plan is implemented, what remains and what problem encountered and what measures to be taken. As a result, they could not provide real feedback to concerned bodies and make people decision for future planning and development.

The second purpose of this study was to ascertain the involvement of PTA and KETB in increasing enrollment and reducing the rate of dropouts and the results were presented in Table 8 below.

4.2 Table–8: The extent of KETB and PTA participation in increasing enrollment and reducing dropout rate of students

No	Item	Perception of Respondents						
		Members	Always	Most of the time	Sometimes	Never	Mean	S.D
			(4) f (%)	(3) f (%)	(2) f (%)	(1) f (%)		
1	How often do KETB and PTA encourage parents to bring children to school?	K	3(8.6)	8(22.8)	23(65.7)	1(2.8)	2.37	0.68
		P	5(8.9)	15(26.8)	33(58.9)	3(5.3)	2.39	0.72
		Ts	7(8)	14(15.9)	65(73.9)	2(2.3)	2.29	0.68
2	How often do KETB and PTA create awareness to reduce drop not?	K	2(5.7)	8(22.8)	21(60)	4(11.4)	2.23	0.72
		P	6(10.7)	9(16.4)	33(58.9)	8(14.3)	2.23	0.82
		Ts	5(5.7)	27(30.7)	53(60.2)	3(3.4)	2.38	0.65
3	How often do KETB and PTA made effort to reduce drop out rate of students?	K	3(8.6)	8(22.8)	23(65.7)	1(2.8)	2.37	0.68
		P	4(7.1)	15(26.8)	29(51.8)	8(14.3)	2.26	0.79
		Ts	2(2.3)	23(26.1)	60(68.2)	3(3.4)	2.27	0.57
4	How often do KETB and PTA shrine to get support from the community in enrolling students to school?	K	3(8.6)	9(25.7)	19(54.3)	4(11.4)	2.31	0.78
		P	7(12.5)	15(26.8)	31(55.4)	3(5.4)	2.46	0.77
		Ts	7(8)	13(14.8)	59(67)	9(10.2)	2.20	0.72

Where K = KETB P= PTA T=Teachers and f= frequency

As it can be seen from table 8, the mean value of each item range from 2.20 to 2.46 and is below the average mean (2.50) for each group of respondents. Respondents have shown that extent of the contribution of KETB and PTA members was rated as sometimes in every item related to increase students enrollment and reducing dropout rate of students.

With regard to item1 of table8, about 23(65.7%) of KETB, 33(58.9%) of PTA and 65(73.9) of teachers with actual mean values 2.37, 2.39 and 2.29 respectively revealed that their contribution in encouraging parents to bring children to school was below the average, they responded as sometimes. Moreover, 65(73.9%) of teacher respondents reported the community representatives' participation in bringing children to school was insignificant and unsatisfactory.

From the interview with WEO experts and reports complied by WEO indicted that it was mainly teachers and principals who did this function, PTA's and KETB's role in this regard was found to be less.

This was one of the reasons given to have the lowest enrollment and high dropout rates in central zone of Tigray Region.

Regarding creation of awareness item 2, 21(60%) of KETB and 33 (58.9%) of PTA members, and 53(60.2%) of teachers reported that the effort and frequency made by KETB and PTA members, in providing and creating awareness with in community was rated as sometimes. Moreover, the mean values 2.23, 2.23 and 2.38 of KETB, PTA and teachers respectively are below the average (2.50). This confirmed that the effort of KETB and PTA members in providing and creating awareness for parents to bring children to school was low.

From this, it is possible to say that KETB and PTA members were not satisfactorily carrying out their responsibilities to create awareness to reduce dropout. From the interview with WEO experts and reports of WEO, like to that enrollment effort, it was mainly teachers and principals who did this function to create awareness that parents send back their children to school.

Further more 23(65.7%) of KETB, 29(51.8%) Of PTA and 60 (68.2%) of teachers with actual mean values of 2.37 2.26 and 2.27 respectively reported that their effort on striving to reduce

the dropout rate of students was agreed as sometimes, that the participation of the community made by the school board and PTA members to reduce dropout rate of students was low.

From this it is possible to say that PTA and KETB members were not satisfactorily carrying out their duties and responsibilities to made effort to reduce dropout rates of students.

In addition to this,19(54.3%) of KETB, 31(55.4%) of PTA members and 59(67.0%) of teachers revealed that the community representative effort to participate the community in reducing dropout rate students was not satisfactorily.

It was agreed as sometimes, from this the data shows that KETB and PTA's role to get support from the communities in increase enrolling students was not satisfactory. Furthermore, from the interview with WEO experts and document analysis support the result obtained from the quantitative data. From this it is possible to say the PTA's and KETB's were not carrying out their responsibilities to get support from the community in enrolling students to school.

The third purpose of this study was to find out the main factors that affecting CP negatively on the part of KETB, PTA and school principals and the results are presented in Table 9 and 10.

4.3.1 Table 9: Factors affecting community participation negatively: on the part of KETB and PTA members

No	Item	Responses							
		Members	S. Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Undecided (3)	D. Agree (2)	S. D. Agree (1)	Mean	S.D
			f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)		
1	Distance of meeting place	K	5(14.3)	24(68.6)	5(14.3)	1(2.8)	-	3.94	0.63
		P	11(19.6)	36(64.3)	6(10.7)	3(5.4)	-	3.98	0.72
		Ts	9(10.2)	65(73.9)	8(9.1)	5(5.7)	1(1.1)	3.86	0.70
2	Lack of time and poor economic status	K	5(14.3)	27(77.1)	1(2.8)	2(5.7)	-	4.0	0.63
		P	7(12.5)	37(66.1)	1(1.8)	11(19.6)	-	3.71	0.93
		Ts	11(12.5)	65(73.9)	3(3.4)	9(10.2)	-	3.88	0.74
3	Lack of knowledge and understanding how to participate in school affairs	K	6(17.1)	26(74.3)	1(2.8)	2(5.7)	-	4.02	0.65
		P	9(16.1)	35(62.5)	4(7.1)	8(14.3)	-	3.80	0.87
		Ts	9(10.2)	65(73.9)	6(6.8)	8(9.1)	-	3.85	0.71
4	Lack of training or insufficient training	K	6(17.1)	24(68.6)	3(8.6)	2(5.7)	-	3.97	0.69
		P	12(21.4)	37(66.1)	5(8.9)	2(3.6)	-	4.05	0.65
		Ts	19(21.6)	60(68.2)	7(8)	2(2.3)	-	4.09	0.61
5	Lack of appreciation over all objectives of education	K	4(11.4)	20(57.1)	5(7.3)	6(17.1)	-	3.63	0.90
		P	11(19.6)	33(58.9)	4(7.1)	8(14.3)	-	3.83	0.90
		Ts	16(18.2)	61(69.3)	5(5.7)	6(6.8)	-	3.98	0.71
6	Belief or trust on school principal	K	5(14.3)	23(65.7)	2(5.7)	5(14.3)	-	3.80	0.85
		P	9(16.1)	39(69.6)	3(5.4)	5(8.9)	-	4.03	0.75
		Ts	13(14.8)	54(61.4)	9(10.2)	12(13.6)	-	3.77	0.86
7	Lack of commitment and willingness of the KETB and PTA members	K	3(8.6)	24(68.6)	3(8.6)	5(14.3)	-	3.71	0.81
		P	10(17.9)	39(69.6)	2(3.6)	5(8.9)	-	3.96	0.75
		Ts	19(21.6)	56(63.6)	6(6.8)	7(8)	-	3.98	0.77

Where K = KETB P= PTA T=Teachers and f= frequency

As table 9 shows, the mean values of the factors affecting community participation related to KETB and PTA members range from 3.63 to 4.09. And the actual mean values of each item responded by each group of respondents are above the average (3.00).

