

**SCHOOL COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS IN GOVERNMENT
SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF HORO GUDURU WOLLEGA ZONE**

BY: MIRESSA TOLU OLANA



ADVISOR: ABEBE HUNDE (ASS. PROF.)

COADVISOR: ATO JAFAR LOLA

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL
PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND
BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCE, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR MASTER OF ARTS DEGREE IN SCHOOL
LEADERSHIP**

JUNE, 2016

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I express my deepest appreciation to my advisor Abebe Hunde (Assi. prof) and Co Advisor Ato Jaffar Lola for their constructive comments, suggestions, and professional advice that guided this thesis to its completion.

I need to extend my sincere gratitude and appreciation to Teshalew Tefera (PhD candidate) for his limitless support in conducting this research.

My sincere gratitude also goes to my respondents including principals, school supervisors, teachers and PTA members of the schools under the study for their commitment and willingness to respond and participate in the study.

Finally, I would like to express my thanks to my wife Saktu Kebede for her moral and emotional support besides typing the thesis.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Table of Contents	ii
List of Tables.....	iv
Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	v
Abstract	vi
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background of The Study.....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	3
1.3 Objectives of the Study.....	4
1.4 Significance of the Study.....	5
1.5 Delimitation of the Study.....	5
1.6 Limitation of the Study.....	5
1.7 Organization of the Study.....	6
1.8 Definition of Key Terms.....	6
CHAPTER TWO.....	7
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	7
2.1 Introduction.....	7
2.2 Historical Events of School Community Relationship.....	7
2.3 Theoretical Framework	8
2.4 The Need for School Community Relationship.....	9
2.5 Areas of School Community Relationship.....	16
2.6. Areas of School Involvement in Community Affairs.....	18
2.7 Roles of Parents, Teachers and Administrators in School Community Relationships.....	19
2.8 Challenges of School Community Relationships	23
2.9 Strategies/Approaches of School Community Relationships.....	26
CHAPTER THREE.....	31
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	31

3.1 Design of the Study.....	31
3.2 The Research Method.....	31
3.3 Sources of Data.....	31
3.4 Description of Study Area.....	31
3.5 Population of the Study.....	31
3.6 Sample and Sampling Techniques.....	32
3.7 Instruments of Data Collection.....	33
3.8 Procedure of Data Collection.....	34
3.9 Techniques of Data Analysis.....	34
3.10 Ethical Consideration.....	34
CHAPTER FOUR.....	35
DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS.....	35
4.1 Introduction.....	35
4.2 Respondents Characteristics.....	35
4.3 Data Presentation and Analysis.....	37
CHAPTER FIVE.....	61
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	61
5.1 Introduction.....	61
5.2 Summary of Major Findings.....	61
5.3 Conclusions.....	63
5.4 Recommendations.....	64
References	
Appendix I	
Appendix II	

List of Tables

Table 1 Sample Size of the Study.....	32
Table 2 Respondents Characteristics.....	35
Table 3.1 Rationale/Importance of School Community Relationships Related to Development and Improvement.....	38
Table 3.2 Rationales/Importance of School Community Relationship Related to Provision..	42
Table 3.3 Rationale/Importance of School Community Relationship Related to Solving and Monitoring.....	44
Table 3.4 Rationale/Importance of School Community Relationship Related to Information Sharing.....	45
Table 4 Areas of Community Involvement in School Issues.....	46
Table 5 Areas of School Involvement in Community Affairs.....	49
Table 6 Factors Hindering Effective School Community Relationship.....	51
Table 7 Strategies of Maintaining School Community Relationships.....	56

Acronyms and Abbreviations

BBO : Biiroo Barmoota Oromiyaa

ESDP IV : Education Sector Development Program IV

ETP: Education and Training Policy

FDRE: Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia

IDRA: Intercultural Development Research Association

MoE : Ministry of Education

NEA; National Education Association

OECD : Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development

PTA: Parent Teacher Associations

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to assess school community relationships in Horo Guduru Walaga Zone government Secondary Schools. The research design employed in this study was descriptive survey, and the data gathering instruments used were questionnaires, interview and document analysis. The samples taken for this investigation were 8 secondary schools of which 8 principals, 12 vice principals, 5 school supervisors, 158 teachers and 16 PTA members. Sample teachers were selected using simple random sampling (lottery method) whereas principals, vice principals, school supervisors and PTA members were selected purposively. The data obtained were analyzed by descriptive and inferential statistical analysis such as, percentage, mean score, independent sample t – test and chi – square. Among the findings of the study, Horo Guduru Wollega Zone community involvement in resource mobilization is low. Lack of interest of administrators, wrong attitude of communities, lack of communities knowledge , lack of professional administrators, resistance of schools, resistance of communities, distance from home to school, lack of effective communication, lack of money to fund , lack of devotion among teachers are the main factors that hindered school community relationship. Among the conclusions, school community relationships in government secondary schools of Horo Gududru Wollega Zone is low because communities have resistance up on visiting schools and solving school problem. The study recommended that Education offices of Horro Guduru Wollega zone should work actively to develop school community relationships, School administrators together with teachers should devote their time and launch strong relationships by continuous awareness creations and effective communications to the communities.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Education has a vital role to play in the life of individual as well as the society. Scholars affirmed that education is a key to develop the economic, social, scientific and political institution of nation states (Lockheed and Verspoor, 1991). It helps any country in creating competent citizens, which can cope up with the challenges and can easily adapt to changing world and technological condition to the global economy. It also enables people to become more productive of a society in relation to the alteration of literacy and alleviation of poverty.

Even though knowledge is obtained from society outside the school organization, the most common and formal one is obtained in school through education. As cited in MoE (2013), John Dewey defined school as it is an institutions devised by civilized man for the purpose of aiding in the preparation of young for well adjusted and efficient member of the society. He also explains that school is the place where a definite curriculum is thought to children during the definite duration of time by definite teacher (MoE, 2013).

Schools as social organization should make an effective interrelationship with its relevant communities. Because school is the only agency through which cooperation of different agencies such as the family, the community and the state may be successfully achieved (T. U. Sa'ad & A. M. Sadiq, 2014). Thus, it is evident that schools and communities should work closely with each other to meet their mutual goals, for the reason that success or failure of the school reflects the success or failure of the community. Bakwai, (2013) contend that what happens in a school affects the community, and what happens in community affects the schools.

School is characterized by its uniqueness, closeness to the community and pointing directly towards the people (Ayalew, 1991). This shows that School community interdependence is unbreakable. There is a reciprocal relationship. The two works for one another and the two have direct impact on one another. Bakwai, (2013) also viewed that school community relationship is a two-way symbiotic arrangement through which the school and community cooperate with each other for realization of goals of the community and vice versa.

Intimate relations between the schools and communities are a pre-requisite for achieving a meaningful educational objective in our community and nation at large (Gital, 2009). It is

through the relationship of the school and the community that the school execute its activities and achieve its goals. Consequently as T.U.Sa'ad &A.M.Sadiq(2014) if schools are expected to be successful in their primary mission of educating community's children, they need to know a great deal about the community and the families from which the children come This means that school community relationship is the sole for the development of the school because schools cannot exist in isolation of the community in which they find themselves (Bakwai. 2013).

Mitrofanova, (2014) and Bibire, (2014) explain that schools and communities should work closely with each other to meet their mutual goals in provision and management of education as well as teaching learning and enforcement of processes. It is through intimate relationships that both the school and the community contribute directly to the strengthening and development of each other.

Strong relationships based upon trust and cooperation amongst teachers, principals, parents, and community residents can and do play an important role in improving schools and student performance. When parents and community members are engaged in the life of the school, the resources available for teaching and the learning environment expand. When teachers and principals build trust with each other and with parents, they can develop a common vision for school reform and work together to implement necessary changes in the school. And, an intersecting set of relationships among adults (parents, teachers, service providers) can provide a holistic environment in which children are raised with a unified set of expectations and behaviours (D. Chrzanowski, S. Rans & R. Thompson, 2006).

The success or failure of schools particularly secondary schools depends to a larger extent on the level of relationship the schools maintain with their neighbouring communities as it is at the age of adolescence of pupils (Baker, 1997). The students of this level may need parental regular follow up as they are departed from their parents for secondary school learning opportunity and exercise their new life. In addition, the community's values, ideas, norms, beliefs and expectations are to be more perpetuated at secondary school level. Therefore, based on this background this study intends to assess whether school community relationship in secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega zone of Oromia Reginal state exist or not.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

After the World Conference on Education for All, assembled in Jomiten, Thailand in 1990, an increasing number of countries have attempted to reach the goal of providing education for all. However, governments have found themselves incompetent to do so because of lack of resources and capacities. Learning materials as well as human resources are limited everywhere, particularly in developing countries (Uemura, 1999). As a result government alone cannot cover all educational deliveries, equipment and buildings. Hence school community relationship is an important choice for the provision of education for the achievements of the goals.

In relation to this, Ethiopia's Education Training policy (ETP) calls for greater community engagement in participation, in school operations and school management. As Swift-Morgan (2006), the 1994 Transitional Government of Ethiopia stated: Schools will be strongly linked with the community, which will take responsibility in its well-being and upkeep. Schools will be made to be responsive to the local needs and requirements and shall act as centers for all educational activities of the community. The management of each school will be democratized and run with the participation of the community, the teachers, the students and the relevant government institutions.

The ETP declares that, school works for the community and the community will share some responsibilities among activities of the school. The question is that, can community discharge his responsibilities of school as owner? Swift-Morgan's, (2006) qualitative study on the form and scope of community involvement found that in rural Ethiopia, this range is complex, but a large portion of what is characterized as community participation is monetary contributions rather than involvement in decision making or teaching and learning.

As far as the researcher's experience is concerned, currently most pupil's parent in some secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega zone lack the execution of the roles and responsibilities given to them. For example, they couldn't come to school when they are invited to school meetings and school festivals. Most of them need not involve in the areas of fund-raising, provision of facilities, equipments, buildings, infrastructure, students disciplinary problems, delivery of the lesson and so on.

Parents of the pupil expect that every school activity should be operated by the government particularly the school principals and teachers. This was seen as a great problem and it is assumed to be an issue of concern because it is only through the help of community that secondary schools in Horo Guduru Wollega Zone could carry its mission. Consequently, this study was focused on school community relationship in government secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone and was intended to answer the following questions:

1. What are the importances of school community relationship in government secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone?
2. What are the areas of school community relationship in government secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone?
3. What are the challenges that hinder school community relationship in government secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone?
4. What are the strategies/approaches to be used for school community relationships in government secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

1.3.1 General Objective

The general objective of this study is to assess school community relationship in government secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone

1.3.2 The specific objectives

Specifically the objectives of this research are:

1. To identify the importance of school community relationship in government secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega zone
2. To identify the areas of school community relationship in government secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone.
3. To identify the challenges that hinder school community relationship in government secondary schools of Horor Guduru Wollega Zone.
4. To assess the strategies used for school community relationship in government secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone.

1.4 Significance of the Study

The finding of this research is expected to have an importance for:

- Educational administrators to understand the fact that school community relationship is one aspect of school administration that cannot be neglected from education world
- School principals in identifying areas to be given priority when dealing with the issues of school-community relationship and to challenge the challenges of school community relationship.
- Teachers to appreciate the fact that members of the community are the integral part of the school and the school depends heavily on the community for its survival
- Researchers by providing more information that will enhance effective school community relationship for further studies and
- Individual members of the community as it was assumed to create awareness among administrators, stakeholders, business organizations and community members so as to realize that education of children is a joint effort by all.

1.5 Delimitation of the Study

This study is focused on assessment of school community relationship in government secondary schools (grade 9-10) of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone. In doing this, the study focused only on identifying the importance of school community relationships, areas of school community relationships, challenges hindering school community relationships and strategies employed in school community relationship, in secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone. It is focused on sampled population of secondary schools' of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone only.

Thus, this study is delimited to government secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega zone of Oromia Regional State to enable the researcher minimize the cost of covering a larger area as an individual researcher.

1.6 Limitation of the Study

The researcher planned 8 school supervisors and gathered data from only 5 supervisors. Some teacher respondents also made reluctance to fill the questionnaire and some PTA members are busy to give response to the researcher. This may create slight difference on the finding.

On the other hand financial constraint is also another limitation as the schools selected by simple random sampling is from 5 weredas and one zonal town administrations. The schools are too scattered and made financial constraint for individual researcher. Despite these problems, the study was completed as it was planned.

1.7 Organization of the Study

The study is divided into five chapters. The first chapter includes background of the study, statement of the problems, objectives, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study and definition of key terms. The second chapter includes review of related literatures, the third chapter presents research design and methodology, the fourth chapter includes analysis and interpretations and the fifth chapter includes conclusions and recommendations.

1.8 Definition of Key Terms

Community: a group of people (teachers, directors, parents, Parent Teacher Association, school administrators etc) who share school responsibilities.

School community relationship: is the way through which the school and the community are interconnected for mutual benefits

Community involvement – is development strategy in which the beneficiaries are active participants at all stages of the development and execution of a project (ESDP IV).

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents different literatures and studies related to school community relationship. The review focused on: historical events, theoretical framework, the need for school community relationship, areas of school community relationship, challenges of school community relationship and strategies for school community relationship

2.2 Historical Events of School Community Relationships

School is not independent entity; it is not isolated from community. Historically school community relationships in the 1950s included participation in parent conferences, monitoring of homework, signing of report cards, attending PTA meetings, and fundraising events. In the 1960s educators and policy makers focused on the relationships through parental involvement as a way to improve educational success for the poor and underachieving students. This led to the development of a variety of models and strategies to promote such parental involvement (Milbrey & Shields, 1987).

In 1965, Haiman began experimenting with parent involvement program strategies. He designed and wrote the Parental Involvement Performance Standards for the National Head Start and this was used as a consultant to Head Start throughout the nation (Haiman, 1965). In 1968 he spoke on the relevance of curriculum, administration and community involvement (Chicago Tribune, 1968). By 1979, many schools had started incorporating parental involvement into their school programs. Parental involvement in special education programs also increased (Los Angeles Times, 1979).

1990s, studies demonstrated that parental involvement could predict academic achievement. Parental involvement was considered as an integral part of the school curriculum. The level of parental involvement was increased in most of the school districts across the nation (USA Today, 1990).

According to the U.S. Department of Education (1997) a sustained mutual collaboration, support, and participation of school staff and families are required for a successful school-family relationships and children's learning. Although the success of school family relationship is difficult to reach, it is important to note that the benefits to children and their

educational success depends on hard work required to sustain the school-family partnerships (Epstein, Coates, Salinas, Sanders, & Simon, 1997).

2.3 Theoretical Framework

School community relationship is the way through which the school and the community are interconnected for mutual benefits. It is a give and take relationship between school and community. Ajayi, Hastrup & Arogundade, (2009) pointed out that, the school and the community are interdependent and interrelated and for the relationship between them to be meaningful, worthwhile and productive, they must be willing to assist each other to achieve their respective goals in atmosphere of love, mutual trust and cooperation.

The theory which is most relevant in the study of relationships between school and community is Chester Barnard Co-operative theory (Bakwai, (2013). This theory defines organization as a system of co-operation whereby people work together for a common goal. And school cannot succeed without the co-operation of several individuals within the community. School community relationship tries to create mutual co-operation between school and community. It brings people and school together. School community relationship therefore is co-operative in nature and man oriented.

In relation to this, literature revealed many theories and models of community participation that contributes on the relationship between community involvement and increased school efficacy and student success. Among the Model Montemayor, (2000), offer dimensions around which a community can positively impact its schools: parents as teachers, as resources, as decision makers, and ultimately leaders and trainers of other parents.