Regarding table 9 item1, 24(68.6%) KETB, 36(64.3%) PTA and 65(73.9%) teachers agreed as high that distance of meeting place affected the KETB and PTA members not to participate in the school management. From the interview with WEO experts and document analysis, it was found that the difficulty of the topography, the scattered settlement of the community due to long distance between school and home were some reasons that hinder KETB and PTA members to meet on regular basis.

In the open ended item of the questionnaire of KETB and PTA it was found that usually meetings were called during working hours of the school which are usually inconvenient for the term to attend meetings.

From the above information it is possible to conclude that for scattered communities attending meetings in places where they are long distance to residence and inappropriate meeting time for members of KETB and PTA are problems that reduce participation in school management (Bagin and Donald 2001: 136).

In item 2, lack of enough time and poor economic status of KETB and PTA were reported to high and very high constraints with 27(77.1%), 37(66.1%) and 65(73.9%) of KETB, PTA and teachers respectively. The respondents KETB, PTA and teachers agreed with mean values of 4, 3.71 and 3.88 respectively which are above the average mean value (3.50).

This showed that, PTA and KETB members were not carrying out their responsibilities due to lack of time and poor economic status.

Based on the responses, it is safe to conclude that lack of time and poor economic status creates problem in participation.

As indicated in Table 9 item 3, 26(74.3%), 35(62.5%) and 65(73.9%) of KETB, PTA and teachers respectively responded 'agree' with mean values 4.02, 3.8 and 3.85 of KETB, PTA and teachers respectively shows lack of knowledge, poor understanding about their roles and responsibilities, and how to participate in school affairs are problems of the community members.

This means the respondents answered positively that lacks skills, knowledge and part understanding of roles and responsibilities is one of the problems to reduce the participation of KETB and PTA in school management.

In item 4, lack of training or had insufficient training how to participate in school management 24(68.6%) of KETB, 37(66.1) of PTA and 60(68.2%) of teachers with actual means (3.97, 4.05 and 4.09) respectively reported that they agree, the KETB and PTA members lack of training or insufficient training how to participate in school management they have. In addition to this 6(17.1%) of KETB, 12(21.4%) of PTA and 19(21.6) of teachers reported that they strongly agree that, KETB and PTA members did not have training regarding participation in school activities. From this it is possible to conclude that having low understanding about their roles and responsibilities made participation difficult and reduce participation and results in educational professional control of the school.

With regard to item5, 20(57.1%) of KETB, 33(58.9%) of PTA and 61(69.3%) of teachers with actual means (3.63, 3.83 and 3.98) respectively reported that they agree with the statement. That is, the KETB and PTA members lack of appreciation of the objectives of education.

Moreover 4(11.4%) of KETB, 11(19.6%) of PTA and 16(18.2%) of teachers strongly agreed that school board and PTA members suffer from lack of appreciating the objectives of education.

This showed that the respondents acknowledge that members of the KETB and PTA lack appreciation of the overall objectives of the education due to this they make poor participation in the management of the school.

Furthermore, from the interview with WEO experts ensured that the results obtained from the quantitative data.

Regarding item6, 23(65.7%) of KETB, 39(69.6%) of PTA and 54(61.4%) of teachers reported that KETB and PTA members believe education is essentially the task of the principal and they trust on the principal. The mean value of each group of respondents (3.8, 4.03 and 3.77) of KETB, PTA and teachers respectively is above the average mean (3.50).

From the majority positive response, it is possible to conclude that the respondents may have in mind that the principal is a full time government employee earning his salary from the government may influence KETB and PTA members to leave the administration to him. The other way may develop a trust on him since he is professional on the area. From this it is possible to say that KETB's and PTA's trust and believe that education is a principal's tasks negatively influence their participation in management. Finally, as far as commitment and willingness of KETB and PTA members is concerned item seven, 68.6% KETB , 69.6% of PTA and 63.6% of teachers reported that they lack commitment and willingness to participate actively in the management of schools. On the bases of the above data, it is possible to conclude that members of KETB and PTA members lack commitment and give less attention to education.

From the interview with WEO experts it was found that most of the KETB members were not show commitment and willingness. Due to this, it was difficult for them to attend meetings called by principals.

4.3.2 Table-10: Factors affecting community participation negatively on the part of school principals

Item	Perception Respondents							
	Members	S. Agree	Agree	Undecided	D. Agree	S. D. Agree	Mean	S.D
		(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)		
		f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)		
Non-participatory leadership style of school principals	K	5(14.3)	23(65.7)	3(8.6)	4(11.4)	-	3.83	0.81
	P	9(16.1)	35(62.5)	6(10.7)	6(10.7)	-	3.82	0.81
	Ts	18(20.5)	58(65.9)	7(8)	5(5.7)	-	4.01	0.71
Principal negative attitude to KETB and PTA members	K	3(8.6)	26(74.3)	3(8.6)	3(8.6)	-	3.83	0.70
	P	7(12.5)	39(69.6)	7(12.5)	3(5.4)	-	3.89	0.67
	Ts	7(8)	67(76.1)	9(10.2)	5(5.7)	-	3.86	0.72
Principals undermine the skill of KETB and PTA members	K	3(8.6)	29(82.8)	1(2.8)	2(5.7)	-	3.94	0.58
	P	5(8.9)	39(69.6)	7(12.5)	5(8.9)	-	3.78	0.72
	Ts	4(4.5)	70(79.5)	5(5.7)	9(10.2)	-	3.78	0.68
Principals lack of training how to participate the community	K	2(5.7)	19(54.3)	10(28.6)	3(8.6)	1(2.8)	3.51	0.84
	P	5(8.9)	35(62.5)	8(14.3)	5(8.9)	3(5.4)	3.60	0.95
	Ts	8(9.1)	61(69.3)	13(14.8)	6(6.8)	-	3.80	0.68
Principals failure to communicate with KETB and PTA members	K	2(5.7)	26(74.3)	5(14.3)	2(5.7)	-	3.80	0.62
	P	7(12.5)	37(66.1)	7(12.5)	5(8.9)	-	3.82	0.75
	Ts	6(6.8)	65(73.8)	8(9.1)	9(6.8)	3(3.4)	3.80	0.88
Principals have time constraints	K	5(14.3)	17(48.6)	11(31.4)	2(5.7)	-	3.71	0.67
	P	15(26.8)	23(41.1)	10(17.8)	8(14.3)	-	3.80	0.98
	Ts	23(26.1)	45(51.1)	13(14.8)	5(5.7)	2(2.3)	3.93	0.80

Where K = KETB P= PTA T=Teachers and f= frequency

Community participation in school management is hampered by barriers not only raised from KETB and PTA members but also by the school principal. The following discussion is therefore

based on the problems related to the principal that may contribute for low level of KETB and PTA participation.

In item 1 of table 10, the respondents were asked to indicate their view on the extent to which non participatory leadership style of the principal creates a negative impression to KETB and PTA members to take meaningful involvement.

Accordingly, 28(80%) of KETB, 44(78.65%) of PTA and 76(86.4%) of teachers revealed that the non-participatory leadership style of school principals highly affected the participation of KETB and PTA members in school matters. On the other hand, the mean value of KETB and PTA members and teacher respondents 3.83, 3.82 and 4.01 respectively is above the average value (3.50).

From the above data it is possible to understand that principals were not democratic. This contradicts (Alison, 1997). That views community participation has become important success of such efforts and more speeding decision making involvement depends on leadership style among principals. The more democratic the principal is the better the participation of the community.

With regard to negative attitude of the principal to participate the KETB and PTA members in school activity, item 2 of Table 10, 29(82.9%) of KETB, 46(82.1%) of PTA and 74(84.9%) of teachers responded with mean value 3.83, 3.89 and 3.86 respectively agreed that school principals do have negative attitude towards the KETB and PTA members. This hinders the community from participating in school activities.

From the interview with WEO expert to it was found that a principals negative attitude to PTA and KETB members greatly matters to less participation of community to school activities. Therefore the school principals do not carrying out their responsibilities and duties to motivate or encourage parents to participating in school activities.

Regarding to item 3, 29(82.8%) of KETB, 39(69.6%) of PTA and 70(79.5%) of teachers with mean values of 3.94, 3.78 and 3.78 taken in order is above the average value (3.50).

From the above data it is possible to understand that school principals degrade the capacity of KETB and PTA members. This may be due to they were laymen without detail know how about school system. Therefore, they may not contribute much during discussion. On the other hand, their educational background may also contribute to such undermining since most of them were not well educated. Due to this and other reasons PTA and KETB members may not have the necessary problem solving and communication skills during meetings to be effective participant

As a result members of the KETB and PTA would not be ready for meeting and adjust themselves for it. In addition to this, meeting time was usually adjusted in terms of the school staff but not that of local community representatives. The meeting place was totally in school. It does not take the geographical location of all members in to consideration.

It is the principals responsibility to sensitize and motivate people that is to say to select appropriate place, time convenient for them and inform them including the agenda there by giving full information to awareness that education is not restricted to professional but rather is of concern to the entire community (UNESCO, 1985:45).

Similarly in item 4, 21(60%) of KETB, 40(71.4%) of PTA and 69(78.4%) of teachers with actual mean value of 3.51, 3.60 and 3.80 respectively have high and very high agreement that school principals did have lack of administrative support, lack of training how to participate the KETB and PTA members in school management. The results support Townsend's (1994) notion that unwillingness on the part of the principal, lack of incentives, lack of skills due to poor or no training regarding participation, lack of provision of leadership support apathy; difficulty of convincing people of the value of participation and reluctance are some of the factors related to the principals that hinder the community to participate in the school management.

Regarding item 5, 26(74.3%) of KETB, 37(66.1%) of PTA and 65(73.9%) teachers responded that they do have high agreement with the statement that principals do have failures to inform KETB and PTA members about the meeting program, time, place and agenda prior to the

meeting date as it is one of problems that contribute for the existing low level of community participation.

Furthermore, the information gathered from the open ended questionnaire and WEO experts through interview provides that most of them do not have a culture of informing the agendas, time of meeting in advance to the community representatives. As a result, members of the KETB and PTA would not be ready meeting and adjust themselves for it .In addition to this ,meeting time was usually adjusted in terms of the school staff but not that of local community representatives. The meeting places was totally in school. It does not take the geographical location of all members in to considerations. It the principals responsibility to sensitize and motivate people that is to say to select appropriate place, time convenient for them and inform them including the agenda there by giving full information to awareness that education is not restricted to professionals but rather is concern to the entire community(UNSCO,1985.45)

From this it is possible to conclude that the level of participation in school management is determined by characteristics of community representatives and school principals. To this end, will-defined measures need to be implemented particularly with the lead of the principal so that the problems could be outcome.

Finally, regarding, item 6,62.2% ofKETB,67.9% PTA and 77.3% teachers responded that the school principals do not have time constraints to participate the community in school management.

From the above data it is possible to understand that school principals do not have time constraints to have meaningful participation in school management. Furthermore, response from the open ended questions factors affecting community participation on the part of principals, were principals are not committed, supportive and open-minded.

The other purpose of this study was to investigate the roles played by the school principals to participate the community in school management and the results was presented in Table-11 below

4.4. Table–11: The roles played by school principals to participate the community in school management.

No	Item	Members	Responses					Mean	S.D
			v. high (5)	High (4)	Medium (3)	Low (2)	v.low (1)		
			f(%)	f(%)	f(%)	f(%)	f(%)		
1	Effort and support made by principals to participate KETB and PTA in planning	K	-	3(8.6)	5(14.3)	25(71.4)	2(5.7)	2.26	0.80
		P	3(5.4)	4(7.1)	11(19.6)	31(55.4)	7(12.5)	2.37	0.97
		Ts	5(5.7)	6(6.8)	14(15.9)	44(50)	19(21.6)	2.25	0.87
2	Effort and support made by principals to participate KETB and PTA in decision making	K	-	3(8.6)	8(22.8)	14(40.0)	10(28.6)	2.11	0.91
		P	2(3.6)	6(10.7)	11(19.6)	31(55.4)	6(10.7)	2.41	0.94
		Ts	2(2.3)	9(10.2)	16(18.2)	54(61.4)	7(8)	2.37	0.78
3	Effort and support made by principals to participate KETB and PTA in resource management	K	3(8.6)	3(8.6)	10(28.6)	15(42.8)	4(11.4)	2.66	1.06
		P	5(8.9)	11(19.6)	17(30.4)	15(26.8)	8(14.3)	2.82	1.16
		Ts	-	11(12.5)	14(15.9)	52(59.1)	11(12.5)	2.28	0.83
4	Effort and support made by principals to participate KETB and PTA in monitoring and evaluation	K	-	7(20)	6(17.1)	16(45.7)	6(17.1)	2.4	0.99
		P	-	7(12.5)	11(19.6)	33(58.9)	5(8.9)	2.35	0.81
		Ts	-	7(8)	17(19.3)	47(53.4)	17(19.3)	2.15	0.82

Where K = KETB P= PTA T=Teachers and f= frequency

Table 11 Summarizes, the mean scores of respondents with effort and support made by principals to participate the community, the mean values of each item range from 2.11 to 2.82 and the actual mean value of each item is less than the average mean (3.00).

As can be seen the first item of table 11, 27(77.1%) of KETB, 38(67.9%) of PTA and 63(71.6) of teachers with mean values 2.26, 2.37 and 2.25 respectively responded the effort and support made by principals to participate KETB and PTA in planning were low and very low.

From the above data to understand that principals do not exert good effort and support to KETB and PTA members in school management. This could be due to lack of inherent interest, capability or inappropriate leadership style. However, it must be known that the school principal is responsible to well come and encourage and maintain healthy relationship were representatives of the community to take part in planning of school activities.

With respect to item 2 of the same table, 14 (40%) of KETB, 31 (55.4%) of PTA, and 54 (61.4%) of teachers with actual mean value of 2.11, 2.41 and 2.37 respectively is below the average value (3.00). From this it is possible to conclude that the effort exerted to become active participation of KETB and PTA members in decision making of school activities was not satisfactorily.