Williams (1994) also argues that there are three models of Education and Community:

(a) Traditional Community-Based Education Model in which communities provide new generations of young people with the education necessary for transmitting local norms and economic skills. In this model, education is deeply embedded in local social relations, and school and community are closely linked. The government, being of little use in meeting the specialized training needs of industrialized economies, plays a minor role, providing little basis for political integration at the national level. (b) Government Provided Education model, in which governments have assumed responsibility for providing and regulating education. The content of education has been largely standardized within and across countries, and governments have diminished the role of the community. However, lack of

resources and management incapability has proven that governments cannot provide the community with adequate educational delivery, fully-equipped school buildings, and a full range of grades, teachers and instructional materials and (c) Collaborative Model in which community plays a supportive role in government provision of education. This model is emerged because of the government by itself cannot provide the community with adequate educational delivery, fully-equipped school buildings and so on.

2.4 The Need for School Community Relationship

The study investigated in Nigeria on the relevance of school community relationship on the development of primary education in Azare Metropolis of Bauchi State revealed that, school community relationship is very relevant in the development of primary education in Azare metropolis due to the fact that community provides land for building schools, funds, facilities, supervise what is going on in school, build additional classrooms and help in the maintenance of indiscipline. It was also found out that the school on the other hand, has resources which it uses to improve school community relationship and ultimately develops education which, include classrooms, play grounds, halls, surroundings, information dissemination to community and making itself available for consultations (Sa'ad & Sadiq, 2014). Thus school community relationship is a two-way symbiotic arrangement through which the school and the community co-operate with each other for the realization of goals of the community and vice versa.

School as a training centre helps develop pupils into efficient social being and to train them to further educate the backward and un progressive members of the society. School interacts with people of the community and is linked with the larger society. The school is a special environment where a certain quality of life types of activities and occupations are provided with the object of securing child's development along desirable lines (Mishra, 2007).

According to Fiore (2006), when families, schools and community institutions (e.g. local business, community colleges and health agencies) collectively agree upon their goals and decide how to reach them, everyone benefits. He identifies the following as the importance/need of school community relationship:

1. Schools enjoy the informed support of families and community members. Families experience a lot of opportunities to contribute to their children's education, and

communities look forward to educated, responsible workforce. Benefits increase to the staff of schools and community agencies as well: they can observe boosts in morale, heightened engagement in their work, and a feeling that their work will net results.

2. Communities can provide schools with a context and environment that can either complement and reinforce the values, culture, and learning the school provide for their students or stops everything the school strive to accomplish.
3. Communities can furnish schools and students in them with crucial financial support system as well as the social and cultural values necessary for success and survival in contemporary society.
4. Communities have the potential to extend a variety of opportunities to students and to their families-social, cultural and vocational.
5. Schools, in turn, offer communities a focal point of educational services for children. Schools have the potential to build well-educated citizens ready to take on responsibilities as contributing community members.
6. By working together, schools, families, and communities can prepare for a more promising future.

The Michigan State University (2004) in its Best Practice Briefs stated that the importance of parents' involvement in school areas as follows:

1. When parents are enabled to become effective partners in their child's education, performance in schools where children are failing improves dramatically.
2. Schools that work well with families, where parents are involved: Outperform identical programs without parent and family involvement have improved teachers' morale and higher rating of teachers by parents and Have more support from families and a better reputation in the community.
3. When parents are involved, students achieve more, regardless of socio-economic status, ethnical/racial background or the parents' education level; Exhibit more positive attitudes as well as decreased violence and antisocial behaviour.
4. Parental involvement early in the educational process results in more powerful effects.
5. Different types of parent/family involvement produce different gains: When parents collaborate with the teacher, educators hold higher expectations of students and higher opinions of the parents; Children from diverse cultural backgrounds tend to do better

because parents and professionals are bridging the gap between the culture at home and the learning institution.

6. When parents are involved in full partnerships (i.e. decision making), student achievement for disadvantaged children not only improves, it can reach levels that are standard for middle-class children; the children who are farthest behind make the greatest gains.

The primary goal of a school is provision of quality education for the parent's child. Such quality education cannot be afforded in the absence of school community relationships. According to Idaho Falls School District (1991) school community relation helps to improve the quality of education for all children. The school noted the following as some of the importance of school community relationship:

1. It helps parents and other citizens recognize their responsibility for the quality of education provided by their schools.
2. It fosters community understanding of the need for constructive change and solicit community advice on how to achieve stated school goals.
3. It involves community members in the work of the schools and the solving of school problems.
4. It helps identifies non-parent groups such as senior citizens and promote the involvement of these persons in school activities and programs;.
5. It helps earn the good will, respect and confidence of the community with regard to school staff and services.
6. It promotes a genuine spirit of cooperation between the school and the community and sets up channels of sharing the leadership in improving community life.
7. It helps develop community understanding of all aspects of school operation; it determines community attitudes towards issues in school; it helps discover the community aspirations for the education of their children.
8. It helps secure adequate financial support for a sound school programs.

To sum up extensive literature research has resulted in identifying the following rationales that explain the importance of community participation in education (Uemura, 1999).

1. Maximizing Limited Resources

Although some communities have historically been involved in their children's education, it hasn't been fully recognized that communities themselves have resources to contribute to

education, and they can be resources by providing local knowledge for their children. They are usually concerned about their children's education, and often are willing to provide assistance that can improve the educational delivery. In places where teacher absenteeism and poor performance are critical issues, parents can be part of the system of monitoring and supervising teachers, ensuring that teachers arrive at classrooms on time and perform effectively in the classrooms (Uemura, 1999).

Parents and communities are powerful resources to be utilized not only in contributing to the improvement of educational delivery but also in becoming the core agent of the education delivery. In Madagascar, where Government investments at the primary level have been extremely low, parents and communities contribute money, labor and materials (World Bank 1995b). The absence of government support leaves the school infrastructure, equipment, and pupil supplies to the parents and the community. As a result, community and parents are in the center in keeping the schools going (World Bank 1995b).

2. Developing Relevant Curriculum and Learning Materials

Communities' and parents' involvement helps achieve curriculums and learning materials that reflect children's everyday lives in society. When children use textbooks and other materials that illustrate their own lives in their community, they can easily associate what they are learning with what they have already known. Best example related to this argument is that in Papua New Guinea, community schools set the goal to link the culture of the pupils' home community with the culture of the school. Accordingly, the schools consider the community as the center of learning as well as the focus of education. As a result, the community schools have become central to the national curriculum development which enables community life, such as festivals, customs, musical instruments, and local business activities, to be reflected in the curriculum (Goldring, 1994).

3. Identifying and Addressing Problems

Communities can help identify and address factors that contribute to educational problems, such as low participation and poor academic performance.

4. Promoting Girls' Education

Community participation can contribute to promoting girls' education. Through participating in school activities and frequently communicating with teachers, parents and communities can learn that girls' education contributes to the improvement of various aspects of their lives, such as increased economic productivity, improved family health and nutrition, reduced fertility rates, and reduced child mortality rates (UNICEF, 1992).

5. Creating and Nourishing Community-School Partnerships

There are various ways to bring parents and community members closer to schools which they serve, including: (a) minimizing discontinuities between schools and communities, and between schools and families; (b) minimizing conflicts between schools and communities, schools and families, teachers and parents, and what is taught in school and what is taught at home; (c) making easy transition of pupils going from home to school; (d) preparing pupils to engage in learning experiences; and (e) minimizing cultural shock of new entrants to schooling (Carino and Valismo, 1994).

6. Realizing Democracy

Where schools are perceived as authoritarian institutions, parents and community members do not feel welcomed to participate in their children's education. They are not capable of taking any responsibility in school issues and tend to feel that education is something that should be taken care of by educational professionals at schools. Involving communities in schools is a way of reaching democracy through identifying and addressing inequities embedded in institutions and society as a whole. In addition, it is a strategy to create an environment in which parents feel comfortable participating in schools (Uemura, 1999).

7. Increasing Accountability

Parental involvement in education, particularly in school governance, is seen as a means of making schools more accountable to the society which funds them. The notion of parental involvement for accountability derives from a more market-oriented concept in which school-family relationships are viewed rather like business partnership, through which the two parties receive mutual and complementary benefits which enable them to operate more effectively (OECD, 1997).

8. Ensuring Sustainability

One of the major factors to ensure sustainability of programs is the availability of funds, whether from governments, private institutions, or donor organizations. In this regard, community participation in education cannot ensure the sustainability of schools by itself since communities oftentimes have to rely on external funding to keep the program sustained (Lovell, 1992).

9. Improving Home Environment

Community participation can contribute to preparing and improving home environment, by encouraging parents to understand about the benefits of their children's schooling. A World Bank study (1997) which analyzed primary education in India discovered that families aware of the importance of education can contribute much to their children's learning achievement,

even in disadvantaged districts. It also shows that students from families that encouraged children's schooling, by allocating time at home for study, encouraging reading, and supporting their children's educational aspirations, scored significantly higher on tests of learning achievement.

Furthermore, families who are involved in schools not only have a better understanding about education but also become more willing to cooperate with schools in attempts to improve children's learning. In addition, parents can help their children with homework, and make sure that children are physically ready to learn at schools. From their extensive literature research, Heneveld and Craig (1996) argue that the parent and the community are one of the key factors to determine school effectiveness because they can prepare children's readiness to come to school and their cognitive development, by ensuring children's well-balanced nutrition and health.

Generally, intimate school community relationship creates a healthy Community participation which can contribute to education delivery through various channels. The following is a list of ways through which communities can contribute to the education delivery (Uemura, 1999).

1. advocating enrolment and education benefits;
2. boosting morale of school staff;
3. raising money for schools;
4. ensuring students' regular attendance and completion;
5. constructing, repairing, and improving school facilities;
6. contributing in labour, materials, land, and funds;
7. recruiting and supporting teachers;
8. making decisions about school locations and schedules;
9. monitoring and following up on teacher attendance and performance;
10. forming village education committees to manage schools;
11. actively attending school meetings to learn about children's learning progress and classroom behaviour;
12. providing skill instruction and local culture information;
13. helping children with studying;
14. garnering more resources from and solving problems through the education bureaucracy;
15. advocating and promoting girls' education;

16. providing security for teachers by preparing adequate housing for them;
17. scheduling school calendars;
18. handling the budget to operate schools;
19. identifying factors contributing to educational problems (low enrolment, and high repetition and dropout); and
20. Preparing children's readiness for schooling by providing them with adequate nutrition and stimuli for their cognitive development.

In relation to this school community relationship is important for teachers in deferent aspects. For instance, communities can provide, or construct, housing for teachers who are from outside of the community. In rural areas, lack of qualified teachers is critical, and preparing a safe environment and housing is necessary to attract teachers, particularly female teachers, who otherwise tend to stay in or go to urban areas (Uemura, 1999).

Teachers can benefit from communities' active participation in their children's schools. For example, community members themselves can be a rich resource to support teachers' practice in classrooms by facilitating children's learning. Respected community members can become knowledgeable lectures who can come to the classrooms, and teach students issues faced by the community.

Also, community members can support teachers by contributing their skill to speak the local language when the majority of students don't understand the teacher's language of instruction. They can attend classrooms as interpreters who not only translate languages but also help teachers as well as students by bridging the gap that exists between cultural values of teachers and those of students. Furthermore, parents and community members can contribute to teachers' teaching materials by providing them with knowledge and materials that are locally sensitive and more familiar to children.

School community relationships can also be a powerful incentive for teachers. Teachers' absenteeism and lack of punctuality to show up in classrooms on time are serious problems in many places. Among many other reasons, lack of monitoring system is one of the critical factors contributing to these problems. When teachers are monitored and supervised for their attendance and performance by communities, they tend to be more aware of what they do.

Feedback from parents and the community about their teaching performance can be a strong tool to motivate teachers, if schools are also collaborative.

2.5 Areas of School Community Relationship

The areas of school community relationship imply those areas where school and community can partner with each other for mutual benefits. Partnering according to Michigan State University (1991) requires give and-take conversation, goal setting for future, and regular follow-up interaction. School community partnership should be considered as connections between school and community resources. Bakwai (2013) outlined very important areas where the community had identified itself in the development of the school to include: donation of land for school building, funding of school activities and projects, and providing accommodation to teachers.

Areas of community involvement in education for the realization of school community relationship are illustrated in various forms as: (a) in research and data collection; (b) in dialogue with policymakers; (c) in school management; (d) in curriculum design; (e) in development of learning materials; and (f) in school construction (Colletta and Perkins, 1995).

In relation to this, Heneveld and Craig, (1996) recognized parent and community support as one of the key factors to determine school effectiveness in Sub-Saharan Africa. They identified five categories or areas of parent and community support that are relevant to the region: (1) children come to school prepared to learn; (2) the community provides financial and material support to the school; (3) communication between the school, parents, and community is frequent; (4) the community has a meaningful role in school governance; and (5) community members and parents assist with instruction.

School community relationships help children to succeed in school and later life that attempt to: (a) improve school programs and school climate; (b) provide family services and support; (c) increase parents' skills and leadership; (d) connect families with others in the school and in the community; and (e) help teachers with their work (Epstein 1995).

In relation to this, Jennifer Swift-Morgan (2006) suggests that there are at least six domains for community participation in schools: infrastructure and maintenance, management and

administration, teacher support and supervision, pedagogy and classroom support, student supervision, and student recruitment. MoE (2010) also added that besides the monetary fund, donation of land, decision making and fulfilling infrastructure and facilities, community involvement in instructional process rests on: determining the content, delivering the content, training and up grading teachers and monitoring and evaluating school quality, achievement and results.

1. Determining the content

Teachers and the community should be involved in curriculum and material development. This is because of (a) to ensure the presentation of material of direct use to their pupils. It can also make teachers feel greater ownership of the school and of what they teach in each, (b) to ensure the local content, the greater articulation between school and community and the inclusion of family and community culture in the school, the marriage of traditional and modern knowledge, coverage of local culture and history (Punch and Bayona, 1990). (c) Participation calls for actual heads - on experience by resource persons in the local community (common wealth secretariat 1992). (d) It helps to convince both teachers and the community that they have some ownership of what goes on in the school.

In addition, the involvement of parents and the community in developing local content works as: (a) the community assists the school staff (teachers and the head teacher) by providing information and suggestions during the stage of identifying local content. (b) The community leaders (culture, religion, business) make consultative judgments and have formal and informal discussions to determine whether the content of the local curriculum is in accordance with certain criteria. (c) Teachers request other leaders to provide information on the details and interpretation of local content as the teachers may not know how to teach them. (d) Some schools employ resource persons/community leaders to help teach in the schools or demonstrate certain aspects of local content.

2. Delivering the content

Parents and other members of the community can be encouraged and even tutored and trained to participate more actively in the teaching learning process. They may help their children at home by: Encouraging to do school work at home, Helping to organize a study timetable, adjusting study time, monitoring their progress at school, reinforcing positive attitude about school and learning and encouraging enrolment and retention and attendance (Redding, 1991, Williams 1993).

3. Training and up grading teachers

Both teachers themselves and the community can also be more active in the actual training of (others) teachers. This can be done through: In-school or in- cluster upgrading and in professional development program (Vera et al 1986 and Shaeffer, 1990).

The community also involved in some kind of teacher training. Such involvement is particularly useful in training teachers about local language and cultural requirements of pupils and in introducing new teachers to the tradition, habits, and facilities available in the community where they will teach (Tatto, 1992).

4. Monitoring and evaluating school quality, achievement and results

Parents and community plays a role in monitoring and supervising classroom performance and teacher absenteeism (Durning, 1989). This includes: (a) regular opening of the school, such as observing classes, open days, school fairs, (b) Regular status/progress reports from the head teachers, (c) Helping to identify indicators of success, participate in data collection of analysis and then use the result, (c) In the adequacy of facilities, the attendance and behaviour of pupil and teachers and (d) the achievement of school targets.