Furthermore, the information gathered from open ended questions and interview with WEO experts provides strong support to the findings that obtained by quantitative data. With regard to item 3 of the same table 15, (42.8%) of KETB 15 (26.8%) of PTA and 52 (59.1%) of teachers with the mean value 2.66, 2.82 and 2.28 respectively revealed that the effort and support made by principals to participate KETB and PTA in resources management of the school was low and poor. In addition to that, the information gathered from open ended and interview equations with WEO experts provides support the findings that obtained from quantitative data.

With the regarding to item 4 of the same table, 16(45.7%) of KETB, 33 (58.9%) of PTA and 47 (53.4%) of teachers with the mean value 2.40, 2.35 and 2.15 respectively finally revealed that the effort and support made by principals to participate KETB and PTA members in monitoring and evaluation was low and not adequate. From this it is possible to say that principals did not exert effort and support to participate community in monitoring and evaluation of school management. Furthermore, from the interview with WEO experts, it was support the idea obtained from the quantitative data.

CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1. Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the status of community participation in the management of secondary schools in central zone of Tigray region. Both qualitative and quantitative data analysis techniques were used. The data obtained from questionnaire were analyzed using frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation. The information gathered by employing interview and document were analyzed textually (qualitatively). The study formulated the following basic research questions.

1. What is the current level of community participation in the management of (planning, decision making, financial and resource management and monitoring and evaluation) secondary schools?
2. To what extent do the KETB and PTA members are involved in increasing enrollment and reducing the rate of dropout?
3. What are the factors that hinder or enhance KETB and PTA members to participation in secondary school management
4. What are the roles played by the principals to participate and enhance community in the school management.

The study was conducted in seven woredas and 7 secondary schools in central zone of Tigray. The methodology employed was descriptive survey. To answer the above questions, a questionnaire and semi-structure interview instruments were employed to obtain data from the selected samples, descriptive statistics was employed to analyze the data collected. Based on the above analysis made, the major findings of the study are the following,

1. With regarded to PTA and KETB participation in planning of school activities 71.4% KETB and 60.7% PTA of the total respondents asserted that their role in this regard was

- low. Due to this school yearly plans were developed, discussed, make all sort of adjustment by teachers and principals and sent to woreda education office.
2. The majority of the respondents 57.1% and 51% respond that KETB and PTA member participation in decision making of school activities was low. In most cases decision were made by principals together with teacher
 3. In relation to KETB and PTA members effort to mobilize the local community to make contribution or support the school in the form of money, labor and in kind was above the average mean value (3.00) therefore the participation of KETB and PTA members was to be a moderate level.
 - ✓ In relation to school budget preparation 54.3% of KETB and 51.8% of PTA members revealed that participation of the community in school budget preparation was average. Therefore, they are also expected to go beyond that to play key roles in examining and controlling school recourses
 4. Moreover the mean values for each item with respect to community participation in implementation of the school plan ranges from 2.04 to 2.37 this is below the mean value (3.00) therefore the participation of KETB and PTA in implementation of the school plan was low and very low.
 5. The mean values of the participation of the community in monitoring and evaluation of the items ranging from 2.16 to 2.44 and each of them are below the mean 3.00. Therefore, the status of KETB and PTA members' participation in monitoring and evaluating the school performance was insignificant.
 6. With regard participation of KETB and PTA members on encouraging parents to bring children to school so as to include access, enrollment and retention the respondents reported that with the mean values range from 2.20 to 2.46 this is below the average mean value 3.00 therefore the participation of the school board and PTA in increasing access, enrollment and reducing the rate of dropout students was low.
 7. As all group of respondents reported, lack of skill, lack of knowledge and poor understanding about their roles and responsibilities due to lack of training or insufficient training; lack of appreciation objectives of education; lack of time and poor economic status; reluctance, lack of commitment and willingness, the belief that KETB and PTA

members have that education is the task of principals and teachers, trust on them were among the barriers on the part of KETB and PTA members themselves which contribute for low level of participation in the management of schools.

8. The majority of the three groups of respondents indicated that, among the barriers on the part of school principals, non participatory leadership styles which contribute for low level of participation in the management of schools.

5.2. Conclusions

Based on the major findings of the study the following conclusions are drawn.

1. As the study indicated, the majority of the respondents KETB and PTA members participation in formulating planning of school activities, securing school resources, planning of school program, decision making, implementation of school plan, monitoring and evaluation of school performance was found to be low and poor. It was the school principals and teachers usually did these functions. From this it is possible to conclude that beyond establishing KETB and PTA in schools, they are not fully carrying out their roles and responsibilities given to them by rules and laws. Due to this participation of the community in the school management was not significant.
2. According to the findings the commitment of the PTA and KETB members in mobilizing the community in line with contribution in the form of money, in kind and labor, and budget preparation of the school was found at an average level. Moreover, the participation of the community with its representatives (KETB and PTA) to increase enrolment, to reduce drop out rate of students, to create awareness, and getting support from the community was not significant. This implies that lack of support in the part of KETB and PTA members resulted from low level of participation during planning and decision-making, the lower it will be during implementation that is true test.
3. As revealed by the majority of the respondents long distance of meeting place, lack of time, poor economic status and poverty, lack of knowledge and understanding of duties and responsibilities, lack of skill due to training and lack of appreciation over all

objectives and lack of trust on school principal were the most prevalent constraints that contributes for low level of KETB and PTA members of participation in the management of school. While the non-participatory leadership and negative attitude to understanding the skill of KETB and PTA members, failure to communicate with the community and lack of the training how to participate the community in school management are the major factors on the part of school principals.

5.3 Recommendations

On the basis of the finding and conclusions with regard to community participation in the management of secondary schools, the following possible solutions are recommended.

1. REB, WEO should increase the awareness about how to participate in management of the school and understanding of school principals and teachers by creating discussion forums, seminars, consultative meeting to make principals committed, open minded and supportive.
2. The REB and WEO should revise the methods and directions of community participation to be involved actively and effectively in school management.
3. School principals should practice democratic and participatory leadership style,
4. **Conducting periodic assessment and evaluation:-** the WEO should establish mechanisms by which it could follow up and evaluate the performance of PTA and KETB of schools by making it part of its super visionary activities. This helps them to identify their weakness and take the necessary measures to rectify them and further strengthen their strong side which ultimately leads to sustainability of the practices and the results achieved.
5. **Motivation:-** WEO and principals should develop ways of encouraging PTA and KETB members in their annual plans so that those who exhibited greater performance would be awarded at the end of the academic year during parents day at school level and during annual educational conference at woreda and /or zone levels as educational heroes. This helps to promote participation of community in school planning activities and finally enhancing healthy school – community relationship and develop sense of ownership of the community in the management of school .

6. Agreement should be reached to increase access, enrolment and retention of students to maintain school facilities, better learning environment, and overall quality and long term impact of education among stakeholders, i.e. REB, WEO and the community at large.
7. **Capacity building:-** it is strongly advisable that members of PTA and KETB should get adequate training that enables them to shoulder their duties and responsibilities effectively. Thus, the WEO and principals should continuously assess training needs, develop capacity building schemes and train PTA and KETB at least twice in a year to refresh and strengthen previous knowledge and add fresh insights that would contribute to filling the gaps which are observed in the course of their endeavors to discharge their duties.
8. **Create a program for sharing of experience:-** schools, WEO, zone education and REB should create a program for sharing of experience to KETB and PTA members, teachers and principals to give them the chance to learn from other schools, woreda or zone who have a better performance in the participation of the community in the management of school.
9. **Provide performance report (give feed back) to the community:-** community members have to receive feedback about their involvement and acknowledged for the efforts they made to help schooling so that they can realize and get lessons that they can make a better participation, this, in turn encourages the community and renews their motivation for further cooperation.

REFERENCES

- Aliison A. (1997). **Leadership and community participation** A:/ leadership, and coom. Part htm .
- Bagin.D. and Donald.R.(2001)(7th ed). **The School and Community Relations**, London; Alyn and Bacon
- Best.J.W and Kahn.V.J (2003) research in education (9thed). New Delhi: prentice of Hail of India PL.
- Bray. Mark. (2000). **Community Participations in Education;Dimensions**, Variations and Implications.Education for all 2000 Assessment, Thematic Studies.
- Catherine. J, Evangelina, O. and Amy.A. (2001). Emerging Issues in School, Family, and Community Connections.
- Central Zone Administration Bureau (2012) Education Statistics Annual Abstract.CZAB. Unpublished.
- Forojalla.S.B (1993).**Education planning for Development** London.: Macmillan press ltd.
- Fullan.M.G. (1991).**The new meaning of education change**. New York. Teachers college press.
- Jimma University (2008).**The School and Community Relationship** (course module) Jimma.
- Kandasamy.M and Lia.B (2004).**School principals: core Actor in educational improvement analysis is of Asian sever counties** Paris: UNESCO.
- Kaufman. R. (1995).**Mapping Educational success strategic thinking and planning for school Administrators**. New York: crowin press, Inc.
- Keeves, J.P. (1990). Educational Research, Methodology and Measurement: An International Handbook. New York: Pargamen Press PIC.
- King.C. (19996).**Working with people in community Action**. New York. Associt. Press
- Koul.L.(1996). Methods of educational research. New Delhi: Hindustan off set prentice Hail of India PLC.
- Lewy,A.(1977) Hand Book of curriculum Evaluation. Paris; Longman inc.
- Medgley.j. et al.(1986) **Community Participation, Social Development and the state**. New York Mthuen and Co. Ltd
- MOE(1 994). **The new Education Training policy** Addis Ababa. EMPDA.

- MOE (1998).**Education sector Development Program Implementation Manual**. Addis Abeba. EMPDA
- MEO (2002).**Educational Organization and management. Community Participation guide line**. Addis Ababa : EMPOA
- Mohanty,J(1990) **Educational Administration, Supervision and School Management**. New Delhi: Deep and Deep Pub.
- Nayaran.D. and Katrika, E. (1997).**Design of Social Funds: participation, Demand orientation, and Local organizational Capacity**. New York: The World Bank.
- Rietbergen-MC-Craken,J.and Deepa. N.(1996) **participation and social Assessment tools and Techniques**, The World Bank Washington DC, USA.
- Robines. R. (2003,26-27). **Educational Admonition a Management Approach** . New York: prentice have INC.
- Rose,P. (2003). **Community participation in school policy and practice** in Malawi Balancing local knowledge, national policy and Agency priorities Vol. 33.No.1 PP:47-67.
- Seyoum,T. and Ayalew, S(1989). Fundamentals of educational research: for students and beginning researchers, A.A.U. Unpublished.
- Shaeffer Sheldon (1994) (ed) **partnership and participation in Basic Education A series of Training Modules and case study Abstracts for Educational Planners and Mangers**. Paris UNESCO, International Institutes for Education planning
- Uemra, M(1999). **Community Participation in Education; What Do We Know? Prepared for Effective Schools and teachers and the knowledge management system**. Washington D.C; World Bank Human Development Network.
- UNESCO (1986).**Education Management at the local level**. Paris UNESCO Pub.
- UNESCO (2006).**Community participation** Paris LilleP.
- Walt.P. (2001).**Community support for basic education in sub-Saharan Africa, Africa Human development working Series**. The World Bank.
- Wasie Alimuz (2011). “Practices and Problems of Conducting Action Research by Government Secondary School Teachers in Central Zone of Tigray Region “A.A.u unpublished M.A Thesis.
- William, J.H.(1997) **“Improving School-Community Relations in the periphery”** in ADAM (2005) available at <https://bora.uib.no/bitstream/1958/1145/15/>

- World Bank (2001), **community support for basic educational in sub Saharan Africa.** Africa region Human Development working paper series. The World Bank. URL.:<http://www.worldbank.org/aft/hd/wps/percommunityfinal.pdf>.
- Yodit. B. Coumitz. A. Goike . C. and Robbins, T (2002) **stimulating community participation in primarily school perspective on Besoproject** in Bahir Dar, Ethiopian. WLTD.
- World Bank (1997). Primary Education in Individual New York A World Bank pub.
- MOE, (2004) Improving planning. A/ edu Guyana Schoolimp.htm
- UNESCO, (1985). Educational Management at the local Level Paris UNESCO
- Kennedy. M. (1979). Building Community Schools: An Analysis of Experiences. Paris UNESCO.
- Robore, R. (1985). Educational Administration: A Management Approach. New York Perintice Hall.Inc.
- Townsend, T. (1994) Effective Schooling for the community. London: MacKays of chatham PLC.
- Weihrica.H and Harold. K. (1993) . Management: A Global Perspective. New York McGtaw-Hill. Inc
- Stoll.L and Deap.F. (1996).Changing out schools. London open university press.
- Aspin wall.K and et.al.(1992). Managing evaluation in Education. A developmental Approach London: Mackyas of chathan PLC.
- Govinda.R. (1995).Status of Primary Education of the urban poor in Indian. Paris: UNESCO.
- Sarthory.F (1974). Educational Leadership Renewal and Planning New York Miss inf. Corp. Renewal and planning. New York: Missing corp.
- Ukeje.B. (1992). Educational Administration Abidjan: forth Dinesion pub co.ltd.

Appendix- 1
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
College of Education and Behavioral Studies
Department of Educational Planning and Management

Questionnaire for KETB members, PTA and teachers

Dear respondents,

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect primary data for the work of Master's thesis. Please cooperate in filling this questionnaire. The data will be used in the study that aims at identifying major problems and proposing some feasible solutions accordingly. In filling this questionnaire, therefore, your objective and honest information would be at a high value for the study.

This questionnaire is designed to survey **the status of community participation in the management of secondary schools**. It is a very confidential document and your candidness will improve the quality of the results.

General direction

- Don't write your name.
- Please follow the instruction when filling the questionnaire.
- Please make a tick mark () on all the items which apply to you.
- Please write short answers in the space provided for questions items that require your opinion or completion.

Part I: General information:

1.1. Name of school/office _____

1.2 what membership do you belong to?