2.6 Areas of School Involvement in Community Affairs

School can contribute so much to the community. The community depends on the school as School library can provide books for parent and youth, School halls can be used by the community for social events, School play grounds can be used by the community for local games, School furniture can be borrowed by the community and School farms can be used for extension services and school technical workshop can be used for community services

Agabi and Okorie in Agabi, Okorosaye-orubite, Ezekiel-Hart and Egbezor (2005) noted that the classrooms are used for adult literacy activities nationwide, for public health activities like immunizations and public enlightenment exercises and in emergency epidemic situation.

In order to serve the community, to build school-community good will, community individuals and organizations are invited to use school facilities for a variety of purposes. These purposes according Lucas and Thompson (n.d) include:

1. **Library Meeting Room:** One room in the school is stocked with materials on topic such as parent-child relations, educational issues and child psychology. Parents are invited to use the room for meetings and conferences and to borrow any of the literature available in the room.
2. **After School Day Care:** Some few classrooms are used as an after school day care centre for young students whose parents have to work until late in the evening. The day care centre is operated by staff hired by community using the centre.
3. **Complimentary Meal:** Every service club in the community is invited to have one evening meal per year in the school. The evening meal is provided by the home economics class.
4. **Community Groups:** Various groups such as Boy Scouts, the Community Associations, the Judo club and First Aid Group are allowed to use classrooms, the athletic and gym for meetings.
5. **Weekend Dances:** A monthly or quarterly weekend dance is held in the school auditorium for students, parents, and their guests.

2.7. Roles of Parents, Teachers and Administrators in School Community Relationships.

2.7.1. Role of parents

Early models of parent involvement tend to focus on the limitation of parents in becoming successful and effective partners in children's education. Three models were viewed in this area. The first model is, Deficit model which viewed parents as lacking the necessary skills, resources or willingness to support their children's education effectively. The second model is Difference model, view that the home and school culture can often differ and the children can be helped to adapt to the new culture by building on their unique learning styles (Bauch 1994). The third model is Empowerment model, view parents as valuable sources of information and as having the ability to attribute meaningful to their child's learning. Unlike difference model, they focus on the importance of collaboration between parent and teacher, and characterize how parent involvement is more likely to be viewed.

Berger (1991) suggests six roles that parents should play in their interaction with their children's educational life: Parent as teacher of their own children, Parent as spectator, Parent as employed resource, Parent as temporary volunteers, Parents as volunteer resources and Parents as policy makers.

2.7.2. The Role of Teachers

The role of the teacher in a positive school-community relationship is extremely important since it is the teacher who is the backbone of the educational system. Teachers play the largest and most critical role in producing public understanding of the school. Although school boards create school policy and administrators interpret these policies, teachers are the personnel who implement school policy (Steller, Arthur, 1983). If something is wrong with the teachers, it probably will surface and become known to the community and if this happens to a school district, years of Positive relations can be lost.

There are basically two views of teacher - community relations: What a teacher does inside the classroom and what the teacher does outside the classroom (Fried, Robby, 1982). The class room teacher is in an excellent position to effectively do this. Since home school partnerships improve academic achievement, the teacher must strive to form some type of relationship with the home.

As Today's Education, (1978), different Studies show that the general public does not know what is going on with teachers, but would like to. It shows that the parent is willing to be supportive if only contacted and that the highest amount of support from the parent will be achieved by the teacher if it is the school who first contacts the parents. The teacher must always be the one who initiates the contact from the parent, not the parent being the one to initiate the first meetings with the schools. Good schools welcome the parents and the community in to them.

Teachers are probably the best communicators of school relations to the community for several reasons. First of all, sheer quantity; teachers give thousands of impressions a year. They are the ones that the children go home and tell their parents about during dinner conversation. Secondly, the teacher is usually the one the parent talks to in order to see how well their children are doing since it generally is only the teacher who knows for sure (Steller and Arthur W, 1983). Many parents view the teacher as an extension of themselves when they are not there. When this happens it can turn out to be an ideal situation for the teacher and as a result, a very positive exchange of information and cooperation can occur.

2.7.3. Role of School Administrators

The differentiated roles of the administrative hierarchy are as evident in school-community relations functions as they are in any other aspect of school organization. School management committee, PTA, school principal and others variety of administrators have interdependent, mutually supportive, sometimes overlapping, as well as discretely different roles. The recognition of these roles and forces is central to administrator effectiveness.

a. Role of school Head

A sense of community within school community relationships is cultivated by the school heads. The school head's decisions and style are determining factor of school community friendliness. Similarly, mentoring and support by the school head for the appropriate training and continuous professional development of teachers raise classroom standards and foster improvement in teaching methods. Adequate planning by the school head, with appropriate involvement of teachers, learners, parents and the community, can raise curriculum standards and help the school meet learning achievement goals and successfully implement other important policy directives or targets (MoE, 2002)

The school head must respond to increasing student diversity, including issues of gender, disability and cultural background, must manage partnerships and networks with other schools and the wider community, and must work closely with government agencies and other organizations that serve children. In addition, the school head must be able to adjust the internal workings of the school to cope with rapid changes and developments in technology, school financing, school size and teachers' conditions of service.

The school heads are responsible for having well-designed procedures for communicating with their communities and for having systems of communicating with school personnel and students. Communication processes and techniques include organizing and administering publicity, making presentations and speeches to community groups, distributing printed material to parents and community group representatives, and conducting special school events (Kimbrough & Burkett, 1990). Each of these is an important category of events which can be implemented at the school. Too often publicity about school events lacks a professional touch. Both printed materials and direct personal contact must be of the highest professional order. Publications should carry with them the recognition that the media are a powerful source of public opinion about schools. Similarly, highly professional presentations

to community and parent groups can be a way of engaging support for schools. In addition to this all printed materials should technically accurate and professionally organized.

Finally, special school events, whether they are curricular or co-curricular, provide a way for the school to put its best foot forward. Our various communities enjoy seeing their children performing at their best and are more likely to be supportive of schools when they participate in well- organized student-cantered activities.

b. Role of School PTA s

The status and roles of PTA in various contexts are diverse. They are either formal or informal. In terms of status, in a majority of countries apart from Djibouti, Zambia, USA, and the River and Lagos states of Nigeria, PTA exist as purely informal voluntary bodies with little or no authority at all (USAID, 2009 and Okendu, 2012). Whereas In Ethiopia PTA replaced School Management Committee and are very powerful such that it is within their power to evaluate teachers and even dismiss those who cannot deliver (Swift, 2006).

The most widely reported role of PTA in many countries is fundraising and organizing social activities. As MoE, (2002) roles of PTA is monitoring and controlling the school budget and all school resources, mobilizing community for every school activities through meetings and working on disciplinary activities in the school. They are the court of the schools on disciplinary problems. They also conduct meetings with students, parents, communities, wereda educations personnel and concerned bodies with school director.

Further review such as Swift Morgan, (2006), qualitative study reveals that teachers are not comfortable with the powers given to PTA and unanimously argue that “the giving authority to PTA is very bad because most of the PTA members are uneducated and very poor. The educated cannot be evaluated by the uneducated”. One teacher added that ‘the community has neither the finance nor the capacity to manage the school effectively and that the head teacher and the government agents should be solely responsible for school management”. Another teacher expressed his fear that even “if the money [is given] to the community, they will feel like they are very superior and will have a boss-like feeling to toward [the teacher]”. However others were rather positive and observed that ‘if PTAs had greater resources, trained and involved more parents and others from the greater community, they would be able to use resources wisely" (Swift, 2006).

2.8. Challenges of School Community Relationships

In attempts to understand factors that prevent communities from being involved in formal education, Shaeffer (1992) found that the degree of community participation is particularly low in socially and economically marginal regions. This is because such regions tend to have the following elements: (a) 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; and (e) ignorance of the structure, functions, and constraints of the school.

Baker (1997) qualitative study with parents which explore barriers to parental involvement revealed that, time constraints due to working outside the home, being alone parent, having a younger children and lack of money required for some parental activities offered by schools are the challenges/barriers of school community relationship.

Parents in Baker's study also reported barriers which related directly to their children and which took two main forms. First parents reported that their children frequently lost correspondence from the school and so information and invitation were not always successfully delivered to parents. Second, some parents reported feeling that their children did not want them to be present in their school, either in classroom or on school tips. Baker primarily found this with parents of adolescent children at secondary school level rather than those at primary level. Finally, the barrier in Baker's study is that, lack of knowledge and information on how community should be involved in school activities.

Steller and Arthur, (1983) suggests that many experts in education and public relations believe that the major problem with school community relations is the public's lack of knowledge of the successes of education and the truly good things that happen in the classroom. Parents' intentions and their actions do not match due to lack of knowledge, lack of skill and lack of opportunity in school community relationship (Steinberg et al, 1996),

Challenges vary from one stakeholder to another because each group has its own vision to achieve the common goal of increasing educational access and improving its quality. The

section below attempts to turn to specific challenges and problems that have been witnessed among teachers, and parents and communities.

2.8.1 Challenges Among Teachers

Not all teachers willing to school community relationships. They tend to feel that they are losing authority within schools, as power is taken by community and parents (Swift, 2006). At the same time, they are encouraged to involve community members who sometimes are not willing to get involved in any school activities.

Teachers' attitude towards, and beliefs about parental involvement also directly related to their practice of outreach to parents (Caspé, 2003). Teachers also regard parents positively and who view parents as primary educator of their children are more likely to invite the involvement of parents (Epstein and Dauber, 1991) and conversely those who perceive parental involvement as a threat to their professional status are less likely to elicit such involvement (Epstein, 1986).

2.8.2 Challenges Among Parents and Communities

Not all parents and community members are willing to get involved in school activities (Bakawi, 2013). Some have had negative schooling experiences themselves, some are illiterate and don't feel comfortable talking to teachers, and getting involved in any kind of school activities. They feel they don't have control over the school. Some parents and families are not willing to collaborate with schools because they cannot afford to lose their economical labour by sending their children.

Parents assume that the students disciplinary problem, misbehaviour and poor academic performance is due lack of teachers monitoring and attainment of students at school, while teachers also point out to the parents that regular follow up of parents on their child is weak. Smith, Wohlstetter, Kuzin and Depedro (2011) argued that challenges of community involvement arise when parents and teachers have different expectations or belief about how parents should be involved. They found that lack of consensus on the issue led teachers to blame parents, and the parents feeling under appreciated by teachers. Homby and Lafaele (2011) also argue that parents and teachers have different agenda and different goals for parental involvement, which lead to tension and conflict, which can in turn limit the relationship and success of parents' involvement practices.

The main challenges of community participation in education in Ethiopia is identified as: (1) contributions are not clearly articulated and communities are not well informed about them and (2) Some communities are overburdened and/or stressed by contributions; the risk of “community fatigue” and a decrease in their participation (ESDP IV, 2010). Even though Parents have awareness on the provision of finance on primary and first cycle secondary educations (grade 1 - 10) for free (FDRE, 1994), and every households are mandated to support all government efforts in educational expansion and development (BBO, 2006; MoE, 1998). There is still a gap between what is expected and what is achieved in case of quality and standards due to the financial constraints.

According to National Education Association (2008), Parents see lots of roadblocks to getting involved in their child’s education. Some point to their own demanding schedules and say they don’t have extra time to volunteer or even attend school activities, much less get involved in bigger ways. Others reveal how uncomfortable they feel when trying to communicate with school officials, whether that’s due to language or cultural differences or their own past experiences with school. Some say they lack the know-how and resources to help their child, or they express frustration with school bureaucracies or policies they find impossible to understand or change. Some parents complain that they rarely hear from the school unless there is a problem with their child’s behaviour or performance. Some families criticize school personnel for not understanding the plight of single parents, grandparents, foster parents, or other caregivers. Others say they lack transportation to attend school events or have no child care for younger siblings. While some schools have made great strides in engaging parents and others in the educational process, there is still much more that can be done.

Lack of effective communication between the educational administrators and the wider community is also the main challenge in school community relationship. It is true that willingness of community through effective communication is the central part of school community relationship. Resource mobilization is realized through effective communication of the educational administrators.

Obviously, secondary school students came from different areas/host schools with different cultural practices. They tend to be free and independently manage themselves without the

intervention of their parents. Research and experience indicate that family participation in their child's education diminishes as children and young people move through their school years. It is too difficult for parents to control the activities of their child at far distance. As a result most siblings fall under disciplinary problems. Hence this is considered as the barriers of school community relationships.

In general, time constraints, financial constraints, poor communications, absence of regular follow up of pupils by parents, lack of knowledge and lack of home school visit are among the challenges of school community relationships. Shaffer, (1994) realized the challenges by describing factors that affect achieving higher level of participation in participatory approach to development in general and in education in particular. These includes: heterogeneity of community; capacity to afford cost of participation required in participatory development and collaboration activities; the need for new and complex managerial and supervisory skills, attitudes, and behaviours; conflict of interest between goals of participation and political agenda; individual and institutional inability and resistance to accept the change and administrative obstacles are among the challenges of school community relationships.

2.9 Strategies/Approaches of School Community Relationships

The relationships, in which both the school and the community contribute directly to the strengthening and development of each other, can provide a firm foundation for both educational re-newal and community regeneration. To achieve this important goal, creative education and innovative community builders (administrators) must begin to work together to discover new ways to mobilize the many and varied resources of local schools as essential components of on-going community development efforts.

Di Benedatto and Wilson (1982) suggest that for principal to help develop positive school community relations, he might: interpret school programs for the community; determine community expectations of the school; communicate with parents through the media and in group conferences; arrange for parents to visit the school; work with parent associations and related groups and interact with school critics.

Epstein (1995) developed various strategies of involvement to explain how schools, families, and communities can work productively together:

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

Although schools have their own uniqueness and similarities, there are specific ways the school principals can provide the leadership to make a school very special in the community. Through the use of some tried-and-true strategies that other successful principals have used, they can make their mark and put the school in the forefront of the community. To be effective, a well-developed school community relation plans must be developed. The 10 components of such a plan are the following (Pawlas, 2005).

1. Provide the community with information about the school

The community should be informed on the goals and objectives of the school. The community should know all the programs and general activities of the school. No any change or innovation that will take place in the school without the prior knowledge of the community which the school serves.

2. Provide the school with information about the community

The school should have information about the composition of the community, such as the income and the educational level and occupation of the majority of the residents. Barry Lucas and Loraine Thompson (n.d) on the SSTA Research centre Report identified that every school should have three types of information about the community it serves. The first one is the information about the composition of the community, such as the income, educational

level and occupations of the majority of the residents is useful in formulating new programs or adapting existing ones to meet students' particular needs. Secondly, the school should know what community opinion, regarding both broad educational issues and the day to day operation of the school itself, specifically (a) board of education regarding its effectiveness in policy making, good judgment, faithfulness in attending meetings and devoting time to the job.(b) What do the people of the community think about the teaching staff with regard to its instructional ability, fairness to students, discipline, participation in the life of the community. Thirdly, the school should also have some familiarity with the educational resources available in the community in order that they can be utilized to enrich and enhance the school program.

3. Establish and maintain public conference in the school

Activities Such as Coffee Parties at predetermined times can be used. At these meetings, members of the local community are encouraged to give their opinions regarding the school and specific educational issues. This can provide an opportunity to establish public confidence

4. Secure community support for the school and its program

Invite the community to participate as volunteers in many of the school activities such as teaching local history, serving in advisory committee, acting as volunteers in library, laboratory, and clinic for the school, kitchen, etc.

5. Develop a community of purpose, effort and achievement

Let the community understand that when the school fails the community also fails, and that the survival of the school depends heavily on the community. This will make the community have some feelings of purpose and hope to support the school and its programs. This could make the community exert serious efforts for the achievement of the school goals.

6. Develop recognition and the vital importance of education in communities

Practicing the student to use skills acquired at school to serve members of the community. For instance, student's drama clubs can perform some interesting drama to entertain senior citizens at their homes or on any special occasion.

7. Keep the community informed of new trends and developments in education

The community should be informed of any change in the curriculum or programs of the school.