A) KETB (board) () B) PTA (association) () C) teacher ()

1.3 Age (*in years*) A. 20-29 () B. 30-39 () C. 40-49 ()

D. 50 and above ()

1.4 Sex A) male () B) female ()

1.5 Marital status A) married () B) single () C) other ()

1.6 Your Occupation A) Merchant () B) Farmer () C) Teacher ()
D) Principal () E) other ()

1.7 Educational status

A) read& write () B) Grade 1-4 ()
C) Grade 5-8 () D) Grade 9-12 () E) Certificate ()
F) Diploma () G) Degree & above () H) other ()

Part II. Rating questions :Community participation in the management of schools

The following are some of the areas that the community is expected to participate in the management of schools that enable KETB and PTA discharge their responsibilities. Please provide appropriate answer by putting () mark in one of the five alternatives.

N O	<i>1. The extent to which the KETB and PTA members are participating in planning</i>	Level of participation				
		<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very low</i>
1.1	Formulating strategy plan and action plan of the school					
1.2	Securing school resources					
1.3	Planning the school program					
2	The extent in which the PTA and KETB participating in					
2.1	Decision making on budgeting					
2.2	Making decision on teachers' complaints					
2.3	Deciding students' and teachers' disciplinary problems					
3	Finance and resource management					
3.1	Mobilizing the community to contribute resource					
3.2	Budget preparation and approval					
3.3	Checking and monitoring school resource					
4	Implementation					
4.1	Follow up of the teaching learning process of the school					
4.2	Follow up of the school resources					
4.3	Monitoring the implementation of disciplinary decision					
5	Monitoring and Evaluation					
5.1	Preparing evaluating criteria to evaluate the school plan implementation					
5.2	Identifying strengths and weaknesses, and challenges encountered					
5.3	Monitoring the school resources and evaluating the implementation of the school plan					
5.4	Evaluating their own activities					

No	2. The extent of the community involvement in increasing enrollment and reducing the rate of dropouts.	Frequency			
		<i>Always</i>	<i>Most of the time</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>never</i>
2.1	How often KETB and PTA encourage parents to bring children to school?				
2.2	How often KETB and PTA create awareness to reduce dropout?				
2.3	How often KETB and PTA made effort to reduce dropout rate of students?				
2.4	How often KETB and PTA strive to get support from the community in enrolling students to school?				

Major factors that hinder KETB and PTA members from participating in the management of school.

The following are factors from the part of KETB and PTA members themselves that hinder them from participating in the management of the school, by taking the existing situation in to account, indicate your feeling by putting () mark.

No	3. Factors that hinder KETB and PTA members from participating in the management of school.	Degree of agreement				
		<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>undecided</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>
3.1	Distance of meeting place from their house					
3.2	Lack of time & poor economic status					
3.3	Lack of knowledge and understanding how to participate in school affairs					
3.4	Lack of training or insufficient training					
3.5	Lack of appreciation objectives of education					
3.6	Belief or trust on school principal					
3.7	Lack of commitment and willingness of the KETB and PTA					

1. Please list any other obstacles that hinder KETB and PTA from participating in the management of schools related to KETB and PTA members themselves.

The following are factors on the part of the school principal that hinder KETB and PTA members from participating in the management of schools. By taking the existing situation in to account indicate your feeling by putting () mark.

No	4. <i>Factors that hinder active participation</i>	Degree of agreement				
		<i>Strongly</i>	<i>agree</i>	<i>undecided</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly</i>
1	Non participatory leadership style of school principal					
2	Principals' negative attitude to KETB and PTA members					
3	Principals' undermine the skill of KETB and PTA members					
4	Principals failure to communicate with KETB and PTA members					
5	Principals lack of training how to participate the community					
6	Principals have time constraints					

2. Please state other problems related to school principal to participate the KETB and PTA members in the management of schools.

4. Efforts and support made by school principals to participate the community in school management. By taking the existing situation in to account indicate your feeling by putting () mark.

No	<i>Principals facilitation roles rated</i>	Level of participation				
		<i>Very High</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very low</i>
1	Efforts and support made by principals to participate KETB and PTA in planning					
2	Efforts and support made by principals to participate KETB and PTA in decision making					
3	Efforts and support made by principals to participate KETB and PTA in resource management					
4	Efforts and support made by principals to participate KETB and PTA in monitoring and evaluation					

3. Please list down other measures to be taken to improve the participation of the community (KETB or PTA).

4. If you have any comment on community participation in the management of school please write down. _____

Thank you once again for filling in the questionnaire

Appendix -2
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
College Of Education and Behavioral Studies
Department of Educational Planning and Management

Interviews guided questions for Woreda Education Experts

1. What are the areas that KETB and PTA members participate in school management in your woreda?
2. To what extent do KETB and PTA members contribute for reducing dropout of students and improving/increasing enrollment of students and improving/increasing enrollment in your woreda context?
3. To what extent do principals support KETB and PTA members to discharge their responsibilities?
4. How does training given to them so as to participate effectively in the management? what are the topics? By whom? For how long? Do you think it is enough?
5. How do you express the relationship between the school and community created by KETB and PTA members?
6. How often do the woreda assess problems and take timely measures to improve their performance?
7. How often do they conduct meetings with staff members and parents?
8. What do you think the major problems encountered by KETB and PTA members to carry out their responsibilities?

Appendix -3

አዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ

ፋካልቲ ትምህርትን ስነባህርን

ክፍሊ ትምህርቲ አመራርሐ ስራሕን ትምህርትን

ዕሑፋዊ መሕትት

ናይዚ መሕትት ዕላማ ሕ/ሰብ ኣብ ኣመራርሐ ስራሕ ትምህርቲ ዘለዎ ተሳትፎ ንምፍታሽ ዘክእል ኣበሬታ ንምእካብ ዘግለመ እዩ።

ዘኸበርኩም መለሰቲ እዚ መፅናዕቲት ክክለኛን ዘተኣማምን ክኸውን ዘክእል ንስኻትኩም ንሕድሕድ ሕቶ ብትህብዎም ላሽ ብምኻኑ ኣብ ሕድሕድ ክፋል ዘለዉ መምርሕታት ብትክረት ብምንባብ ንዝቀረበልኩም ሕቶታት ግቡእ ምላሽ ብምሃብ እጃምኩም ክተወፍዩ ብትሕትና እላቦ። በዚ መሰረት

- 1^ይ ኣብዚ መሕትት ኣብ ዘኸነ ቦታ ሽም ምፅሓፍ ኣየድልን
- 2^ይ ሕድሕድ ሕቶ ናይ ባዕልኻ ሓሳብን ብርኪ ስምምዕነትን ዝገልፅ እምበር ኣደ ቅኑዕ መልሲ ስለዘይበሉ ናይ ካሊእ ሰብ ምላሽ ብምቅዳስ ይኹን ተመያይጥካ ምስራሕ ዕላማ እቲ መሕትት ስለዘዛብዕ ናይ ዉልቅኹም መልሲ ጥራሕ ብምሃብ ንትገብርዎ ተሳትፎ ኣቀዲመ የመስግን