8. Develop an atmosphere of cooperation between the school and other social institution of the community

A variety of school activities that requires use of community resources by the school is introduced.

9. Secure an evaluation of the school's programs in terms of educational need as the community sees them

Find out from the community whether they are satisfied with what the school is producing in terms of student's behaviours and their reactions to social life.

10. Develop public goodwill towards the school

The school can invite community organizations to use schools facilities such as classroom, library, laboratory, gym, halls fields, pools, theatre, auditorium, etc. This will create in the community a sense of belonging to whatever success or failure of the school.

NEA team identified 10 major strategies and approaches that define the direction of program efforts and appear to be critical to family-school-community success (NEA, 2011). These are:

1. **Agreeing on core values:** Taking time at the beginning to think deeply and reflect about what participants believe, and why they think the efforts will work. The core values include (a) Families and teachers are equally important co educators: The family is the expert on the child; the teacher is the expert on the curriculum. (b) Before teachers can effectively share important information about academics, teachers and parents must establish positive communication. (c) Teachers must visit all students and families, because targeting only the challenging students will perpetuate the cycle of mistrust. (d) All parents can assist in their children's academic success; effective family involvement can happen in every home.
2. **Listening to the community:** Identifying priorities and developing an action plan in a collaborative way that creates community consensus around what needs to happen and in what sequence.
3. **Using data to set priorities and focus strategies:** Looking closely at current achievement trends and addressing areas of weakness in students' knowledge and skills.
4. **Providing relevant, on-site professional development:** Basing professional development on data and conversations among stakeholders, in a way that builds both educator-educator and educator-parent collaborations.

5. **Building collaborations with community partners:** Pulling in strategic partners and developing community with colleges, social service agencies, community groups, faith-based organizations, local leaders, public officials, and businesses to improve student learning and other outcomes.
6. **Using targeted outreach to focus on high needs communities, schools, and students:** Identifying groups that need special attention, learning about their concerns and needs, and responding in culturally appropriate ways.
7. **Building one-to-one relationships between families and educators that are linked to learning:** Taking time to have conversations and reach agreement on how best to collaborate in order to improve student achievement.
8. **Setting, communicating, and supporting high and rigorous expectations:** Making it clear that success is the norm by creating pathways to college, especially for students at risk and those at the margins, and providing students with support to succeed.
9. **Addressing cultural differences:** Providing support for teachers and education support professionals to bridge barriers of culture, class, and language.
10. **Connecting students to the community:** Making learning hands-on and relevant to students' lives while also showing that students and schools serve the community.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Design of the Study

The study is descriptive survey design which uses both quantitative and qualitative techniques of data collection and analysis.

3.2. The Research Method

In this study, the researcher used both quantitative and qualitative approaches with more emphasis on quantitative approach as the leading methods. Quantitative approach is greatly emphasized because school community relationships can be understood by collecting large quantitative data from respondents through questionnaire. In addition, qualitative approach was employed to supplement and validates the quantitative data.

3.3. Sources of Data

In order to strengthen the findings of the research, data was gathered from both primary and secondary sources. The primary data sources were principals, vice principals, teachers, PTAs and school supervisors, where as secondary data source was document analysis like PTA minutes and records, because document analysis can give an expert understanding of available data and also it is cheap (Abiy et al., 2009)

3.4. Description of Study Area

The researcher conducted this study on Horo Guduru Wollega Zone government secondary schools. This Zone is located in Oromia Regional State of Ethiopia which is 314KM away from Addis Ababa in western direction. It has 9 woredas (districts) and 1 municipal administration bearing a total of 32 government secondary schools and in the zone. Its administrative capital is Shambu town.

3.5 Population of the Study

The population of this study included all government secondary schools found in Horro Guduru Wollega Zone. According to the zone education office statistics of 2015 G.C, there are 32 government secondary schools in rural, sub-towns and towns of the zone. Within these

schools, there are 32 principals, 37 vice principals, 224 PTA members, 10 supervisors and 808 teachers. Thus the population for the study included 1111 members.

3.6 Sample and Sampling Techniques

The researcher used Multistage Sampling. In multi stage sampling the sample to be studied is selected at random at different stages (Best and Kahn, 2006). Thus in first stage the researcher used simple random sampling technique to select 8(25%) schools. Accordingly, Hareto, Gaba Robi, Shambu, Finca, Tulu wayu, Alibo, Sekela and Homi were selected from 32 secondary schools so that all schools have got equal chance of being selected (Kothari, 2004).

In second stage from 8 schools, 8 principals (from each school 1), 12 vice principals, 5 supervisors (from each school 1) and 16 PTAs (from each school 2) were purposively included in the study because they are in the selected schools.

Finally from 308 teachers in eight schools, 158 teachers were selected using quota sampling (by taking almost 50% of total number of teachers from each school). Finally the researcher used lottery method and selected the decided number of respondents. The following table shows the sample size of the study selected from each school.

Table 1 Sample Size of the Study

s. no	Name of sec. schools	Teachers		School leaders						PTA		Total no of samples
				Principals		Vice Principals		Supervisors		No of PTA	No of sample PTA	
		No of teacher	No of sample teacher	No of Pri	No of sample P	No of V/P	No of sample V/P	No of Sup	No of sample Sup			
1	Alibo	29	14	1	1	2	2	1	1	7	2	20
2	T/ wayu	25	13	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	2	18
3	Sekela	42	22	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	2	27
4	Shambu	80	41	1	1	2	2	1		7	2	46
5	Fincha	57	29	1	1	2	2	1	1	7	2	35
6	G/ robi	19	10	1	1	1	1	-	-	7	2	14
7	Hareto	45	22	1	1	2	2	1	1	7	2	28
8	Homi	11	7	1	1	1	1	-	-	7	2	11
Total		308	158	8	8	12	12	6	5	56	16	199

3.7 Instruments of Data Collection

In order to get a reliable data, the researcher used questionnaire, interview and document analysis for the study.

a. Questionnaire

The questionnaire is designed by the researcher based on the objectives of the study using 5-points Likert scale. It is a structured because in case of structured questionnaire, the questions are presented with exactly the same wording and in the same order to all respondents to reply to the same set of questions (Kothari, 2004). Thus it requires the respondents to tick their best option on Likert scale which represent 5 = strongly agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Undecided, 2 = Disagree and 1 = strongly disagree.

b. Interview

A seven item Semi- structured interview questions were designed for PTA members. It was translated to Afan oromo because most of the PTA members are not familiar to English language. It was conducted through face to face interaction sessions. The researcher takes the note while the interviewee shares their response and finally the responses were translated to English and analysed.

c. Document Analysis

Documents refers to those sources of data that are not produced at the request of the researcher but produced and out there waiting to be assembled and analyzed that include such forms as letters, diaries, photographs, newspapers, magazines, videos, audios and autobiographies (Bryman, 2008). In light of this, documents were collected to supplement the questionnaire. These documents were collected from schools including PTA minutes and school reports.

3.7.1 Validity of the Instrument

Before administering the questionnaire designed for this study the researcher gave the questionnaire to the experts in the field of education and checked its validity (the relevance to subject matter, appropriateness of the text content and coverage of content area). Accordingly variable A of the questionnaire was amended and under variable C of the questionnaire 4 items were additionally included for the coverage of the content. In addition 2 interview questions were rejected and 3 were merged before conducting interview.

3.7.2 Reliability of the Instrument

To check the reliability of the questionnaire, the researcher used pilot test in two secondary schools: Green lake and kambi, which are not included in sample schools of the study. The researcher disseminated questionnaire bearing 50 questions to 2 principals 2 vice principals and 24 teachers for the pilot study. Finally the researcher used spilt half method (internal consistency reliability) and tested the reliability of the instrument for each five variables using spearman-Brown Prophecy formula (Kothari, 2004) and the average r value of the variables is estimated to 0.81. This indicated that the questionnaire was reliable for obtaining information for this study.

3.8 Procedures of Data Collection

During the data collection, the researcher personally visited the sampled secondary schools. The researcher was assigned assistants in each eight secondary school and managed the data collection by introducing the respondents that the instrument is only meant for academic research purposes and information was filled properly.

3.9 Techniques of Data Analysis

The data collected through questionnaire was analyzed through descriptive and inferential statistical analysis. Descriptive statistical analysis is not adequate by itself because it limits generalization to the particular group of individuals observed (Best and Kahn. 2006). To fill the gap of descriptive statistical analysis, thus, the researcher used additionally inferential statistical analysis. This analysis involves the process of sampling and the selection of samples assumed to be related to the population from which it is drawn (Best and Kahn, 2006). Accordingly, the descriptive (frequencies, percentages, mean scores,) and inferential (independent sample t - test and chi-square) was used in the analysis. Whereas data gathered through interview and document analysis were analyzed qualitatively.

3.10 Ethical Consideration

The researcher gave official letter written by the University to each 8 secondary school principals to inform the issue. The researcher was also informed the respondents that the research to be conducted is only for the purpose of education so that the respondents gave their responses with confidence.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the analyses of the result obtained from the data collected. It comprises two major parts; the first one is characteristics of respondents (in terms of roles in school, educational background sex and age) and the second presents the presentation and interpretation of data which were gathered through questionnaire, interview and document analyses.

4.2. Respondents Characteristics

In this study 25 school leaders (principals, vice principals and school supervisors), 158 teachers and 16 PTAs, totally 199 respondents were involved. The characteristics of respondents in terms of their roles in school, educational background, sex and age levels are discussed in the table below.

Table 2 Respondents Characteristics

Characteristics		Questionnaire respondents						interviewee		Total respondents		
		Teachers		principals and vice principals		school supervisors		PTA				
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%			
educational ground	back	Grade 1-10	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1.50	3	1.50
	ground	Certificate							5	2.51	5	2.51
		Diploma	4	2.01	0	-	0	-	5	2.51	9	4.52
		Degree	143	71.86	19	9.54	3	1.51	3	1.50	168	84.42
		Masters	11	5.52	1	0.50	2	1.01	0	0	14	7.03
		Total	158	79.4	20	10.05	5	2.51	16	8.04	199	100
Sex	Male	141	70.85	20	10.05	5	2.51	16	8.04	182	91.46	
	Female	17	8.54	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	8.54	
	Total	158	79.4	20	10.05	5	2.51	16	8.04	199	100	
age	20-30	79	39.7	2	1.00	0	0	2	1.00	83	41.71	
	31-40	45	22.61	12	6.03	3	1.51	6	3.01	66	33.17	
	41-50	24	12.06	6	3.01	2	1.01	13	6.53	45	22.61	
	51 and above	10	5.02	0	0	0	0	3	1.50	13	6.53	
	Total	158	79.4	20	10.05	5	2.51	16	8.04	199	100	

As the above table 3 indicates, 3(1.5%) PTA respondents are Grade 1 – 10, 5(2.51%) PTA respondents are certificate, 4(2.01%) respondent teachers and 5(2.51%) PTA respondents totally 9 (4.52%) participants are diploma holders, 143(71.86%) teacher respondents, 19(9.54%) principal and vice principal respondents, 3(1.51%) school supervisor respondents, and 3(1.5%) PTA respondents totally 168(84.42%) respondents are degree holders and the rest 11(5.52%) teacher respondents, 1(0.5%) principal respondent, 2(1.01%) school supervisor respondents with no PTA respondents totally 14(7.03%) participants are Masters Degree holders.

As discussion indicates, majority of the respondents (91.45%) are Degree and Masters Degree holders. From this finding one can conclude that majority of the respondents were qualified and so they responded the questionnaires and interview without difficulty. This contributed for truthfulness of the data collected through these tools that guaranteed the findings of this study.

The same table also indicates that 141(70.85%) teacher respondents, 20(10.05%) principal and vice principal respondents, 5(2.51%) school supervisor respondents and 16(8.04%) PTA respondents totally 182(91.46%) respondents are male. While 17(8.54%) teacher respondents, with no principals, vice principal, school supervisor and PTA respondents are female.

In terms of age level table 3 above indicates, 79(39.7%) teacher respondents, 2(1.0%) principal and vice principal respondents, and 2(1.0%) PTA respondents totally 83(41.71%) participants are of age 20-30 years. 45(22.61%) teacher respondents, 12(6.03%) principal and vice principal respondents, 3(1.51%) School supervisor respondents and 6(3.01%) PTA respondents totally 66(33.17%) participants are 31-40 years old. 24(12.06%) teacher respondents, 6(3.01%) principal and vice principal respondents, 2(1.01%) School supervisor respondents and 13(6.53%) PTA interviewee, totally 45(22.61%) participants are 41-50 years old. 10(5.02%) teacher respondents with no principal, vice principal and School supervisor respondents, and 3(1.5%) PTA respondents totally 13(6.53%) participants are 51 and above years old. This shows that majority of the respondents are young and filled their response strictly.

4.3 Data presentation and Analysis

The major purpose of this study is to assess school community relationship in government secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone. For this study, 8 secondary schools in the zone were selected. Data were gathered from school principals, vice principals, school supervisors and teachers through closed ended questionnaire. In order to supplement the result of the questionnaire, document analysis was made and PTAs were interviewed. Data from respondents was presented in tables. The data gathered through closed-ended questionnaires was analyzed using percentage, mean score, chi – square and independent sample t - test. Data gathered through interview and document analysis were organized and summarized to supplement the information gathered through questionnaires. For this study a questionnaire consisting of 50 items were distributed to two groups: school leaders (principals, vice principals and school supervisors) and teachers.

4.3.1 Importance of School Community Relationship

One of the major objectives of this study is to assess the school community relationships. Thus, an attempt was made to assess the importance of school community relationships. Accordingly, 15(fifteen) item questions were made to gather information. Teachers and leaders (principals, vice principals and school supervisor) were asked to indicate the importance of school community relationships. Their response is tabulated in four sub tables as the nature of the questions. In computing the value of their response, the researcher used descriptive statistical analysis (percentages and frequencies) and inferential statistical analysis (chi-square test).

Table 3.1 importance of School Community Relationships Related to Development and Improvement

S.no	Items	Response rate	Role in school						Chi-Square Tests		
			Leaders		Teachers		Total		Value	Df	Sig. (2-sided)
			No	%	No	%	No	%			
1	For the development of sustainable mutual collaboration between members of school and community.	SD	0	0	10	6.33	10	5.46	4.935	4	.294
		D	3	12	14	8.86	17	9.29			
		U	1	4	24	15.19	25	13.7			
		A	12	48	54	34.17	66	36.1			
		SA	9	36	56	35.44	65	35.5			
		Total	25	100	158	100	183	100			
2	For developing a sense of trust between school and community	SD	1	4	11	6.96	12	6.56	1.028	4	.906
		D	4	16	23	14.56	27	14.8			
		U	2	8	21	13.29	23	12.6			
		A	9	36	55	34.81	64	35			
		SA	9	36	48	30.38	57	31.1			
		Total	25	100	158	100	183	100			
3	For the development and practices of school policies	SD	3	12	10	6.33	13	7.1	2.421	4	.659
		D	3	12	11	6.96	14	7.65			
		U	5	20	28	17.72	33	18			
		A	8	32	68	43.04	76	41.5			
		SA	6	24	41	25.95	47	25.7			
		Total	25	100	158	100	183	100			
4	for the improvement of school performance	SD	1	4	12	7.59	13	7.1	1.782	4	.776
		D	2	8	18	11.4	20	10.93			
		U	7	28	30	19	37	20.22			
		A	7	28	53	33.5	60	32.79			
		SA	8	32	45	28.5	53	28.96			
		Total	25	100	158	100	183	100			
5	For the developments of a curriculum	SD	3	12	18	11.4	21	11.48	2.265	4	.687
		D	2	8	22	13.9	24	13.11			
		U	5	20	24	15.2	29	15.85			
		A	11	44	54	34.2	65	35.52			
		SA	4	16	40	25.3	44	24.04			
		Total	25	100	158	100	183	100			
6	For the improvement of students disciplinary problems	SD	1	4	11	6.96	12	6.55	3.517	4	.475
		D	3	12	24	15.2	27	14.75			
		U	4	16	21	13.3	25	13.66			
		A	10	40	38	24.1	48	26.23			
		SA	7	28	64	40.5	71	38.8			
		Total	25	100	158	100	183	100			
7	For the improvement of students' academic performance	SD	2	8	8	5.06	10	5.46	.892	4	.926
		D	2	8	21	13.3	23	12.57			
		U	3	12	20	12.7	23	12.57			
		A	8	32	51	32.3	59	32.24			
		SA	10	40	58	36.7	68	37.16			
		Total	25	100	158	100	183	100			

Table 4.1 item no. 1 indicates that majority of leader respondents (i.e principal, vice principal and school supervisor) 19(84%) and majority of teacher respondents, 106(69.51)% agreed that the relationship of school and community is essential for the development of sustainable mutual collaboration between members of school and community. 3(12%) leaders and 24(15.19%) teachers agreed that the relationship of school and community is not essential for the development of sustainable mutual collaboration between members of school and community. On the other hand, the calculated chi – square value for item number 1 is $x^2 = 4.935$. This calculated value is less than the critical table value $x^2 = 9.49$ at 4 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the response of leaders and teachers. Thus, the relationship of school and community is essential for the development of sustainable mutual collaboration between members of school and community.