1. እዞም ዝሰዕቡ ዝርዝራት ንዕዎም ዝምልከት ኣበሬታ ኣብ ዝሓዘ () ምልክት ብምቅማጥ መልሶም ይሃቡ

ክፍሊ ኣደ ሓፈሻዊ ኣበሬታ

- 1.1 ሽም ቤት ትምህርቲ _____
- 1.2 ብኣባልነት ኣበይ ይሳተፍ? ሀ/ ቦ.ት. ስ. ጣ () ለ/ ወ. መ.ሕ () ሐ/ መምህር ()
- 1.3 ዕድመ ሀ/ 20-29 () ለ/ 30- 39 () ሐ/ 40 - 49 () መ/ 50 ልዕሊ.ኡጂ ()
- 1.4 ፆታ ሀ/ ተባዕታይ () ለ/ ኣነስታይ ()
- 1.5 ኩነታተ ኣዳር ሀ/ በዓል ኣዳር () ለ/ ኣዳር ዘይበሉ ()
- 1.6 ኩነታት ስራሕ ሀ/ ነጋዳይ () ለ/ ኣረስታይ () ሐ/ መምህር () መ/ ርእሰ መምህር () ሰ/ ካልእ ()
- 1.7 ደረጃ ትምህርቲ ዝምልከት ሀ/ ምንባብን ምፅሓፍን ይክእል (ትክእል) () ለ/ 1ይ- 4ይ () ሐ/ 5ይ- 8ይ () መ/ 9ይ-10ይ () ሪ/ ሰርቲፊኬት () ሰ. ዲፕሎማ () ሽ. ዲግሪን ል. ዕሊ.ኡጂ () ቀ/ ካሊእ ()

1. ካብዚ ንታሕቲ ንዝተዘርዘሩ ነጥብታት መልሶም ኣብ ወ.ሸጢ ሰደቃ () ምልክት የቅምጡ

ተቁ	ዝርዝር ነጥብታት	የመና ልዑል	ልዑል	ማእኸ ላይ	ትሑት	የመና ትሑት
1	ትልሚ					
1.1	ኣባላት ቦት-ስጣን ወመተሕን ኣብ ምስንዳእ ትልሚ ቤት-ትምህርቲ ናይ ምክታት ዘሎ ኩነታት					
1.2	ኣባላት ቦት-ስጣን ወመተሕን ሕ/ሰብ ቤት ት/ቲ ኣብ ምህናፅ ኮነ ኣብ ምስፍፋሕ ብገንዘብ ወይ ብዓይነት ወፊያ ዝገብረሉ መንገዲ ናይ ምትላም ኩነታት					
1.3	ኣባላት ቦት-ስጣን ወመተሕን ሕ/ሰብ ናይ ቤት ት/ቲ መርሃ ግብሪ ትምህርቲ ኣብ ምትላም ዘለዎም ተሳትፎ					
2	ኣወሃሃባ ውሳኔ					
2.1	ኣባላት ቦት-ስጣን ወመተሕን ኣብ ባጀት ቤት ትምህርቲ ኣወሃባ ውሳኔ ዝገብርዎ ተሳትፎ					
2.2	ኣባላት ቦት-ስጣን ወመተሕን ብወገን መምራን ንዝቀርቡ ቅሬታትን ጥርፃናትን ውሳኔ ናይ ምሃብ ተሳትፎ					
2.3	ኣባላት ቦት-ስጣን ወመተሕን ዲስፕሊን ተምሃሮን መምህራንን ተኸታቲሎም-በመረዳእታ ዘተደገፈ ውሳኔ ናይ ምሃብ ተሳትፎ					
3	ኣመራርሓ ፋይናንስን ሃፍቲ ቤት ትምህርትን					

3.1	አባላት ቦት-ስጣን ወመሕን እቲ ሕ/ሰብ ብገንዘብን ብጉልበትን ዓይነትን ንቤትምህርቲ ሓገዝን ንክገብር ናይ ምልዕዓል ተባብሖም					
3.2	አባላት ቦት-ስጣን ወመተሕን በጀት ቤት/ቲ ኣብ ምዕዳቅን ኣብ ስራሕ ንክውዕል ኣብ ብምውሳኔን ዝህልዎም ተሳትፎ።					
3.3	አባላት ቦት-ስጣን ወመተሕን ናይ ቤት/ቲ ሃፍትን ንብረትን ብትክክል ኣብ ስራሕ ምውዓሉ ኣብ ምርግጋዕን ምቁፅፃርን ዘለዎም ተሳትፎ።					
4	ትግበራ ትልሚ					
4.1	አባላት ቦት-ስጣን ወመተሕን ናይቲ ቤት/ቲ ከይዲ ምምሃር ምስትምሃር ናይ ምክትታል ተሳትፎኡም					
4.2	አባላት ቦት-ስጣን ወመተሕን ሃብቲ ቤተ/ቲ ኣብ ስራሕ ኣብ ስራሕ ምውዓሉ ምክትታል					
4.3	አባላት ቦት-ስጣን ወመሕን ወሳኒታት ዲ.ሲ.ፕ.ሊ.ንምትግባርም ምክትታል					
5	ገምጋምን ክትትልን					
5.1	አባላት ቦት-ስጣን ወመተሕን አፈ.ፃፅማ ተግባራት ቤት/ቲ ንምግምጋምን መገምገሚ ረቃሒታትን መሳርሕን ኣብ ምድላው ዘለዎም ተሳትፎ።					
5.2	አባላት ቦት-ስጣን ወመተሕን ናይቲ ቤት/ቲ ድኻምን ጥንኩርን ጎንታት ዘጋጠሙ ፀገማትን ፈ.ሊ.ኻ ኣብ ምውፃእ ዘለዎም ተሳትፎ።					
5.3	አባላት ቦት-ስጣን ወመተሕን ንብረት ቤት/ቲ ብግቡእ ንክትሓዝን ንቤት ት/ቲ ኣብ ስራሕ ንክውዕል ዝገብርዎ ክትትልን ትልሚ ቤት ትም/ቲ መሰረት ጌርካ ምግምጋምን					
5.4	አባላት ቦት-ስጣን ወመተሕን ስራሕቶም ናይ ምቁፅፃርን ምግምጋምን ልምዲ					

2 ተምሃሮ ናብ ቤት/ቲ ንክኣትውን ንክዮቃርፁን ዝተገበረ ፃዕሪ ዝምልከት ብ () ምልክት ይግበሩ

ተ ቁ	ተግባራት	ድግግሞሽ			
		ከ-ሉ ግዜ	መብዛሕትኡ ግዜ	ሓልሓሊፉ	ፈ.ፂ.መ.
2.1	ኣባላት ቦት-ስጣን ወመተሕን ወለዲ ደቆም ናብ ቤት/ቲ ክኸቱ ከመይ ዮበረታትዑ				
2.2	ኣባላት ቦት-ስጣን ወመተሕን ተምሃሮ ትምህርቶም ክዮቃርፁ ኣብ ውሽጢ እቲ ሕ/ሰብ ግንዛብ ኣብ ምፍጣር ዝገብርዎ ምንቅስቃስ ክንደየናይ እዩ				
2.3	ኣባላት ቦት-ስጣን ወመተሕን ምቁራፅ ተምሃሮ ንምንካይ ክንደየናይ ዝኣክል ፃዕሪ ይገብሩ				
2.4	ኣባላት ቦት-ስጣን ወመተሕን ካብቲ ሕ/ሰብ ደገፍ ንምርካብ ክንደየናይ ዝኣክል ፃዕሪ ይገብሩ				