Table 4.1 item 2 indicates that 18(72%) leaders and 103(65.19%) teachers agree that school community relationship is important for developing a sense of trust between school and community. 2(8%) leaders and 21(13.29%) teachers were replied undecided and the rest 5(20%) leaders and 34(21.52%) teachers agreed that school community relationship is not important for developing a sense of trust between school and community. It was found that the calculated value of chi- square ($x^2 = 1.028$) is less than the critical table value $x^2 = 9.49$ at 4 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the response of leaders and teachers. From this one can conclude that school community relationship is important for developing a sense of trust between school and community

Table 4.1 item no 3 shows 14(56%) leaders and 109(68.99%) teachers agreed that school community relationship is vital for the development and practices of school policies. While 6(24%) and 21(13.29%) leaders and teachers respectively agreed that school community relationship is not vital for the development and practices of school policies. Result from chi – square test also indicates the calculated value of chi- square ($x^2 = 2.421$) is less than the critical table value $x^2 = 9.49$ at 4 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the leaders and teachers response. Hence one can conclude that school community relationship is vital for the development and practices of school policies.

Table 4.1 item no 4 shows 15(60%) leaders and 98(62%) teachers agreed that school community relationship is important for the improvement of school performance. While 3(12%) and 30(18.99%) leaders and teachers respectively agreed that school community relationship is not crucial for the improvement of school performance. Result from chi – square test also indicates the calculated value of chi- square ($x^2 = 1.782$) is less than the critical table value $x^2 = 9.49$ at 4 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the leaders and teachers response. Hence one can conclude that school community relationship is crucial for the improvement of school performance.

Table 4.1 item no 5 shows 15(60%) leaders and 94(59.5%) teachers agreed that school community relationship is crucial For the developments of a curriculum, 5(20%) leaders and 24(15.2%) teachers responded that it is impossible to decide the relationship of school and community as it is crucial for the developments of a curriculum and the rest 5(20%) and 40(25.3%) leaders and teachers respectively agreed that school community relationship is not crucial For the developments of a curriculum. Result from chi – square test indicates the calculated value of chi- square ($x^2 = 2.265$) is less than the critical table value $x^2 = 9.49$ at 4 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the leaders and teachers response. Hence it is evident that school community relationship is crucial for the development of a curriculum. These ideas also supported by Uemura (1999). He asserted that Communities' and parents' involvement helps achieve curriculum and learning materials that reflect children's everyday lives in society. When children use textbooks and other materials that illustrate their own lives in their community, they can easily associate what they are learning with what they have already known.

Table 4.1 item no 6 indicates 17(68%) leaders and 102(64.6%) teachers agreed that school community relationship is important for the improvement of students disciplinary problems and 4(16%) leaders and 35(22.16%) teachers agreed that school community relationship is not important for the improvement of students disciplinary problems. Result from chi – square test also indicates the calculated value of chi- square ($x^2 = 3.517$) is less than the critical table value $x^2 = 9.49$ at 4 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the leaders and teachers response. Thus it is evident that school community relationship is important for the

improvement of student disciplinary problems. This idea is also supported by Sheldon & Epstein, (2002) and they confirmed that when educators communicate effectively and involve family and community members in activities focused on student behaviour, schools report fewer disciplinary actions with students from one year to the next.

Table 4.1 item no 8 indicates 18(72%) leaders and 109(69%) teachers agreed that school community relationship is important for the improvement of students' academic performance and 4(16%) leaders and 29(18.36%) teachers agreed that school community relationship is not important for the improvement of students' academic performance. Result from chi – square test also indicates the calculated value of chi- square ($\chi^2 = 0.892$) is less than the critical table value $\chi^2 = 9.49$ at 4 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the leaders and teachers response. Thus one can conclude that school community relationship is important for the improvement of students' academic performance. Asset Based Community Development (2006) report also indicates, Strong relationships based upon trust and cooperation amongst teachers, principals, parents, and community residents can and do play an important role in improving schools and student performance. When parents and community members are engaged in the life of the school, the resources available for teaching and the learning environment expand. When teachers and principals build trust with each other and with parents, they can develop a common vision for school reform and work together to implement necessary changes in the school. And, an intersecting set of relationships among adults (parents, teachers, service providers) can provide a holistic environment in which children are raised with a unified set of expectations and behaviours.

In addition Henderson & Mapp, (2002) stated when schools build partnerships with families that respond to their concerns and honour their contributions; they are successful in sustaining connections that are aimed at improving student achievement. Their research review also reveal that students with involved parents, no matter what their income or background, are more likely to: earn higher grades and test scores, and enrol in higher-level programs; be promoted, pass their classes, and earn credits; attend school regularly; have better social skills, show improved behaviour, and adapt well to school; and graduate and go on to post secondary education

Table 3.2 Importance of School Community Relationship related to provision

S.no	Items	Response rate	Role in school						Chi-Square Tests		
			Leaders		Teachers		Total		Value	Df	Sig. (2-sided)
			No	%	No	%	No	%			
1	For providing the community a sense of ownership in school activities	SD	0	0	5	3.16	5	2.73	4.177	4	.383
		D	3	12	21	13.29	24	13.1			
		U	4	16	17	10.75	21	11.5			
		A	8	32	75	47.47	83	45.4			
		SA	10	40	40	25.31	50	27.3			
		total	25	100	158	100	183	100			
2	For sustaining the provision of finance for the school	SD	2	8	20	12.66	22	12	3.359	4	.500
		D	5	20	15	9.49	20	10.9			
		U	4	16	39	24.68	43	23.5			
		A	8	32	45	28.48	53	29			
		SA	6	24	39	24.68	45	24.6			
		total	25	100	158	100	183	100			
3	For the provision of school facilities	SD	1	4	16	10.13	17	9.29	1.837	4	.766
		D	5	20	22	13.92	27	14.8			
		U	4	16	33	20.89	37	20.2			
		A	9	36	49	31.01	58	31.7			
		SA	6	24	38	24.05	44	24			
		total	25	100	158	100	183	100			
4	For the provision of security to the school	SD	3	12	13	8.23	16	8.74	3.382	4	.496
		D	2	8	17	10.76	19	10.4			
		U	4	16	37	23.42	41	22.4			
		A	11	44	45	28.48	56	30.6			
		SA	5	20	46	29.11	51	27.9			
		total	25	100	158	100	183	100			

Table 4.2 item no. 1 indicates that 18(72%) leader respondents and 115(72.78%) teacher respondents agreed that school community relationships is vital for providing the community a sense of ownership in school activities, 4(16%) leaders and 17(10.75%) teachers responded school community relationship cannot be decided as it has an importance for providing the community a sense of ownership in school activities. The rest 3(12%) leaders and 26(16.45%) teachers responded that school community relationships is not important for providing the community a sense of ownership in school activities. Result from chi – square test also indicates that the calculated value of chi - square ($\chi^2 = 4.177$) is less than the critical table value $\chi^2 = 9.49$ at 4 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the responses of leaders and teachers. Hence one can conclude that school community relationship is important for providing the community a sense of ownership in school activities.

Table 4.2 item no 2 indicates that 14(56%) leaders and 84(53.12%) teacher respondents agreed that school community relationship is important for sustaining the provision of finance for the school, 4(16%) leaders and 39(24.68%) teachers were not decided the idea as school community relationship is important or not for sustaining the provision of finance for the school , and the rest 7(28%) leaders and 35(22.15%) teachers agreed on the existence of relationship between school and community is not important for sustaining the provision of finance for the school. It was also founded that the calculated value of chi- square ($\chi^2 = 3.359$) is less than the critical table value $\chi^2 = 9.49$ at 4 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the response of leaders and teachers. From this one can conclude that the existence of relationship between school and community is important for sustaining the provision of finance for the school

Table 4.2 item no 3 indicates that 15(60%) leaders and 87(56.15%) teachers agreed that the availability of school community relationship is for the provision of school facilities, 4(16%) leaders and 33(20.89%) teachers didn't decided that school community relationship is important for the provision of school facilities, and the rest 6(24%) leaders and 38(24.05%) teachers didn't agreed on the assumptions that school community relationship is available for the provision of school facilities, Result from chi – square test shows the calculated value of chi- square ($\chi^2 = 1.837$) is less than the critical table value $\chi^2 = 9.49$ at 4 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the leaders and teachers response. Thus one can conclude that school community relationship is important for the provision of school facilities like classrooms, water, latrines, clinics, library, laboratory, internet, electricity and plasma television (MoE, 2010 annual abstract).

Table 4.2 item no 4 shows that 16(64%) leaders and 91(57.59%) teachers agreed that school community relationship is vital for the provision of security to the school, 5(20%) leaders and 30(18.99%) teachers responded that school community relationship is not vital for the provision of security to the school.. Result from chi – square test also indicates the calculated value of chi- square ($\chi^2 = 3.382$) is less than the critical table value $\chi^2 = 9.49$ at 4 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the leaders and teachers response. Thus one can conclude that school community relationship is vital for the provision of security to the school

Table 3.3 Importance of School Community Relationship Related to Solving school problems and Monitoring students progress

S.no	Items	Response rate	Role in school						Chi-Square Tests		
			Leaders		Teachers		Total		Value	Df	Sig. (2-sided)
			No	%	No	%	No	%			
1	For solving school problems	SD	2	8	14	8.86	16	8.74	6.088	4	.193
		D	4	16	31	19.6	35	19.13			
		U	2	8	18	11.4	20	10.93			
		A	11	44	34	21.5	45	24.59			
		SA	6	24	61	38.6	67	36.61			
		total	25	100	158	100	183	100			
2	For the welfare of teachers and students	SD	0	0	11	6.96	11	6.01	5.270	4	.261
		D	5	20	13	8.23	18	9.83			
		U	3	12	23	14.6	26	14.21			
		A	11	44	63	39.9	74	40.44			
		SA	6	24	48	30.4	54	29.51			
		total	25	100	158	100	183	100			
3	For monitoring student progress	SD	0	0	7	4.43	7	3.82	1.363	4	.851
		D	4	16	23	14.6	27	14.75			
		U	4	16	20	12.7	24	13.11			
		A	9	36	60	38	69	37.7			
		SA	8	32	48	30.4	56	30.6			
		total	25	100	158	100	183	100			

Table 4.3 item no 1 shows that 18(68%) leaders and 95(60.1%) teachers agreed that school community relationship is crucial for solving school problems. While 6(24%) and 35(28.46%) leaders and teachers respectively agreed that school community relationship is not crucial for solving school problems. Result from chi – square test also indicates the calculated value of chi- square ($x^2 = 6.088$) is less than the critical table value $x^2 = 9.49$ at 4 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the leaders and teachers response. Hence one can conclude that school community relationship is crucial for solving school problems. Interview result also supports this idea in that community solved a lot of problems such as disciplinary problems, student revolutions and disagreements between schools and other firms.

Table 4.3 item no 2 indicates 17(68%) leaders and 111(70.3%) teachers agreed that school community relationship is decisive for the welfare of teachers and students. 3(12%) leaders and 13(8.23%) teachers responded that the presence or absence of school community relationship didn't decide their response whether or not school community relationship is

important for the welfare of teachers and students. 5(20%) leaders and 24(15.21%) teachers agreed that school community relationship is not decisive for the welfare (happiness) of teachers and students. Result from chi – square test indicates the calculated value of chi-square ($x^2 = 5.270$) is less than the critical table value $x^2 = 9.49$ at 4 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the leaders and teachers response. Thus it is evident that school community relationship is decisive for the welfare of teachers and students.

Table 4.3 item no 3 indicates 17(68%) leaders and 108(68.4%) teachers agreed that school community relationship is vital for monitoring student progress and 4(16%) leaders and 30(19.03%) teachers agreed that school community relationship is not vital for monitoring student progress. Result from chi – square test indicates the calculated value of chi- square ($x^2 = 1.363$) is less than the critical table value $x^2 = 9.49$ at 4 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the leaders and teachers response. Thus it is evident that school community relationship is vital for monitoring student progress.

Table 3.4 Rationale/Importance of School Community Relationship Related to Information Sharing

S.no	Items	Resp onse rate	Role in school						Chi-Square Tests		
			Leaders		Teachers		Total		Value	Df	Sig. (2- sided)
			No	%	No	%	No	%			
1	For information sharing and dissemination	SD	1	4	14	8.86	15	8.19	4.587	4	.332
		D	2	8	19	12	21	11.48			
		U	2	8	33	20.9	35	19.13			
		A	11	44	54	34.2	65	35.52			
		SA	9	36	38	24.1	47	25.68			
		Total	25	100	158	100	183	100			

Table 4.4 item no 1 indicates 20(76%) leaders and 92(58.3%) teachers agreed that school community relationship is important for information sharing and dissemination and 3(12%) leaders and 33(20.86%) teachers agreed that school community relationship is not important for information sharing and dissemination. Result from chi – square test shows the calculated value of chi- square ($x^2 = 4.587$) is less than the critical table value $x^2 = 9.49$ at 4 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the leaders and teachers response. Thus it is evident that school community relationship is important for information sharing and dissemination.

4.3.2. Areas of Community Involvement in School Affairs

The raw data gathered from the respondents during field work through questionnaire were analysed using descriptive statistics like mean and standard deviations and inferential statistics like independent sample t – test. The items were prepared in Likert scale which is designed in the form of five points rating scale comprising Strongly Agree, Agree, undecided, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. These responses have been given values 5,4,3,2 and 1 respectively. Based on the average mean value (3) of the Likert, the mean scores were interpreted as follows: if the mean score is greater than 3 it is above average and the involvement is high. If the mean score is 3 it is moderate and if the mean score is less than 3 the involvement is below average and it is low

Table 4 Areas of Community Involvement in School Issues

S.No	Items	Role in school	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
1	fund raising for projects	Leaders	25	2.40	.95	-2.149	.033
		Teachers	158	2.88	1.06		
2	management of school finance	Leaders	25	3.20	1.19	-.055	.956
		Teachers	158	3.21	1.29		
3	construction of buildings	Leaders	25	2.44	.71	-2.134	.034
		Teachers	158	2.89	1.03		
4	maintenance of school furniture and facilities	Leaders	25	2.56	1.22	-2.013	.046
		Teachers	158	3.01	1.03		
5	provision of school materials	Leaders	25	2.64	1.31	-2.124	.035
		Teachers	158	3.17	1.13		
6	securing of school discipline	Leaders	25	2.88	1.42	.423	.673
		Teachers	158	2.76	1.22		
7	provision of land for building	Leaders	25	2.60	1.15	-2.475	.014
		Teachers	158	3.20	1.12		
8	decision making related to school issues	Leaders	25	3.04	.88	.165	.869
		Teachers	158	3.00	1.15		
9	supervising teachers professional development	Leaders	25	2.28	.79	-2.572	.011
		Teachers	158	2.88	1.13		

*Note: 1. As Best and Kahn (2006) we can take positive t – value even if it is negative.
2. Degree of freedom is 181 and $\alpha = 0.05$*

Table 5 item no 1 indicates the mean score of leaders is (2.4) and mean score of teachers is (2.89). The response of both leaders and teachers is below the average mean score (3). This

shows that they didn't agree on the involvement of community in fund raising for school projects. To show the implications of the mean difference founded between the two groups, independent sample t – test was computed to compare the responses on the involvement of community in fund raising for school projects. Hence the calculated t value (2.15) is greater than the critical t value (1.98) at 181 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance. This indicates that there is statistically significant difference between the opinions of the two groups. Thus, the involvement of community in fund raising for school projects is low.

Table 5 item no 2 indicates the average mean scores of leaders and teachers response is 3.2 and 3.21, which is above mean average (3). On the other hand the calculated t value (0.50) is less than the table value of $t = 1.98$ at 181 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance. This indicates that there is no statistically significance difference between the mean values of the two groups. This indicates that community involvement in management of school finance is high. The interview made with PTA shows that community; especially the representative of the community (PTA) highly managed the finance of the school even by auditing twice a year. Document analysis also confirmed that the school grants and other school finance were utilized and managed appropriately.

Table 5 item no 3 indicated that both mean score of the leaders and teachers response were 2.44 and 2.89 respectively. This shows that it is below mean average. On the other hand the calculated t value (2.13) is greater than the table value of $t = 1.98$ at 181 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance. This indicates that there is statistically significance difference between the mean values of the two groups. Thus, community involvement in construction of school buildings is low. On top of this, the results of the interview indicated that the already constructed a few secondary schools built by community participations lacks quality and needs maintenance from year to year.

Table 5 item no 4 indicates the mean scores of leaders response is 2.5, below the average mean score (3) and that of teacher respondents is 3.1 above the average mean score (3). The difference in mean scores is detected by an independent sample t – test so that the calculated t value (2.01) is greater than the table value of $t = 1.98$ at 181 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance. This shows that there is statistically significance difference among the opinion of the two groups. Thus, one can conclude that community involvement in maintenance of school furniture and facilities is low. In addition, the results of the interview

concluded that only the surrounding community of rural secondary schools involve in maintaining school fence, classrooms, farming and harvesting school's own lands.

Table 5 item no 5 indicates the mean scores of leaders and teachers response is 2.64 and 3.17. The mean scores of the respondents are different. The difference in mean scores of the respondents, decided by applying independent sample t – test so that the calculated t value (2.214) is greater than the table value of $t = 1.98$ at 181 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance. This shows that there is statistically significance difference among the opinion of teachers and leaders. Thus one can conclude that community involvement in provision of school material is low.

As it is seen in table 5 item no 6 the mean scores of leaders and teacher response were 2.88 and 2.76. The mean scores of the respondents are slight different but it is below mean average (3). In relation to this the calculated t value (0.423) is less than the table value of $t = 1.98$ at 181 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference among the opinion of teachers and leaders. Thus one can conclude that community involve in securing school discipline.

As it is seen in table 5 item no 7 the mean scores of leaders and teachers response is 2.6 and 3.2. The mean scores of the respondents are different. In relation to this the calculated t value (2.46) is greater than the table value of $t = 1.98$ at 181 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance. This shows that there is statistically significance difference among the opinion of teachers and leaders. This indicates that community involvement in provision of land for building is low. The interview result also shows that, community resist to give land to schools for free. They need replacement from the surrounding.

As it is seen in table 5 item no 8 the average mean of leaders and teachers response is 3.04 and 3.0. The mean scores of the respondents are similar and above average mean score (3). In relation to this the calculated t value (0.165) is less than the table value of $t = 1.98$ at 181 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference among the opinion of teachers and leaders. This indicates that community involvement in decision making related to school issues is high. The interview result revealed that, not all communities involved in every decision, but the PTA involved highly in all decisions related to school issue as they are the representatives of community.

As it is seen in table 5 item no 9 the average mean scores of leaders and teachers response is 2.28 and 2.88 respectively. The mean scores of the respondents are different and below mean score. The independent sample t – test calculated to align such opinion difference is 2.57 which is greater than the table value of $t = 1.98$ at 181 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance. This shows that there is statistically significance difference among the opinion of teachers and leaders. Thus one can conclude that community involvement in supervising teachers professional development is low.

4.3.3 Areas of School Involvement in Community Affairs

Table 6 below indicates the involvement of schools in community affairs. Chi – square test is applied to compute and show whether or not statically significance difference appears in options of leaders and teachers.

Table 5 Areas of School Involvement in Community Affairs

S.no	Items	Response rate	Role in school						Chi-Square Tests		
			Leaders		Teachers		Total		Value	Df	Sig. (2-sided)
			No	%	No	%	No	%			
1	supporting the community in literacy development	SD	2	8	12	7.59	14	7.65	3.803	4	.433
		D	3	12	23	14.56	26	14.21			
		U	4	16	31	19.62	35	19.13			
		A	13	52	53	33.54	66	36.07			
		SA	3	12	39	24.68	42	22.95			
		Total	25	100	158	100	183	100			
2	supporting the community in community based development	SD	3	12	10	6.32	13	7.104	10.672	4	.031
		D	6	24	13	8.22	19	10.38			
		U	2	8	33	20.89	35	19.13			
		A	12	48	65	41.14	77	42.08			
		SA	2	8	37	23.42	39	21.31			
		Total	25	100	158	100	183	100			
3	supporting the community by offering play grounds, meeting halls, etc.	SD	4	16	14	8.861	18	9.836	2.378	4	.667
		D	5	20	26	16.46	31	16.94			
		U	4	16	42	26.58	46	25.14			
		A	9	36	53	33.54	62	33.88			
		SA	3	12	23	14.56	26	14.21			
		Total	25	100	158	100	183	100			
4	supporting the community by providing consultancy, training, etc.	SD	4	16	16	10.1	20	10.93	9.861	4	0.043
		D	9	36	33	20.9	42	22.95			
		U	1	4	38	24.1	39	21.31			
		A	10	40	46	29.1	56	30.6			
		SA	1	4	25	15.8	26	14.21			
		Total	25	100	158	100	183	100			

Table 6 item no. 1 indicates that 16(64%) leader respondents and 92(58.22%) teacher respondents, agreed that the school support the community in literacy development where as 5(20%) leaders and 35(22.15%) teachers agreed that the school did not support the community in literacy development. It is indicated that the calculated chi – square value is $\chi^2 = 3.803$ which is less than the critical table value $\chi^2 = 9.49$ at 4 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the response of leaders and teachers. Thus, the school supports the community in literacy development.

Table 6 item no. 2 indicates 14(56%) leader respondents and 102(64.56%) teacher respondents agreed that the school support the community in community based development, 2(8%) leader respondents and 33(20.89%) teacher respondents didn't conclude their idea that schools support the community in community based development or not. whereas 9(36%) leaders and 23(14.46%) teachers agreed that the school did not support the community in community based development. In contrary to this, the computer computation revealed that the calculated chi – square value ($\chi^2 = 10.672$) is greater than the critical table value $\chi^2 = 9.49$ at 4 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. This shows that there is statistically significance difference between the response of leaders and teachers. Thus, one can conclude that community support in community based development by the school is low.

Table 6 item no. 3 indicates 12(48%) leader respondents and 76(48.1%) teacher respondents agreed that school support the community by offering play grounds and meeting halls and 9(36%) leader respondents and 40(25.32%) teacher respondents agreed that school did not support the community by offering play grounds and meeting halls. on the other hand the calculated chi – square value ($\chi^2 = 2.378$) is less than the critical table value $\chi^2 = 9.49$ at 4 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the response of leaders and teachers. Thus, one can conclude that the school support the community by offering play grounds and meeting halls. Result from interview also concluded that especially the surrounding community used the school seats during weeding, school library for reading. Even though it is not for free the surrounding community also used school grasses and trees.

Table 6 item no. 4 indicated, 11(44%) leader respondents and 71(45.9%) teacher respondents agreed that school support the community by providing consultancy and training. 13(52%) leader respondents and 49(34%) teacher respondents disagreed on the idea that schools

support the community by providing consultancy and training. It is also indicated that the calculated chi – square value ($\chi^2 = 9.86$) is greater than the critical table value $\chi^2 = 9.49$ at 4 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. This shows that there is statistically significance difference between the response of leaders and teachers. Thus, it is concluded that school did not supported the community by providing consultancy and training.

4.3.3 Factors Hindering Effective School Community Relationship

School community relationships can be hindered in a number of ways. The response of respondents on some factors hindering relationship of the two is summarized in table 7 below.

Table 6 Factors Hindering Effective School Community Relationship

s.no	Items	Role in school	N	Mean	Std. Dev	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
1	Lack of interest of the school administrators in mobilizing community.	leaders	25	2.92	1.22	-1.046	.297
		teachers	158	3.23	1.41		
2	Wrong attitude that secondary school students are matured enough.	leaders	25	3.16	1.02	.502	.616
		teachers	158	3.03	1.24		
3	Lack of knowledge	leaders	25	3.20	1.70	.036	.971
		teachers	158	3.18	1.21		
4	Lack of professional administrators	leaders	25	3.28	1.36	.502	.616
		teachers	158	3.13	1.35		
5	Resistance of schools in supporting community	leaders	25	2.88	1.23	-.519	.605
		teachers	158	3.02	1.31		
6	Resistance of communities in involvement of school issues	leaders	25	3.20	1.41	-.226	.821
		teachers	158	3.26	1.34		
7	Distance from home to school	leaders	25	2.64	1.11	-.981	.328
		teachers	158	2.93	1.44		
8	Lack of community's time for the involvement on school issues.	leaders	25	3.12	1.33	-.226	.821
		teachers	158	3.21	1.37		
9	Lack of effective communication	leaders	25	2.88	1.56	1.629	.105
		teachers	158	3.36	1.36		
10	Lack of money to fund	leaders	25	3.20	1.44	-.863	.389
		teachers	158	3.45	1.36		
11	Lack of devotion among teachers	leaders	25	3.48	1.19	1.187	.237
		teachers	158	3.15	1.29		
12	Lack of commitment of the community for the involvement.	leaders	25	3.60	1.11	.370	.712
		teachers	158	3.50	1.27		

Df = 181 p = 0.05 table value = 1.98

Table 7 item no 1 indicates the mean scores of leaders is 2.92 which is below average mean score (3) showing that lack of interest of the school administrators in mobilizing community may not be the factors hindering school community relationships, while the mean score of teachers is 3.23 which is above mean (3) showing that lack of interest of the school administrators in mobilizing community is the factor that hinders school community relationships. To show the implications of the mean difference founded between the two groups, independent sample t – test was conducted to compare their responses. Hence the calculated T- value (1.046) is less than the critical t value (1.98) at 181 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance. This indicates that there is no statistically significance difference between the mean values of the two groups. Thus, lack of interest of the school administrators in mobilizing community is one factor that hinders the relationship.

Table 7 item no. 2 indicates the mean scores of the responses of leaders and teachers are 3.16 and 3.03 respectively. It is above mean average (3) showing that secondary school students are matured enough and did not need the help of their parents in secondary schools. To show the implications of the mean difference founded between the two groups, independent sample t – test was conducted to compare their responses. Hence the calculated t value (0.502) is less than the critical t value (1.98) at 181 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance. This indicates that there is no statistically significance difference between the mean values of the two groups. Thus, wrong attitude that secondary school students are matured enough is one factor that hinders the relationships of school community relationships.

Table 7 item no. 3 indicates the mean scores of the responses of leaders and teachers are 3.2 and 3.19 respectively. It is above average mean score (3) showing that lack of knowledge of the community can be a factor to hinder school community relationships. In contrary to these to show the implications of the slight mean difference founded between the two groups, independent sample t – test was conducted to compare their responses. Hence the calculated t value (0.036) is less than the critical t value (1.98) at 181 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance. This indicates that there is no statistically significance difference between the mean values of the two groups. Thus, lack of knowledge of the community is a factor that hinders school community relationships. Interview result indicated community think that school leaders, teachers and community representative (PTAs) by themselves are adequate to handle school activities. In support of this Steller and Arthur, (1983) suggested the major problem with school community relations is the public's lack of knowledge of the

successes of education and the truly good things that happen in the classroom. Backer (1997) quantitative study also affirmed that lack of knowledge and information on how communities should be involved in school activities is the barriers of school community relationships.

Table 7 item no. 4 indicates the mean scores of leaders and teachers response is 3.28, and 3.13, above average mean score (3) showing that lack of professional administrators can be a factor to hinder school community relationships. To show the implications of the mean difference founded between the two groups, using independent sample t – test, the calculated t value (0.502) is less than the critical t value (1.98) at 181 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance. This indicates that there is no statistically significance difference between the mean values of the two groups. Thus, lack of professional administrators is a factor that hinders school community relationships. As indicated in table 3 (respondents characteristic), only 12% leaders are professionals (Masters Level), while others are either subject specialists or un fit for the position (Degree level). From document analysis it was also observed that managing partnerships and networks with other schools and the wider community is very low in the zone.

Table 7 item no. 5 indicates the mean scores of leaders and teachers response is 2.88 below average mean and 3.02, above average mean score respectively. In contrast to this the mean difference between the two groups, using independent sample t – test was found to be $t = 0.519$. It is less than the critical t value (1.98) at 181 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance. This indicates that there is no statistically significance difference between the mean values of the two groups. Thus, there is resistance of schools in supporting community. PTA interview indicates that most schools have resistance in supporting community. Schools save themselves in serving the community as volunteers. Even though school leader plans to support community in community based education and training support, the teachers need incentives.

Table 7 item no. 6 indicates the mean scores of leaders and teachers response were 3.2.and 3.27 respectively. This mean score is above mean average (3) showing that there is resistance of communities in involvement of school issues. In addition to relate the mean difference between the two groups, independent sample t – test was computed. Accordingly, the calculated t- value (0.226) is less than the critical t value (1.98) at 181 degree of freedom and $p = 0.05$ level of significance. This indicates that there is no statistically significance

difference between the mean values of the two groups. Thus, one can conclude that there is resistance of communities in involvement of school issues. Result from interview also indicated that when communities are decided to contribute money to them self, those who refused to contribute cannot be punished. The community feel they don't have control over the school. They cannot afford to lose their labour and monetary funds. Okubanjo, (2006). affirmed as not all parents and community members are willing to get involved in school activities Some have had negative schooling experiences, some are illiterate and don't feel comfortable talking to teachers, and getting involved in any kind of school activities.

Table 7 item no. 7 indicates the mean scores of leaders and teachers response were 2.64 and 2.94 respectively. The mean score is below mean average (3) showing that distance from parents home to school cannot be considered as factors hindering school community relationships. But the result of independent sample t – test shows that t calculate (0.981)) is less than the critical t value (1.98) at 181 degree of freedom and $p = 0.05$ level of significance. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the mean values of the two groups. Thus, from this it can be concluded that distance from parents' home to school is considered as factors hindering school community relationships. Response of the interview indicated that when communities are called for school issues, almost half of them didn't come due to the far distance of parents' home to school. Thus it is considered as it is one factor that hinders strong relationships of school and the community.

As table 7 item no. 8 indicates the mean scores of leaders and teachers response were 3.12.and 3.21 respectively. This mean score is above average mean score (3) showing that lack of community's time for the involvement on school issues is considered as factors hindering school community relationships. Also the result of independent sample t – test shows that t calculate (0.226)) is less than the critical t value (1.98) at 181 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance. This shows there is no statistically significance difference between the mean values of the two groups. Thus, it can be concluded that lack of community's time for the involvement on school issues is one factor hindering school community relationships.