3. አባላት ቦርድ-ትምህርትን ስልጠናን ጣቢያን ወለዲ መምህራን ሕብረትን አብ
 ቤት ትምህርቲ ከይሳተፉ ዝግግትዎም ማሕለካታት
 እዞም ዝስዕቡ ማሕለካታት አባላት ወመተሕን ቦትስጣን አብ አመራርሓ ቤት ትምህርቲ
 ከይሳተፉ ዝገብርዎም እዩ ተባሂሉ ይእመን ሕዚ ንዘሎ
 ኩነታት አብግምት ብምእታው ብ() ምልክት ይግበሩ

ተቁ	አባላት ወመተሕን ቦትስጣን ከይሳተፉ ዝገብርዎም ኩነታት	የመና ይስማ ማዕ	ይስ ማማ ዕ	ክውስን አይክእ ልን	አይስ ማማ ዕን	ፈ.ጊ.መ አይስማማዕ ንኻ
3.1	መስክቢ ቦታ ካብ ገዛኡም ርሑቅ ብምኻኑ እቲ ናይ ኣኼባ ጊዜ ምቕው ዘይምኻኑ					
3.2	ናይ ጊዜን ኢኮኖሚ ግብርና ግብርና					
3.3	እኹል ፍልጠት ዘይምህላውን ሕፃናት ግንዛቤን					
3.4	ስልጠና ዘይምርካብን እንተህለወውን እኹል ዘይምኻን					
3.5	ብሓፈሻ አብ ዕላማት ትምህርቲ ዘለዎም ግምት ትሑት ምኻን					
3.6	ኗይ ትምህርቲ ስራሕ ሓላፍነቱ ናይ ርእሰ መምህር ኢዩ ኢሎም ስለ ዝኸምኑን አብ ልዕሊ እቲ ርእሰ መምህር ዕኩስ እምነት ስለ ዘለዎም					
3.7	አባላት ወመተሕን ቦትስጣን ሓደ ቃል ዘይምኻኖምን ሰናይ ድሌት ዘይምህላዎም					

1. አባላት ወመተሕን ቦትስጣን አብ አመራርሓ ስራሕ ቤት ትምህርቲ ከይሳተፉ ዝገብርዎም አብ ላዕሊ ዘይተጠቀሱ ማሕለካታት እንተህሊዩም ኣብዚ ክፍቲ ቦታ ይጥቀሱልና _____

2. እዞም ስዲቦም ዝተጠቀሱ ፀገማት ኣባላት ወመተሕን ቦትስጣን ኣብ ኣመራርሓ ስራሕ ቤተትምህርቲ ከይሳተፉ ምክንያት ዝኮኑ ርእሰ መምህራን ክኮኑ ስለዝክእሉ ሕዚ ዘሎ ኩነታት ኣብግምት ቦምኣታው ምርጫኦም ብ ምልክት የርእዩ

ተቁ	ኣባላት ወመተሕን ቦትስጣን ኣብ ኣመራርሓ ስራሕ ቤተትምህርቲ ከይሳተፉ ብወገን ርእሳን መምህራን ዘጋጠሙ ፀገማት	የመና ይስማማዕ	ይስማ ማዕ	ክውስን ኣይክእልን	ኣይስማ ማዕን	ፈ.ጊ.መ ኣይስማ ማዕንን
4.1	ናይ ርእሰ መምህራን ኣሳታፋይ ዘይኮነ ኣመራርሓ ምክታል					
4.2	ርእሰ መምህራን ኣብ ልዕሊ ኣባላት ወመተሕን ቦትስጣን ዘለዎም ኣሉታዊ ኣረኣኢያ					
4.3	ርእሰ መምህራን ኣባላት ወመተሕን ቦትስጣን ዘለዎም ዓቕምን ክእለትን ኣናኢስካ ምርኣይ					
4.4	ርእሰ መምህራን ነቲ ሕብረተሰብ ከመይ ከሳትፍዎ ከምዘለዎም ስልጠና ዘይወሰዱ ምካናምን ወይ ክእለት ስለ ዘይብሉምን					
4.5	ርእሰ መምህራን ምስ ኣባላት ወመተሕን ቦትስጣን ናይ ምርጫ ፀገም					
4.6	ርእሰ መምህራን ሕፅረት ግዜ ስለ ዘሉዎም					

2. በዜና እዞም አብ ላዕሊ ዝተጠቀሱ ዕንቅፋታት ካልዕ ርእሰመምህራን ሕብረተሰብ

ዘይምስታፍ ማሕለካ ዝኸውን እንተሃልዩ ይጥቀሱልና

ተቁ	ርእሰመምህራን ኣባላት ቦትሰጣን ወመተሕን ኣብዞም ዝስዕቡ ብፅሒት ስራሕ ንክሳተፉ ዝገብርዎ ከይዲ ፃዕርን ደገፍን	የመና	ልዑል	ማክሻላ	ትሑት	የመና
		ልዑል	ል	ይ	ት	ትሑት
5.1	ኣብ ምድላው ትልሚ					
5.2	ኣብ ምምሕዳር ሃፍትን ፋይናንስን ቤት ትምህርቲ					
5.3	ኣብ ክትትልን ገምጋምን					
5.4	ትልሚ ኣብ ምትግባር					

3. ኣብ ኣመራርሓ ስራሕ ትምህርቲ ተሳትፎ ኣባላት ወመተሕን ቦትሰጣን ንምሕያል

ክውሰዱ ዝግበኡም መመሓየሺ ሓሳባት ይዘርዝሩ-----

4. ኣብ ስራሕ ኣመራርሓ ቤት ትምህርቲ ሕብረተሰብ ዘለዎ ተሳትፎ ኣመልኪቶም ዝህብዎ ሪኪቶ እንተሃልዩዎም ይፅሓፍልና

ቃላዊ መሕትት ንሱብ ሞያታት ወረዳቤት ፅሕፈት ትምህርት

1. ኣባላት ወመተሕን ቦትስጣን ኣብ ስራሕ ኣመራርሓ ትምህርቲ ኣብ ምንታይ ኣብ

ምንታይ ይሳተፉ?

2. ኣባላት ወመተሕን ቦትስጣን ተምሃሮ ናብ ቤት-ትምህርቲ ክከቱን ክደቃርፁን

ዝግበር ደገፍ እንታይ ይመስል?

3. ርእሰ መምህራን ኣባላት ወመተሕን ቦትስጣን ሓላፍነቶም ክዋፅኡ ክንደይ

ዝኣክል ይድግፍዎም?

4. ስልጠና ንወመተሕን ቦትስጣን ይወሃብ ዶ ክንደይ ዝኣክል እዩ እኩል ዶ ይብሉ?

5. ቤት ትምህርቲን ሕብረተሰብን ንምርካብ ግደ ወመተሕን ቦትስጣን

ዝሰርሕዎ ስራሕ ክመይ ይፀልዉዎ?

6. ወመተሕን ቦትስጣን ናይ ወለዲ መምህራን ጉባኤ ክንደይ ግዜ ኣብ ዓመት ይገብሩ?

7. ወመተሕን ቦትስጣን ሓላፍነቶም ክይዋፅኡ ዝክክልዎም ነገራት እንታይ እዮም?

8. ሕብረተሰብ ኣብ ቤት-ትምህርቲ ንምስታፍ እንታይ መፍትሒ

ሓሳባት ኣለዉ ትብሉ?

Declaration

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

Name: Habteslassie Alemayehu

Signature: _____

Date: _____

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

Name: Zenebe Baraki (PhD)

Signature: _____

Date: _____