As table 7 item no. 9 indicates the mean scores of leaders and teachers response were 2.88.and 3.37 respectively. Since the mean score of leaders is below mean average (3), lack of effective communication between school and community did not be considered as the

factors hindering school community relationships. In contrast to this, the mean score of teachers is above average showing that lack of effective communication between school and community is considered as the factors hindering school community relationships. In order to relate the mean difference of the two groups an independent sample t – test is incorporated. The output of this test indicates t calculate (1.629) is less than the critical t value (1.98) at 181 degree of freedom and $p = 0.05$ level of significance. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the mean values of the two groups. Thus, lack of effective communication between school and community is considered as the factors hindering school community relationships.

As table 7 item no. 10 indicates the mean scores of leaders and teachers' response is 3.2.and 3.45 respectively. The mean score of both respondents' responses is above mean average (3). Thus, lack of money to fund for the school issues is a serious factor that hinders school community relationships. In relation to this the mean difference of the two groups is checked by an independent sample t – test. The output of this test indicates t calculate (0.863) is less than the critical t value (1.98) at 181 degree of freedom and $p = 0.05$ level of significance. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the mean values of the two groups. Thus, lack of money to fund for the school issues is a serious factor that hinders school community relationships. This assertion is supported as some communities are stressed by contributions (ESDP IV, 2010) and refuse to fund.

As table 7 item no. 11 indicated the mean scores of leaders and teachers response were 3.48 and 3.15 respectively. The mean score of both respondents' responses is above mean average (3). Thus lack of devotion among teachers is one factor that hinders school community relationships. In relation to this the mean difference of the two groups is checked by an independent sample t – test. The output of this test indicates t calculate (1.187) is less than the critical t value (1.98) at 181 degree of freedom and $p = 0.05$ level of significance. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the mean values of the two groups. Thus, one can conclude that lack of devotion among teachers is one factor that hinders school community relationships.

As table 7 item no. 12 indicated the mean scores of leaders and teachers response were 3.6 and 3.5 respectively. The mean score of both respondents' responses is above mean average (3). This shows lack of commitment of the community for the involvement is a serious factor that hinders school community relationships. In relation to this the mean difference of the two

groups is checked by an independent sample t – test. The output of this test indicates t calculate (0.37) is less than the critical t value (1.98) at 181 degree of freedom and $p = 0.05$ level of significance. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the mean values of the two groups. Thus, lack of commitment of the community for the involvement is a serious factor that hinders school community relationships

4.3.5. Strategies of Maintaining School Community Relationship

In order to maintain strategies to bring strong relationships between school and community, the researcher disseminated 10 item questionnaires to 25 school leaders (including principals, vice principals and school supervisors) and 158 teachers. Their response is set to computer software called SPSS. The independent t – test is incorporated in order to compare the means of the two groups (leaders and teachers). The output of their responses is summarised as table 8 below.

Table 7 Strategies of Maintaining School Community Relationships

S.no	Items	Role in school	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
1	Teachers visit the homes of their students	Leaders	25	1.88	.97	-2.35	.19
		Teachers	158	2.60	1.49		
2	Teachers inform parents on new trends in the school.	Leaders	25	3.12	1.12	-.321	.748
		Teachers	158	3.20	1.30		
3	Parents come to school when called to see how the school is performing	Leaders	25	2.36	1.18	-2.83	.005
		Teachers	158	3.20	1.40		
4	School administration recognizes parents' secure their support for the school projects.	Leaders	25	3.40	1.15	-.20	.835
		Teachers	158	3.45	1.24		
5	School organizes Parent Visitation Days/establish public conference	Leaders	25	3.16	1.21	-.041	.967
		Teachers	158	3.17	1.23		
6	school provide information about communities opinion to school	Leaders	25	3.00	1.22	-1.89	.060
		Teachers	158	3.48	1.17		
7	School invites influential community members during its meetings or conferences.	Leaders	25	3.36	1.07	-.372	.711
		Teachers	158	3.45	1.21		
8	Students meet with parents to solve in school problems	Leaders	25	2.40	1.19	-2.09	.038
		Teachers	158	2.98	1.30		
9	School uses print media to communicate to the community..	Leaders	25	2.28	.97	-2.07	.039
		Teachers	158	2.90	1.45		
10	School management facilitate fund raising campaign	Leaders	25	2.48	1.04	-2.098	.037
		Teachers	158	3.06	1.34		

Df 181 p = 0.05 table value 1.98

As table 8 item no. 1 indicates the mean scores of leaders and teachers response is 1.88 and 2.60 respectively. The mean score of both respondents' responses is below mean average (3). This shows that teachers didn't visit the home of their students in order to strength the relationships between school and community. The independent sample t – test also indicates that the calculated t value is $t = 2.357$ which is greater than the critical value $t = 1.98$ at 181 degree of freedom and $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance. This shows that there is statistically significance difference among the opinions of the two groups. Hence it supports that idea that students home visit by the teacher is low. The interview made with PTAs also indicates that home visit is not incorporated. But when there is drop out some teachers and principals ask the reason of drop out only for reporting.

As table 8 item no. 2 indicates the mean scores of leaders and teachers response were 3.12 and 3.21 respectively. The mean score of both respondents' responses is above mean average (3). This tells us teachers inform parents on new trends in the school. It is obvious that if parent get new information about their pupil as well as their school they feel a sense of ownership and as a result the relations become strong. In addition, the mean difference of the two groups is also checked by an independent sample t – test. The output of this test indicated t calculate (0.321) is less than the critical T value (1.98) at 181 degree of freedom and $p = 0.05$ level of significance. This shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the mean values of the two groups. Hence the idea is supported.

Table 8 item no. 3 indicated the mean scores of leaders and teachers response were 2.36 and 3.2 respectively. The mean scores of leaders response is below average mean (3). From this one can conclude that Parents didn't come to school when called to see how the school is performing. In contrary to this idea, teachers responded that parents come to school when called to see how the school is performing. To relate the mean difference of the two groups through independent sample t – test, $t = 2.834$ is computed. Since it is greater than the critical t value (1.98) at 181 degree of freedom and $p = 0.05$ level of significance, there is statistically significance difference between the mean values of the two groups. Thus, one can conclude that parents didn't come to school when called to see how the school is performing. The document analysis also support this idea as, even though it is not uniform in all schools, in some schools only PTAs meet at regular meeting schedule. Interview result also shows few parents (those who are surrounding the school) came to school for meeting in order to solve school related problems.

Table 8 item no. 4 indicates the mean scores of leaders and teachers response were 3.4 and 3.45 respectively. The mean scores are above average mean (3). Showing that, School administration recognizes parents to secure their support for the school project. When Communities support is recognized and advertised to communities, they mentally satisfied to their support and plan for further. The slight mean difference of the two groups also supports the detected by a high statistical computation so that the calculated value of t – test is 0.209. Since it is less than the critical t value (1.98) at 181 degree of freedom and $p = 0.05$ level of significance, there is no statistically significance difference between the mean values of the two groups. Thus from this, it is concluded that school administration recognized parents to secure their support for the school project.

Table 8 item no. 5 indicates the mean scores of leaders and teachers response were 3.6 and 3.17 respectively. The mean scores are above average mean (3). Showing that, School organizes Parent Visitation Days/establish public conference. The slight mean difference of the two groups also detected by a high statistical computation so that the calculated value of t – test is 0.041. Since it is less than the critical t value (1.98) at 181 degree of freedom and $p = 0.05$ level of significance, there is no statistically significance difference between the mean values of the two groups. Thus from this assertion one can conclude that school organizes parent visitation days/establish public conference. It is obvious that when communities come to school they hear the report and decide the school maps and identify the strength and weakness of the school. As a result the weakness of the school would be planned and implemented. Thus, parent visitation was seen as a tool for the relationship of school and community.

Table 8 item no. 6 indicates the mean scores of leaders and teachers response were 3.0 and 3.48 respectively. The mean scores are above average mean (3) showing that, schools provide information about community's opinion. The mean difference of the two groups also detected by a high statistical computation so that the calculated value of t – test is 1.89. Since it is less than the critical t value (1.98) at 181 degree of freedom and $p = 0.05$ level of significance, there is no statistically significance difference between the mean values of the two groups. Hence schools informed community opinion to other community highly.

Table 8 item no. 7 indicates the mean scores of leaders and teachers' response is 3.6 and 3.45 respectively. The mean scores are above average mean (3). The slight mean difference of the two groups also detected by a high statistical computation so that the calculated value of t – test is 0.372. Since it is less than the critical t value (1.98) at 181 degree of freedom and $p = 0.05$ level of significance, there is no statistically significance difference between the mean values of the two groups. Thus School invites influential community members during meetings or conference is seen as good strategy to strength school community relationships. As (Uemera, 1999) communities can contribute to schools by sending respected community members, such as religious leaders or tribe heads, to the classrooms and talk about community history, traditions, customs, and culture, which have been historically celebrated in the community. Schools themselves can contribute to community efforts by developing sustainable solutions to local problems through the influential community members.

Table 8 item no. 8 indicates the mean scores of leaders and teachers response were 2.4 and 2.98 respectively. The mean scores of both leaders and teachers response are below average mean (3). The mean difference of the two groups is detected by a high statistical computation so that the calculated value of independent sample t – test is 2.093. Since it is greater than the critical t value (1.98) at 181 degree of freedom and $p = 0.05$ level of significance, there is statistically significance difference between the responses of the two groups. Thus, one can conclude that holding meetings of parents and students together on school issues is low. This is because most parents did not come when called.

Table 8 item no. 9 indicates the mean scores of leader and teachers response were 2.28 and 2.90 respectively. The mean scores of both leaders and teachers' response are below average mean (3), The mean difference of the two groups also detected by a high statistical computation so that the calculated value of independent sample t – test is 2.07. Since it is greater than the critical t value (1.98) at 181 degree of freedom and $p = 0.05$ level of significance, there is statistically significance difference between the opinions of the two groups. Thus, using print media to communicate the wider community in schools is low. Interview conducted with PTA concluded that schools didn't use print media such as magazine, brochures, etc. Instead, schools inform students to come with their parents whenever there is meeting or any contacts. In additions schools made strong bond with wereda/kebele administrators so that message was disseminated through kebele administrators (cabines).

As table 8 item no. 10 shows the mean scores of leaders and teachers response is 2.48 below average mean score and 3.06 above average mean score respectively. The mean difference of the two groups also detected by a high statistical computation so that the calculated value of t – test is 2.098. Since it is greater than the critical t value (1.98) at 181 degree of freedom and $p = 0.05$ level of significance, there is statistically significance difference between the opinions of the two groups. Thus, one can conclude that school management facilitated fund raising campaign in low manner. Document analysis and Interview conducted with PTA also concluded that in most schools, fund raising campaign is not planed. Secondary School only seek government and non government organizations for constructions of buildings and others,

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents summaries, conclusions drawn from the findings and recommendations suggested based on the findings of this study.

5.2 Summary of Major Findings

The main purpose of this study was to assess school community relationships in government secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone. In order to achieve the objective, efforts were made to seek possible answers for the basic questions which stresses on the importance, areas, challenges and strategies/approaches of school community relationships.

The study was carried out on 8 government secondary schools in Horo Guduru Wollega zone. A descriptive survey was designed and employed in this study. The study used simple random, purposive and quota sampling. 5 supervisors, 8 school principals, 12 vice-principals, 158 teachers and 16 PTA members were the respondents of the study. Questionnaires, interview and document analysis were used as data gathering tools. The quantitative data, obtained from questionnaires were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical analysis such as percentages, means, chi – square and independent sample t – test. The qualitative data obtained from interview and document analysis were described to supplement the quantitative data analysis.

Finally, based on the analyses of the data the following major findings were obtained from the study.

5.2.1. Importance of school community relationships

The study indicated that School community relationship is very important for Horo Goduru wollega zone government secondary schools. Because it helps for: the development and practices of school policies, the developments of curriculum, developing a sense of trust between the two, providing the community a sense of ownership in school activities, sustaining the provision of finance, the provision of school facilities and the provision of security to the school. It is also important for solving school problems, the improvement of school performance, the welfare of teachers and students, monitoring student progress for the improvement of students' disciplinary problems, the improvement of students' academic performance and for information sharing and dissemination.

5.2.2 Areas of School Community Relationships

The involvement of communities of Horo Guduru Wollega zone in school's related issues are low. The low involvement of the communities include: areas of fund raising for projects, construction of buildings, maintenance of school furniture and facilities, provision of school materials, provision of lands for building, and supervising teachers professional development. However, the involvement of communities in the areas of management of school finance, securing of school discipline and decision making related to school issues are high. The study also indicated that Secondary Schools in Horo Guduru Wollega Zone supported the community in literacy development and offered play grounds and meeting halls. But the school didn't involve in community based development like consultancy and training.

5.2.3 Factors Hindering School Community Relationships

The study revealed the following factors that hinder school community relationships

- There is lack of interest of the school administrators (principals, vice principals, school supervisors and woreda education office heads and PTAs) in mobilizing community for having good relationships with schools.
- Wider community have wrong attitude regarding secondary school students' maturity level (i.e secondary school students are matured enough); the pupil couldn't need the support of parents.
- Communities of the Zone lack the knowledge of supporting school. The community feels that they don't have control over the school so that they cannot afford to lose their labour and monetary funds. They also think that school leaders, teachers and community representative (PTAs) by themselves are adequate to handle school activities.
- Most school leaders lack the knowledge of managing partnerships and coordination with other schools and the wider community due to unfitness to the position.
- Most communities have resistance in involvement on school issues because they may have negative schooling experiences and low commitment in involvement. Thus, schools save themselves from serving the community as volunteers and teachers also need incentives to support community in community based education and training.
- For most pupils' parent coming to school were thought losing more resource (time and finance) due to far distance from home to school.
- Most of the communities in the zone are stressed by contributions and refuse to fund due to lack of money.

5.2.4 Strategies used for school community relationships

The finding of the study indicated that in order to strengthen school community relationship teachers didn't visit the home of their pupil for further support. In turn when schools establish public conference and parent visitation days/school festivals/school open days, most of them (particularly the rural) didn't come.

The study revealed that School administration recognized parents' to secure their support for the school project, and provided information about their opinion to school but their contribution is not adequate for the school projects.

The study also revealed that using print media such as magazine, brochures and abstracts to communicate the wider community is low. Instead schools inform orally the students to come with their parents whenever there is meeting or any contacts. In addition, schools made strong bond with woreda/kebele administrators so that message was disseminated through kebele administrators.

5.3 Conclusions

In Horro Guduru Wollega zone government secondary schools, school community relationship plays an important role in resource mobilizations, improving school performance, monitoring student progress, improvement of students' disciplinary problems and academic performance. The communities of the Zone involved highly in areas of management of school finance, securing of school discipline and decision making rather than involvements resource provision, supervising teachers' professional development in turn secondary schools didn't involve in consultancy and training the community. Lack of administrators' interest, lack of communities knowledge and attitude, lack of professional administrators, resistance of schools and communities, distance from school, lack of effective communication, lack of money, lack of devotion (i.e teachers) are the main factors that hinder school community relationships in the Zone

Generally School community relationships in government secondary schools of Horo Gududru Wollega Zone is low because communities have resistance up on visiting schools and solving school problems. In turn there are also resistance of schools in giving continuous awareness creations and effective communication even though challenges made.

5.4 Recommendations

On the basis of the findings obtained and conclusions drawn, the following recommendations were made.

1. School community relationship is low in government secondary schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone Therefore Education offices of the zone actively work to raise up school community relationships.
2. To sustain good relationships of school and community, communities of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone need to involve in the areas of fund raisings, construction, maintenance of school furniture and facilities, provision of school materials, provision of lands, and supervising teachers' professional development.
3. School administrators together with teachers need to devote their time and launch strong relationships by continuous awareness creations and effective communications to the communities.
4. Ministry of Education need to encourage school principals to be professionals and to have adequate knowledge on school community relationship to handle school community relationship effectively despite its numerous challenges.

Finally, the researcher recommends researchers that they may conduct more detailed study on school community relationships.

References

- Abiy Zegeye et al. (2009). *Introduction to Research Methods: Preparatory Module for Addis Ababa University Graduate Program*. Graduate Studies and Research Office, Addis Ababa University: Unpublished
- Agabi, O.G., Okorosaye-Orubite, Ezikiel-Hart, J. & Egbezor, D.E. (2005). *School and society*. Port Harcourt: Davidstone Publishers
- Ayalew Shibeshi (1991). *Approaches to Educational Organization and Management, Part One*: Unpublished Teaching Material, Addis Ababa University
- Baker, A. J. L. (1997). Improving parent involvement programs and practices: A qualitative study of parents' perception. *School community journal*, 7(1), 127-153..
- Bakwai, B. (2013). Assessment of School Community Relationship in Secondary School in Zamfara State. Retrieved from <http://www.academia.edu/3999314/>
- Barry Lucas and Loraine Thompson. (n.d.). *School Community Relations Handbook*. SSTA research center report no. 66.
- Bauch, J. P. (1994). Categories of parent involvement. *The School Community Journal*, 4, 53-60.
- Berger, E.H. (1991). *Parents as partners in education*. New York: Macmillan
- Bibire, A. (2014). Community Participation in Education: Challenges and Prospects in Nigeria. Retrieved from http://challengenigeria.com.ng_community-participation-in-education-challenges-and-prospects-in-Nigeria
- Bray, Mark. (1996). *Decentralization of Education: Community Financing*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Bray, M. (2000). *community participation in Education: Dimensions, Variations and Implications*. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/image/0012/00123/123483>
- Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research methods (3rd ed.)*. New York, United States of America: Oxford University Press.
- Carino, Isidro D. and Mona Dumlao Valisno. (1994). "The Parent Learning Support System (PLSS): school and community collaboration for raising pupil achievement in the Philippines." In *Partnerships and Participation in Basic Education: A Series of Training Modules and Case Study Abstracts for Educational Planners and Managers*. edited by Sheldon Shaeffer. Paris: UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning.

- Colletta, Nat J. and Gillian Perkins. (1995). *Participation in Education*. Environment Department Papers. Paper No.001. Participation Series. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Dacia Chrzanowski, Susan Rans and Raymond Thompson. (2006). *Building Mutually-Beneficial Relationships Between Schools and Communities: The Role of a Connector*. Asset Based Community Development Institute at Northwestern University.
- Epstein, Joyce L., Lucretia Coates, Karen Clark Salinas, Mavis, G. Sanders & Beth S. (1997). *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Your Handbook for Action*. ERIC:ED 415003.
- Epstein, J. L. & Sheldon, S. B. (2002). Present and accounted for: Improving student attendance through family and community involvement. *Journal of Educational Research*, 95, 308-318.
- ESDP IV (Education sector development Plan), (2010). *Program Action Plan*: MoE, Addis Ababa
- FDRE (Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia). (1994). *Education and Training Policy*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Fiore, D. J. (2006). *School community relation* (2nd ed.). Eye on education. Retrieved on February, 28, 2011, from <http://books.google.ca/book?>
- Gital, M. A. (2009). *The Impact of School-Community Relationship on Primary Education (A Case Study of Some Selected Communities of Tafawa Balewa Local Government Area of Bauchi State)*. Unpublished PGDE Project
- Goldring, E. B. (1994). "Community and Parents' Participation in Curriculum Decisions." In *The International Encyclopedia of Education*. Second Edition Volume 2. By Husén, Torsten and T. Neville Postlethwaite (Editors in Chief). New York: Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Haiman, P. (1965). *To be successful, community programs must involve parents in a Meaningful way*. Retrieved 2009 from <http://www.accessmylibrary.com/article-1G1-21163380/successful-community-programs-must.html>
- Henderson, A. T. & Mapp, K.L. (2002). *A New Wave of Evidence: The Impact of School, Family, and Community Connections on Student Achievement*. National Center for Family & Community Connections with Schools, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory www.sedl.org/connections/

- Heneveld, Ward and Helen Craig. (1996). *Schools Count: World Bank Project Designs and the Quality of Primary Education in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Homby, G.& Lafael, R. (2011). Barriers to parental involvement in education: An explanatory model. *Educational review* 63(1), 37-82.
- I. A. Ajayi, T. Ekundayo Haastrup and B.B.Arogundade. (2009). Parents' involvement in school administration as a correlate of effectiveness of secondary schools in Nigeria. *Education Administration and policy studies Vol. 1 (3)*, 41-44.
- Idaho Falls School District (1991). *Board policy*. Idaho: Public Relation Department.
- INEE and Ethiopian Education Cluster. (2013). *Ethiopia Minimum Standards For Education in Emergencies*. Addis Ababa: UNICEF Ethiopia.
- Kindred, L. W., Bagin, D., & Gallagher, D. R. (1990). *The school and community relations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kothari, C., R. (2004). *Research Methodology: methods and techniques 2nd ed*. New Delhi: New age international private Ltd Publishers.
- Lawson, M. A. (2003). School family relation in context: Parent and teacher perceptions of parent involvement. *Urban education*, 38, 77-133.
- Lockheed, M.E. & Vers Poor, (1991). *Improving Primary Education in Developing country*. Washington D.C, World Bank.
- Los Angeles Times*. (1979). Parent involvement in education. Retrieved 2009 from pqasb.pqarchiver.com/latimes/access/652316102
- Lovell, Catherine H. (1992). *Breaking the Cycle of Poverty: The BRAC Strategy*. West Hartford, Connecticut: Kumarian Press, Inc
- McDonough, Maureen H. and Christopher W. Wheeler. (1998). *Toward School and Community Collaboration in School Forestry: Lessons Learned from Thai Experiences*. Washington, DC: Advancing Basic Education and Literacy Project, supported by US Agency for International Development and housed in Academy for Educational Development
- Mishra, R. C. (2007). *History of education administration*. New Delhi: APH Publishing Corporation.
- Mitrofanova, Y. (2011). Building Community-School Relations. Retrieved from <http://lancaster.unl.edu/community/articles/communityschools.shtml>
- MoE, (1994). *The New Education and Training Policy*, Addis Ababa: MoE/EDPDA.
- MoE, (2010). *Education Sector Development Plan ESDP IV*. Addis Ababa

- MoE. (2013). *School Improvement Planning*. Addis Ababa.
- Montemayor, A.M., and A.A. Romero, (2002). "Valued Parent Leadership," *IDRA Newsletter* (San Antonio, Texas: Intercultural Development Research Association,
- NEA. (2008). *Parent, Teacher, Community Participation in Education*. Washington DC: NAE ,Education Policy and Practice Department.
- NEA. (2011). *Family - school - community partnership*. Washington DC.
- Nieto, S. (2004). *Affirming diversity: The socio-political context of multicultural education 4th ed.* .Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development). (1997). *Parents as Partners in Schooling*. Paris: OECD, Center for Educational Research and Innovation
- Pena, Valeria Junho. (1995). "Second Phase of the Social Assessment for the El Salvador EDUCO Program and the Basic Education modernization Project." LATEN dissemination Note #13. Washington, DC: The World Bank. .
- R. Hill.(1998). *What sample size is "enough" in internet survey research? Interpersonal Computing and Technology: An Electronic Journal for the 21st Century*, Volume 6, Number 3-4,4-10
- Shaeffer, Sheldon (Ed.). (1992). *Collaborating for Educational Change: the Role of Teachers, Parents and the Community in School Improvement*. Paris: UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning.
- Shaeffer, Sheldon (Ed.). (1994). *Partnerships and Participation in Basic Education: A Series of Training Modules and Case Study Abstracts for Educational Planners and Managers*. Paris: UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning.
- Smith, J., Woholstetter, P., Kuzin, C.A. & Depedro, K. (2011). Parental involvement in urban charter schools :New strategies for increasing Participation. *The school community journal*, 21(1), 71-79.
- Steller, Arthur W., (1983): *How to Develop Positive Teacher-Parent Relationships*. Educational Resources Information Center, ED 240678.
- Swift-Morgan, J. (2006).What Community Participation in Schooling Means: Insight from South Ethiopia. *Harvard Educational Review* Vol. 79, No. 3, pp 339-368.
- Today's Education, (1978), *Public Respects Teachers*
- T. U. Sa'ad and A. M. Sadiq. (2014). The Relevance of School Community Relationship on the Development of Primary Education in Azare Metropolis of Bauchi State, Nigeria. *Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 4 (6), 23-29.
- Uemura, M. (1999). *community Participation in education*. World Bank.

- UNICEF. (1992). *Strategies to Promote Girls' Education: Policies and Programmes that Work*. New York: UNICEF
- USA Today. (1990). *Parents hold the key to learning*. Retrieved 2006 from pqasb.pqarchiver.com/USAToday/access/55904475
- U.S. Department of Education. (1997). Family involvement in children's education: *Successful local approaches*. Retrieved 2004 from <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/FamInvolve/execsumm.html>
- Williams, James H. (1993). "Improving School-Community Relations in the Periphery." In *Reaching Peripheral Groups: Community, Language and Teachers in the Context of Development*. Edited by William K. Cummings. Buffalo, NY: Graduate School of Education Publications in association with the Comparative Education Center, State University of New York at Buffalo; Washington, DC: Project ABEL, the Academy for Educational Development
- Williams, James H. (1994). "The Role of the Community in Education." In *The Forum For Advancing Basic Education and Literacy*, Volume 3, Cambridge: Harvard Institute for International Development.
- World Bank. (1995a). *The Gambia: Why Gambian Households Underinvest in Education of Girls*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank. (1995b). *Madagascar: Towards a School-Based Strategy for Improving Primary and Secondary Education*. Washington, DC: World Bank
- World Bank. (1997). *Primary Education in India*. Development in Practice Series. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

•
•
•

Appendix I

Jimma University
College of Education and Behavioural Science
Department of Educational Planning and Management

Questionnaire to be filled by Directors, Vice directors and teachers, on Assessment of School Community Relationship in Secondary Schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone

Dear Sir/Ma,

I am MA student in School Leadership in Jimma University. I am conducting a research on Assessment of School Community Relationship in secondary Schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone. This questionnaire is given to you for the purpose of educational research. It is designed to obtain information on School Community Relationship in secondary Schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone. The information provided will be treated in strict confidence and will be used for the purpose of research only. Thus, I am very grateful for your genuine support in response to the questionnaire.

Part I: Personal Information

Please use the symbol (√) thick in the boxes bellow that mach to your appropriate concern

1. Educational background:

Grade 1-10 diploma degree Masters

2. sex: Male Female

3. Age: 20-30 31-40 41-50 51 and above

4. Role in school: Director Vice Director Teacher

II. Questionnaire on the Assessment of School Community Relationship in Secondary Schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone Schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone. Use the symbol (✓) tick for your best option under Likert scale which represents 5 = strongly agree (SA) 4 = Agree (A) 3 = Undecided (U) 2 = Disagree (D) 1 = Strongly Disagreed (SD)

S/N	Item Statement	5	4	3	2	1
o						
A	Importance of School community relationship					
1	For the development of sustainable mutual collaboration between members of school and community.					
2	For providing the community a sense of ownership in school activities.					
3	For developing a sense of trust between school and community					
4	For sustaining the provision of finance for the school					
5	For the provision of school facilities					
6	For the provision of security to the school					
7	For the development and practices of school policies					
8	For solving school problems					
9	for the improvement of school performance					
10	For the developments of a curriculum					
11	For the welfare of teachers and students					
12	For monitoring student progress					
13	For the improvement of students disciplinary problems					
14	For the improvement of students' academic performance					
15	For information sharing and dissemination					
B	Areas of community involvement in school					
16	In fund raising for projects					
17	In management of school finance					
18	In construction of buildings					
19	In maintenance of school furniture and facilities					
20	In provision of school materials					
21	In securing of school discipline					
22	In provision of lands for building					
23	In decision making related to school issues					
24	In supervising teachers professional development					
C	Areas of school involvement in community affairs					
25	supporting the community in literacy development					

26	supporting the community in community based development					
27	supporting the community by offering play grounds, meeting halls, etc.					
28	supporting the community by providing consultancy, training, etc.					
D	Factors hindering effective school community relationship					
29	Lack of interest of the school administrators in mobilizing community.					
30	Wrong attitude that secondary school students are matured enough.					
31	Lack of knowledge					
32	Lack of professional administrators					
33	Resistance of schools in supporting community					
34	Resistance of communities in involvement of school issues					
35	Distance from home to school					
36	Lack of community's time for the involvement on school issues.					
37	Lack of effective communication					
38	Lack of money to fund					
39	Lack of devotion among teachers					
40	Lack of commitment of the community for the involvement.					
E	Strategies of maintaining school community relationship					
41	Teachers visit the homes of their students					
42	Teachers inform parents on new trends in the school.					
43	Parents come to school when called to see how the school is performing					
44	School administration recognizes parents' secure their support for the school projects.					
45	School organizes Parent Visitation Days/establish public conference					
46	school provide information about communities opinion to school					
47	School invites influential community members during its meetings or conferences.					
48	Students meet with parents to solve in school problems					
49	School uses print media to communicate to the community..					
50	School management facilitate fund raising campaign					

Appendix II

Jimma University
College of Education and Behavioural Science
Department of Educational Planning and Management

An Interview for parents and Parent teacher Associations (PTA) on an assessment of school community relationship in Secondary Schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone

Age _____ Sex _____ level of education _____

IF PTA, Experience in PTA service _____

1. What do the communities provide/offer for the school and the school provide/offer for the community?
2. To what extent do parents follow up their pupil? Participate on school funds, school festivals, meetings and parents' day?
3. What is your view towards the economic capacity of the community in financing schools?
4. What channels do schools use to communicate the community to create awareness, motivate and convince the community for participation?
5. What are the challenges facing school community relationship in your school?
6. What has been done to solve problems related to school community relationships in your school?
7. What success is registered as a result of community involvement in your school?

Thank you for your participation!

Jimma University
College of Education and Behavioural Science
Department of Educational Planning and Management

An Interview for parents and Parent teacher Associations (PTA) on an assessment of school community relationship in Secondary Schools of Horo Guduru Wollega Zone

I Umurii _____ III. Sadarkaa barumsaa _____
II Saala _____ Iv Tajaajila GMB keessatti qabu _____

1. Hirmaannaan uummataa m/b sadarkaa 2ffaatiif maaliif barbaachisee?
2. Akka nnaannoo keetto uummatni m/barumsaatiif maal gumaache? Mannii barumsaa hoo uummataaf maal maal gumaachee?
3. Maatiin barattootaa barattoota isaanii akkamiin hordofuu? akkamiinis arjooma dhimma mana barumsaa irratti, wal ga'ii dhimma mana barumsaa fi guyyaa ayyaana maatii irratti hirmaatuu?
4. Manni barumsaa uummataaf hubannoo waa'ee deeggarsa mana barumsaa kennuu fi uummata amansiisuuf akkasumas sissi'oomsuuf quunnmtii odeeffannoo maal maal fayyadamaa?
5. Akka mana barumsaa keetti walitti dhiyeenyi mana barumsaa fi uummataa akka hin cimneef kan hudhaa ta'e maal maal fa'i?
6. Rakkoolee walitti dhufeenya uummataa fi mana barumsaa gidduutti gufuu ta'an dhabamsiisuuf hojii maal maaltu raawwatamee?
7. Akka mana barumsaakeetti hirmaannaa uummanni mana barumsaaf godheen malkaa'ina maal maaltu galma ga'ee?